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Hearing Agenda

Tuesday, April 14, 2015

9:45 A.M.

PROCLAMATIONS
Autism Awareness Month
National Volunteer Week

10:00 A.M.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

INVOCATION

CONSENT AGENDA
Consent Agenda Items will be considered together and will be approved on a single motion. Any person desiring to remove an item for separate consideration should so request before approval of the agenda.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

1. Request approval of a plat for recording: Lacamas Prairie Estates.

   (Fiscal Impact: yes no; + – n)

COMMUNITY PLANNING

2. Request approval of a contract amendment with ESA for the completion of a supplemental environmental impact statement in support of the 2016 Clark County Comprehensive Plan update.

   (Fiscal Impact: yes no; + – n)

PUBLIC WORKS

3. Request approval of a Final Order of Vacation for the NE 5th Street, NE 6th Street, NE 193rd Avenue, NE 196th Avenue, and NE 194th Place – all located in the Plat of Regency Place. Work Order Number 11343.

   (Fiscal Impact: yes no; + – n)

For any questions regarding consent agendas, contact Mark McCauley at Mark.Mccauley@clark.wa.gov or 360.397.2232.

For other formats, contact the Clark County ADA Office: Voice (360) 397-2322; Relay 711 or (800) 833-6388; Fax (360) 397-6165; E-mail ADA@clark.wa.gov.
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4. Request approval of a Final Order of Vacation for a portion of NE 13th Avenue located between NE 78th Street and NE 88th Street. Work Order Number 11354.

   (Fiscal Impact: yes no; + – n)

5. Request approval to establish Public Works Project #313822, NE 47th Avenue (NE 68th Street to NE 78th Street), and approve the Notice to Contractors to advertise the construction contract for bids.

   (Fiscal Impact: yes no; + – n)

6. Request approval of the Federal-Aid Project Prospectus and Local Agency Agreement for the Hayes, Washougal River, and Lockwood Creek Roads Safety Improvement project CRP 351622.

   (Fiscal Impact: yes no; + – n)

7. Request approval authorizing the Public Works Director to execute contracts with Matt Peterson, Tribeca Transport, and Natural Selection Farms for the land application of biosolids from the Salmon Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant.

   (Fiscal Impact: yes no; + – n)

ROUTINE

8. Request approval of warrants for payment of claims against various county departments dated 3/30 – 4/03/15 in the amount of $3,636,211.45; and dated 3/16 – 3/20/15 in the amount of $2,969,722.22.


10. Notice of Hearing approved setting Wednesday, April 22, 2015, 9:00 a.m., in the Commissioners’ Hearing Room, 1300 Franklin Street, 6th Floor, Vancouver, Washington, as the time and place to consider an ordinance relating to the regulation of smoking in public places by adoption of the Legislature’s enactment of Chapter 70.160, RCW, Smoking in Public Places (SIPP), the regulation of inhalant delivery systems, and the amendment to Title 24 of the Clark County Code, Chapter 24.20. The proposed ordinance takes the existing county code and includes inhalant delivery systems to be subject to the SIPP law, which prohibits smoking in public places, places of employment and within 25 feet of exits, entrances and windows of buildings. Further, the proposed ordinance does not ban inhalant delivery devices; rather, it makes them subject to the same regulation as tobacco products.

For any questions regarding consent agendas, contact Mark McCauley at Mark.Mccauley@clark.wa.gov or 360.397.2232.

For other formats, contact the Clark County ADA Office: Voice (360) 397-2322; Relay 711 or (800) 833-6388; Fax (360) 397-6165; E-mail ADA@clark.wa.gov.
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PUBLIC COMMENT—CLARK COUNTY ISSUES

PUBLIC HEARING: 2016 COMPREHENSIVE GROWTH MANAGEMENT PLAN UPDATE
The purpose of the hearing will be to take public testimony and discuss the proposed alternatives for consideration in the environmental review needed to update the county’s Comprehensive Growth Management plan. The council will also consider revised Population and Employment Allocation - Issue Paper 4.2 and SEPA Alternatives — Issue Paper 5.1.
Staff: Oliver Orjiako, 397-2280, ext. 4112

COUNCILOR COMMUNICATIONS

ADJOURN

2:00 P.M. PUBLIC BID OPENINGS

BID 2619
Annual High Density Polyethylene Culvert

BID CRP 333022
Salmon Creek Avenue WSU Entrance to Pleasant Valley Park

For any questions regarding consent agendas, contact Mark McCauley at Mark.MCCAULEY@clark.wa.gov or 360.397.2232.
STAFF REPORT

TO:   Clark County Board of Councilors
      David Madore, Tom Mielke, Jeanne Stewart

FROM: Oliver Orjiako, Director

DATE: April 9, 2015

SUBJECT: Proposed Alternatives for consideration in the environmental review needed to update the county's Comprehensive Growth Management Plan

Purpose

The purpose of this hearing is for the Clark County Board of Councilors to take public testimony and decide on proposed alternatives for the environmental review needed to update the county’s Comprehensive Growth Management plan. The council will also need to update population and employment allocations, Issue Paper 4.2, and State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Alternatives, Issue Paper 5.1.

What is needed is a final decision that identifies all alternatives to be studied under SEPA so staff can re-start the environmental review process. Staff also requests approval of a contract amendment with Environmental Science Associates (ESA). ESA is an environmental science and planning firm the county contracted with to develop the environmental impact review relating to the plan update.

Background

The Board adopted the county’s first plan under the Growth Management Act, RCW 36.70A, in 1994. The 1994 plan was challenged for a number of reasons, but resource and rural zoning were ultimately found to be GMA-compliant. The comp plan’s resource and rural zoning were reaffirmed by the Board in both 2004 and 2007. The 2007 plan was challenged primarily because of the inclusion of a large amount of what had been agricultural land in urban growth areas.

In July 2013, Clark County began the process of updating its Comprehensive Growth Management Plan to meet 2016 periodic update requirement of the GMA (RCW 36.70A.140). Several issue papers have been prepared to allow the Board to make decisions about the update. Issue Paper 5.1 discusses alternatives that are being considered in a supplemental environmental impact statement. That process began in October 2014, but was halted by the Councilors in January 2015.
Discussion of Proposed Alternatives and Potential new rural lots

Alternative 1: No action. This alternative is the adopted Comprehensive Plan as amended in July 2014, with current urban growth boundaries, planning assumptions, policies and implementation ordinances. SEPA requires the inclusion of a no-action alternative. The county would re-adopt the map as it is with no new changes. There are 9,390 potential new lots in the no-action alternative.

Alternative 2: Rural and Urban Changes. The new planning assumptions, policy direction, changes in land use/zoning, and principles and values defined by the commissioners were used in this alternative. This option supports job and population growth, acknowledges development trends, updates zoning and makes changes to some comprehensive plan designations. This option as proposed would reduce the minimum parcel size for agriculture (AG-20 to AG-10) and some forest (FR-40 to FR-20) lands, and adjust some R-20 to R-10 as appropriate to maintain buffering of resource lands. This alternative as proposed could add approximately 1,686 new lots to the rural area, for a total of 11,016 new lots.

Alternative 3.1 (updated): Battle Ground, La Center, Ridgefield, and Washougal. The cities of Battle Ground, La Center, Ridgefield and Washougal are considering expanding their urban growth areas to support job and residential growth. In this proposal the City of Battle Ground requests urban zoning for 80 acres (currently zoned R-5) for employment. La Center’s requests urban zoning for 56.55 acres (currently zoned AG-20) for employment and the La Center School District requests urbanization for 17 acres (currently zoned R-5) as a school site. Ridgefield’s request is to expand its urban growth area by 107.47 acres (currently zoned AG-20) for residential use. Washougal requests 40.6 acres (currently zoned R-5) for residential. This alternative as proposed would add a total of 301.68 acres into the urban growth boundaries but would allow for about 9,370 new lots in the rural area based on existing rural zoning.

Alternative 4: Resource and Rural changes. This option as proposed would add 10 and 20 acre minimum lots sizes in Forest zones in certain locations, considering existing rural character and predominant lot sizes. In the Agricultural zones, Alternative 4 would eliminate the AG-20 zone, and would establish 5 and 10-acre minimum lot sizes in certain locations, considering existing rural character and predominant lot sizes. In the Rural zones, Alternative 4 would eliminate R-10 and R-20 zones, and would establish 1 and 2.5-acre minimum lot sizes in certain locations, considering existing rural character and predominant lot sizes. This alternative as proposed would add approximately 7,931 new lots to the rural area bringing the total to potentially 17,321 new lots.

Staff held a series of open houses where the public provided comment on the scope of impacts to be examined under SEPA. The comments from the March 25 and April 1, 2015 open houses are included in the Board’s packet.
Discussion of Revised Issue Papers 4.2, 5.0, and 5.1

Issue Paper 4.2, attached, discusses the additional capacity for population and jobs not captured by the vacant land model reflecting an increase of 15,224 persons and 24,175 jobs. It updates Issue Paper 4.0, to reflect more recent information. Countywide forecasts adopted by the Board in Resolution 2014-06-17 are modestly adjusted to reflect the increase in existing population and jobs that occurred during 2014, to include city assumptions for projected future growth through redevelopment as directed by the Board, and to be consistent with the cities' proposals for their respective UGAs. These forecasts and allocations are intended to keep cities whole by not forcing unrequested reductions or significant expansions of Urban Growth Areas.

Issue Papers 5.0 and 5.1, attached, provide in detail a summary of events that have transpired since the Board of County Councilors initially discussed the environmental impact review process.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends the Board of Clark County Councilors finalize the selection of all alternatives for study in the SEPA analysis, and approve the revised Issue Papers, adopting resolutions, as well as the amended contract with ESA.

Attachments:

A. Adoption Resolutions
   A.1. Population and Employment Allocation
   A.2. SEPA Alternatives
B. Estimating Potential Rural Lots per Proposed Alternatives
D. SEPA Alternatives – Issue Papers 5.0 and 5.1
E. Public Comment:
   E.1. August 2014: Summary of Scoping Comments
   E.2. October 29/30, 2014: Open House Comments on the Alternatives
   E.3. March 25/April 1, 2015: Open House Comments on the Alternatives
F. Public Involvement Timeline
G. Amended Contract with ESA and Staff Report
RESOLUTION NO. 2015-04-

A RESOLUTION amending Resolution 2014-06-17, relating to the adoption of the Clark County population and employment allocations that will be used for the county’s comprehensive land use plan 2016 periodic update pursuant to Chapter 36.70A RCW.

WHEREAS, the Board adopted Resolution 2014-06-17 Clark County 2016 Population and Employment Allocation, the Comprehensive Plan 2016 periodic update Planning Assumptions and the 2016 Board Principles and Values at a duly advertised public hearing on June 24, 2014 that will be used for the county’s Comprehensive Plan 2016 periodic update pursuant to RCW 36.70A.140; and

WHEREAS, the Board reviewed Issue Paper 4.2 and considered amending the population allocation at a work session on September 24, 2014; and

WHEREAS, the Board considered Issue Paper – 4.2: Clark County 2016 Population and Employment Allocation, the Comprehensive Plan 2016 periodic update Planning Assumptions and the 2016 Board Principles and Values (Exhibit 1) at a duly advertised public hearing on April 14, 2015; and

WHEREAS, the Board took public testimony from interested parties, considered all the written and oral arguments and testimony, and considered all the comments presented to the Board; and

WHEREAS, the Board finds that adoption will further the public health, safety and welfare; now therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS OF CLARK COUNTY, STATE OF WASHINGTON, hereby amends the Comprehensive Plan 2016 periodic update Planning Assumptions as shown in Table 1, the population growth and employment allocation for the preliminary allocations for initial review of urban growth areas 20-year period ending in 2035 as shown in Table 2 and the 2016 Board Principles and Values as shown in Table 3. This information will be used for the County’s 20-year Comprehensive Growth Management Plan 2016 periodic update pursuant to RCW 36.70A.140.

Table 1: Planning Assumptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assumption</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-Year Population Projection</td>
<td>578,391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Population Growth (new)</td>
<td>129,546</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>75% single-family, 25% multifamily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons per Household</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jobs</td>
<td>101,153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs to Household</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>

2015 Resolution Relating to Comprehensive Plan 2016 Periodic Update
Table 2: Population and Employment Allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Battle Ground</td>
<td>20,871</td>
<td>15,972</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>37,705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camas</td>
<td>22,843</td>
<td>11,255</td>
<td></td>
<td>34,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>62,205</td>
<td>11,432</td>
<td></td>
<td>73,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaCenter</td>
<td>3,209</td>
<td>3,233</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>6,714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridgefield</td>
<td>6,575</td>
<td>13,087</td>
<td>5,832</td>
<td>20,523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver</td>
<td>315,460</td>
<td>52,786</td>
<td>6,200</td>
<td>365,743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washougal</td>
<td>15,932</td>
<td>6,023</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>22,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodland</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>229</td>
<td></td>
<td>339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yacolt</td>
<td>1,661</td>
<td>303</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>448,845</strong></td>
<td><strong>114,322</strong></td>
<td><strong>15,224</strong></td>
<td><strong>563,167</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Clark County, Geographic Information System and Community Planning
Note: 10% based on 90/10 urban/rural planning assumption. March 31, 2015 expansion request includes additional acreage for Washougal’s UGA - 392 persons and Ridgefield’s UGA - 832 persons; totaling an additional 1,224 persons.

Table 3: Board Principles and Values

**Employment Lands**
- Equalize land allocation and jobs/population ratio so that cities have equitable share of jobs – diverse job base
- Mapping: Put job lands close to transportation so that capacity is provided to job opportunities
- Ground-truth where residential and jobs “make sense” – no more “wetland industrial”
- Focus Public Investment Areas – “hubs” of job growth that can be serviced effectively (adjust Transportation Improvement Plan if necessary)
- Maximize the potential for the county’s railroad as a job-creating asset
- Prioritize lands that are most likely to provide “family-wage jobs” as defined in the comprehensive plan policies

**Housing**
- Vancouver UGB: minimize residential growth (there will be some residential growth but not dense residential growth, especially where there already exists large-lot, high-value development). Minimize doesn’t mean “don’t” but lower density of residential growth.
- Maintain a mix of housing options (a variety of housing densities – large, medium, and small lots)
- Identify school sites or areas where school buildings will be necessary inside the new hubs of residential areas (need sites close to where children will be). Avoid penalizing property owners in the process.

**Community Design**
- New growth needs to blend well with existing neighborhoods (e.g., transition zones, buffering, gradual transitions in development style, type)

**Rural Lands**
- Minimize the conversion of productive farmland – those lands which have long-term commercial agricultural viability. Is it being used today for commercial agriculture?

**Other Land Use**
- Ensure good geographic distribution of commercial lands
- Breaks/Green spaces between communities – natural borders
- Use an integrated view in examining the proposed boundaries and plan map
- Respect cities’ investment in capital facilities by not shrinking the 2007 urban growth boundaries.

**Tax Base**
- Maintain county tax base (generate revenue necessary to provide services
- Balance between the cities
• Resulting tax base (e.g., jobs, residential that doesn't result in great demand for schools) needs to be equitable for school districts. Tax base equitably distributed between residential and job producing lands.

Mapping Implications
• La Center needs greater economic diversification opportunities and multi-family land use designations
• Ground-truthing is extremely important for employment
• Lands with few if any constraints ("easy") should be allocated first for employment
• Employment-reserve overlay for lands served by county railroad corridor

Allocation
• Guided by the values identified (in the previous topics)
• Ground-truthing will clarify/define the allocation (versus "assigned")
Section 1. Instructions to Clerk.

The Clerk to the Board shall:

1. Transmit a copy of this resolution to the Washington State Department of Commerce within ten days of its adoption pursuant to RCW 36.70A.106.

2. Transmit a copy of the adopted resolution to Community Planning Department Director.

3. Transmit a copy of the adopted resolution to the Cities of Battle Ground, Camas, La Center, Ridgefield, Washougal, Woodland, Vancouver and Town of Yacolt.

4. Transmit a copy of the adopted resolution to the Ports of Camas/Washougal, Ridgefield, Vancouver and Woodland.

5. Transmit a copy of the adopted resolution to the Columbia River Economic Development Council President.

6. Record a copy of this resolution with the Clark County Auditor.

7. Cause notice of adoption of this resolution to be published forthwith pursuant to RCW 36.70A.290.

ADOPTED this ___ day of April 2015.

BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
FOR CLARK COUNTY, WASHINGTON

Attest:

Clerk to the Board
By: ____________________________
David Madore, Chair

Approved as to Form Only:
By: ____________________________
Jeanne E. Stewart, Councilor

Anthony F. Golik
Prosecuting Attorney

By: ____________________________
Christine Cook
Deputy Prosecuting Attorney

By: ____________________________
Tom Mielke, Councilor
Exhibit 1
Clark County Comprehensive Plan 2016 Update
Planning for growth 2015 – 2035
2016 Population and Employment Allocation — Issue Paper 4.2

Purpose
This memorandum provides a basic framework and starting point from which the county and its cities may consider population and employment allocation.

Background
In July 2013, Clark County began the process of updating its Comprehensive Growth Management Plan to meet the 2016 periodic update requirement of Chapter 36.70A.140 RCW. Several issue papers have already been prepared to allow the Board to make decisions about the update:

- Issue Paper 4 – Population and Job Allocation: On June 24, 2014, the Board identified the methodology for allocating growth by UGA and adopted preliminary allocations for initial review (Res. 2014-06-17). The allocations were revised as Issue Paper 4.1 to reflect the additional capacity for population and jobs not captured by the vacant land model and presented at a BOCC Worksession on September 24, 2014.
- Issue Paper 5 – SEPA Scoping: On July 16, 2014, the Board discussed the environmental impact review process under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) and directed staff to proceed to scoping on development of alternatives. Issue Paper 5.1 provides a partial list of what has transpired from July 17, 2014 through March 11, 2015.

This issue paper (Issue Paper 4.2) will discuss the additional capacity for population and jobs not captured by the vacant land model reflecting an increase of 15,224 persons and 24,175 jobs from redevelopment and public sector jobs that will occur within the planning horizon.

It updates Issue Paper 4.0, to reflect recent information. Countywide forecasts adopted by the Board in Resolution 2014-06-17 are modestly adjusted to reflect the increase in existing population and jobs that occurred during 2014, to include City assumptions for project future growth through redevelopment as directed by the Board, and to be consistent with cities proposals for their respective UGAs. These
forecasts and allocations are intended to keep cities whole by not reducing or significantly expanding city UGAs.

Methodology
Allocation of population growth and jobs is a key step in the planning process. There are three options for allocating that can be used by the Board:

1) placing growth where it has historically occurred within the urban growth areas (UGA) as documented by U.S. Census;
2) allocating growth by UGA based on the vacant and buildable lands model plus the potential capacity for jobs and population by considering factors such as FPIAs, redevelopment, filling vacancies, etc.; or
3) allocating growth by UGA according to the proportion of the total county identified vacant and buildable lands (used since 1994).

The following are essential to the outcome regardless of which method is used:

- Maintain coordination and consistency with local comprehensive plans;
- Use official state population forecasts from OFM (already adopted);
- Use the employment projections from ESD (already adopted);
- Use estimates of the existing VBLM capacity for growth of the UGAs to inform decisions on allocation of growth targets;
- Continue using the inventory of available VBLM inventory information; a practice since 1994;
- Allow for flexibility where necessary;
- Consider impacts of the recent stormwater regulations on infrastructure needs. Identified vacant and buildable residential lands reflect a 27.7% infrastructure deduction;
- Carrying capacity is assumed on vacant or underutilized residential land are on net developable acres at units per UGA; Vancouver - 8; Battle Ground, Camas, Ridgefield, Washougal, at Woodland - 6; La Center and Yacolt - 4 units per net acre; and
- The urban/rural growth percentage split remains at 90/10. (Rural population growth is assumed to be 10% of the population forecast even though the GMA does not require a cap or formal allocation.)

Countywide Population Allocation
The following table shows the current population estimate, 2015 vacant lands model capacity, and the allocation of 2035 population forecast if the Board use method 3 as listed above. The cities have concerns that the allocation shows a reduction in capacity from the 2007 Comprehensive Plan. Additional allocation was added in order to reflect the existing comprehensive plans of the cities.

The 2035 population allocation to UGA's is based on determining the potential population that can be accommodated by the 2015 Vacant Lands Model (VLM) and figuring the share of the total potential VLM population by UGA. The 2035 estimate is calculated by applying the UGA share of the VLM to the total population for the urban area (114,322 = 102,890 + 11,432). The 11,432 represents 10% of population assumed for the rural area and 102,890 represents 90% urban allocation. 2015 VLM can accommodate the urban population and additional allocation.
The Board directed that the county acknowledge the 2007 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan adopted urban growth areas as a baseline for the 2016 update. Staff allocated 1,600 persons to the Battle Ground UGA, 5,832 persons to Ridgefield’s UGA, 1,200 persons to La Center’s UGA, and 6,200 persons to the Vancouver UGA. See table 1 below. Total population growth expected between 2015 and 2035 is 114,322 persons plus 15,224 persons totaling 129,546. The January 1, 2015 base year estimate of 448,845 plus 129,546 produces a 2035 estimate of 578,391.

Table 1: 2035 Population Forecast by UGA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Battle Ground</td>
<td>20,871</td>
<td>15,972</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>37,705</td>
<td>39,305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camas</td>
<td>22,843</td>
<td>11,255</td>
<td></td>
<td>34,410</td>
<td>34,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>62,205</td>
<td>11,432</td>
<td></td>
<td>73,628</td>
<td>73,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaCenter</td>
<td>3,209</td>
<td>3,233</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>6,714</td>
<td>7,914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridgefield</td>
<td>6,575</td>
<td>13,087</td>
<td>5,832</td>
<td>20,523</td>
<td>26,356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver</td>
<td>315,460</td>
<td>52,786</td>
<td>6,200</td>
<td>365,743</td>
<td>371,943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washougal</td>
<td>15,932</td>
<td>6,023</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>22,118</td>
<td>22,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodland</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>229</td>
<td></td>
<td>339</td>
<td>339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yacolt</td>
<td>1,661</td>
<td>303</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,986</td>
<td>1,986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>448,845</td>
<td>114,322</td>
<td>15,224</td>
<td>563,167</td>
<td>578,391</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Clark County, Geographic Information System and Community Planning

Note: * 10% based on 90/10 urban/rural planning assumption. March 3, 2015 expansion request includes additional acreage for Washougal’s UGA - 392 persons and Ridgefield’s UGA - 832 persons; totaling an additional 1,224 persons.

Countywide Employment Allocation

The GMA does not dictate a data source that must be considered in planning for future employment. For the 1994, 2004, and 2007 planning efforts, the number of anticipated new jobs in Clark County was developed by the Washington State Employment Security Department. The forecasts were based on anticipated population growth, workforce participation, unemployment, and percentage of Clark County employees who commute to Oregon for work.

Table 2 below shows the number of net new jobs based on allocation method number 3 as listed above. The Board chose to plan for a total of 91,200 net new jobs. According to the 2015 vacant land model and additional land requested by the cities of Battle Ground, La Center and Ridgefield, the county has capacity for 101, 153 net new jobs. Public sector employment is not accounted for in the model. ESD estimates up to 7,400 new public sector jobs over the next twenty years. We anticipate that most of those public sector jobs will occur on existing facilities, and therefore will not require new lands.
Table 2: 2015-2035 Employment Forecast by UGA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UGA</th>
<th>2015 VBLM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Battle Ground</td>
<td>9,933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camas</td>
<td>11,182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Center</td>
<td>1,324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridgefield</td>
<td>8,708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver</td>
<td>41,188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washougal</td>
<td>4,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yacolt</td>
<td>468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodland</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>*101,153</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Clark County, Geographic Information System and Community Planning

*Note: Existing assumptions of total potential jobs not captured by the vacant lands model increase the capacity by 16,775 jobs for redevelopment and 7,400 public sector jobs, thus increasing the total potential job capacity from 76,978 to 101,153.

Conclusion and Recommendation

Much has changed since Clark County first adopted its Comprehensive Plan in 1994. The county's demographic characteristics have continued to change. Community Planning recommends that this revised population and employment allocation be approved as they reflect new information.
RESOLUTION NO. 2015-04-____

A RESOLUTION relating to the adoption of the alternatives for study in an environmental impact statement under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) that will be used for the county’s comprehensive land use plan 2016 periodic update pursuant to Chapter 36.70A RCW.

WHEREAS, the 2016 Clark County comprehensive growth management plan review process required under RCW 36.70A.130(3) began on July 17, 2013, with a duly advertised public meeting; and

WHEREAS, the Board of County Commissioners (Board) adopted Resolution 2014-01-09 Clark County Population and Job Projections at a duly advertised public hearing on January 21, 2014, and in doing so adopted the office of financial management’s medium population projection of 562,207 persons for the 20-year period ending in 2035; and

WHEREAS, the Board adopted Resolution 2014-04-01 Employment Forecast at a duly advertised public hearing on April 1 and 29, 2014, thereby adopting the employment security department’s projection of 91,200 net new jobs for the 20-year period ending in 2035; and

WHEREAS, the Board adopted Resolution 2014-06-17 Population and Employment Allocation, Planning Assumptions and the 2016 Board Principles and Values at a duly public hearing on June 24, 2014 to be used for the county’s Comprehensive Plan 2016 periodic update pursuant to RCW 36.70A.140; and

WHEREAS, the county is required under Chapter 43.21C RCW to evaluate environmental impacts that could result from actions it approves or undertakes; and

WHEREAS, RCW 43.21C.030 states that all policies, regulations and laws of the state of Washington shall be interpreted and administered in accordance with the policies set forth in Chapter 43.21C RCW; and

WHEREAS, as part of the 2007 comprehensive plan update, the county prepared an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), issuing both a draft EIS (DEIS) and a final EIS (FEIS); and

WHEREAS, given the economic downturn that happened subsequent to the 2007 plan update, it was determined using the vacant buildable lands model that the adopted population and jobs targets can be accommodated in current urban growth areas with minimal targeted additions; and

WHEREAS, given that determination, the county on July 30, 2014 re-adopted the 2007 EIS and announced its intent to prepare a supplemental EIS for additional proposed changes, in addition to announcing scoping meetings for August 2014; and

WHEREAS, the county held scoping meetings on August 18, 20, 27, and 28, 2014; and
WHEREAS, the Board approved a contract with ESA (Seattle) on August 19, 2014 to prepare the supplemental EIS; and

WHEREAS, the Board held work sessions on SEIS alternatives on July 16, September 24, and October 22, 2014, and at the latter, the Board agreed upon three alternatives; and

WHEREAS, the county held public open houses on the details of the three alternatives on October 29 and 30, 2014; and

WHEREAS, the Board requested at a work session on January 21, 2015, that work be halted on the supplemental EIS until a fourth alternative could be developed; and

WHEREAS, the Board reviewed Issue Paper 5.0 SEPA Scoping (Exhibit 1) at a worksession on July 16, 2014, and reviewed Issue Paper 5.1 SEPA Alternatives (Exhibit 2) at a worksession on March 11, 2015; and

WHEREAS, a fourth alternative was developed and the county held additional open houses on the alternatives on March 25 and April 1, 2015; and

WHEREAS, the Board considered revised Issue Papers 5.0 SEPA Scoping and 5.1 SEPA Alternatives at a duly advertised public hearing on April 14, 2015; and

WHEREAS, the Board took public testimony from interested parties, considered all the written and oral arguments and testimony, and considered all the comments presented to the Board; and

WHEREAS, the Board finds that adoption will further the public health, safety and welfare; now therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS OF CLARK COUNTY, STATE OF WASHINGTON, as follows:

Section 1. The Board hereby adopts the Clark County Alternatives for study under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) as shown below. This information developed in SEPA analysis of the Clark County Alternatives will be used for the county's 20-year Comprehensive Growth Management Plan 2016 periodic update pursuant to RCW 36.70A.140.

Alternative 1: No Action Alternative. This alternative is the adopted Comprehensive Plan as amended in July 2014, with the current urban growth boundaries, planning assumptions, policies and implementation ordinances.

Alternative 2: Rural and Urban Changes. The new planning assumptions, policy direction, changes in land use/zoning and principles and values defined by the Board were used in this alternative. This option supports job and population growth.

• FR-40/AG-20 to FR-20/AG-10, and R-20 to R-10, where appropriate
• Washougal UGA comp plan to zone consistency
• Expand Ridgefield UGA to include the Tri-Mountain Golf Course
• Single Rural Lands comp plan designation
• Single Rural Commercial comp plan designation
• Urban reserve (UR) changing urban reserve to a true overlay, and applying underlying rural zoning where needed
• Urban holding (UH) changing urban holding to a true overlay, recognizing the underlying zoning applied when the land was brought into a (UGA)
• Public facilities zone creation
• Single Commercial comp plan designation
• Removal of Three Creeks Special Planning Area
• Removal of UH in the Fisher Swale area of the Vancouver UGA
• Mixed Use comp plan to zone consistency
• Subarea comp plan and zone changes
• Arterial Atlas updates (Includes Bicycles)

Alternative 3: Battle Ground, La Center, Ridgefield and Washougal.
• Battle Ground’s request for 80 acres (currently zoned R-5) for employment
• La Center’s request for 56.55 acres (currently zoned AG-20) for employment, and for an additional 17 acres (currently zoned R-5) for a new school site
• Washougal’s request for 40.66 acres (currently zoned R-5) for residential
• Ridgefield’s request for 107.47 acres (currently zoned AG-20) for residential

Alternative 4: Rural options.
• Forest zones: Include 20- and 10-acre minimum lot size areas where appropriate (considering the existing rural nature and predominant lot sizes)
• Agriculture zones: Include 5- and 10-acre minimum lot size areas where appropriate (considering the existing rural nature and predominant lot sizes), and eliminate the 20-acre minimum lot size
• Rural zones: Create 1, 2.5, and 5 acre minimum lot size areas where appropriate (considering the already developed lots, the existing rural nature, and predominant lot sizes), and eliminate the 10- and 20-acre minimum lot sizes
• Clustering Options to aggregate and preserve 70% of R, AG, and FR land in open space for agriculture, forest, or other non-residential uses.

* * * * *
Section 2. Effective Date. This resolution shall take effect immediately upon its adoption.

Section 3. Instructions to Clerk.

The Clerk to the Board shall:

1. Transmit a copy of this resolution to the Washington State Department of Commerce within ten days of its adoption pursuant to RCW 36.70A.106.

2. Transmit a copy of the adopted resolution to Community Planning Department Director.

3. Transmit a copy of the adopted resolution to the Cities of Battle Ground, Camas, La Center, Ridgefield, Washougal, Woodland, Vancouver and Town of Yacolt.

4. Record a copy of this resolution with the Clark County Auditor.

5. Cause notice of adoption of this resolution to be published forthwith pursuant to RCW 36.70A.290.

ADOPTED this ___ day of April 2015.

Attest:

BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
FOR CLARK COUNTY, WASHINGTON

By: ________________________________

Clerk to the Board

By: ________________________________

David Madore, Chair

Approved as to Form Only:

By: ________________________________

Anthony F. Golik
Prosecuting Attorney

By: ________________________________

Jeanne E. Stewart, Councilor

By: ________________________________

Christine Cook
Deputy Prosecuting Attorney

By: ________________________________

Tom Mielke, Councilor

Exhibits

Exhibit 1, Issue Paper 5.0
Exhibit 2, Issue Paper 5.1

2015 Resolution Relating to Comprehensive Plan 2016 Periodic Update
Exhibit 1
Clark County Comprehensive Plan 2016 Update
Planning for growth 2015 – 2035
SEPA Scoping – Issue Paper 5

Purpose
This memorandum provides a basic framework and starting point from which the county and its cities will launch the environmental impact review process under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA). This process will be used to inform the public about three proposed growth alternatives, advertise the county’s intent to prepare a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS), and provide an opportunity to comment on the scope of impacts to be examined in the SEIS.

Background
In July 2013, Clark County began updating its Comprehensive Growth Management Plan to meet the 2016 periodic update requirement of RCW 36.70A.140. Community Planning prepared the following issue papers to help the Board of County Commissioners make decisions about the update:

- **Issue Paper 1 - Comprehensive Plan Overview:** A summary of the county’s Planning Assumptions, 2013 vacant and buildable lands model (VBLM) inventory and population and employment projections.
- **Issue Paper 2 – Population and Job Projections:** Background information for a discussion with the cities and the town of Yacolt on population and job planning assumptions for 2015-2035. On Jan. 21, 2014, the Board adopted the state Office of Financial Management’s (OFM) medium population projection of 562,207 for the 20-year period ending 2035 (Res. 2014-01-09).
- **Issue Paper 3 – Employment forecast based on input from Washington Employment Security Department (ESD).** It was revised as Issue Paper 3.1 to include the 2014 VBLM information. On April 29, 2014, the Board adopted the high employment forecast of 91,200 net new jobs for the 20-year period ending 2035 (Res. 2014-04-01).
- **Issue Paper 4 – Population and Job Allocation:** On June 24, 2014, the Board identified the methodology for allocating growth by UGA and adopted preliminary allocations for initial review (Res. 2014-06-17).

This issue paper, Issue Paper 5, will discuss the environmental impact review process under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) and seek Board direction on development of alternatives.

SEPA Process
Enacted in 1984, the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) requires local governments to evaluate environmental impacts that could result from actions they approve or undertake. The most common evaluation is to discuss potential impacts of a proposed development on various resources and qualities of the environment listed on the SEPA checklist. There also are non-project actions that are reviewed, such as adoption of code language or a new plan or policy. The completed checklist is shared with federal, state and local agencies, Indian tribes, neighborhood organizations and interested parties.
Large development projects, such as an asphalt plant, and certain non-development projects, such as expansion of an urban growth area, require a more in-depth SEPA review, including, 1) identification and analysis of potential project-related impacts, and 2) consideration of possible alternatives to the proposed action. An environmental impact statement (EIS) is prepared, discussing any potential impacts. The county prepared an EIS in 2007, issuing both a draft EIS (DEIS) and a final EIS (FEIS). Comments on alternatives presented in the draft were used to determine a preferred alternative that was the focus of analysis in the FEIS.

For the 2016 update, the county is proposing to add to the 2007 environmental analysis, as needed, by preparing a supplemental EIS (SEIS). Under SEPA, analysis of a plan’s impacts is not required to be site-specific, but rather give an overview of impacts that could be expected under the alternatives.

The EIS process under SEPA begins with a scoping process. That is when the county seeks public input and Board direction to define issues related to the comprehensive plan update that will be addressed in the draft SEIS. The preferred alternative studied in the final SEIS and eventually adopted by the Board will reflect local jurisdictions’ input, Board directives, guiding principles and values and countywide planning policies. The SEIS and comprehensive planning process will end with adoption of an updated comprehensive growth management plan for Clark County.

Methodology
Since Clark County’s 2007 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update, conditions in the county, as well as state and federal laws, have changed, requiring corresponding changes to the plan. The Board has adopted planning assumptions and principles and values that provide policy direction for reviewing and updating the county’s growth management plan by June 2016.

As stated above, preparation of an EIS must include alternatives, including a ‘no action’ alternative that maintains the status quo. Possible alternatives for review in the EIS are listed below.

Alternative 1: No Action Alternative. This alternative is the adopted Comprehensive Plan as amended in July 2014, with the current urban growth boundaries, planning assumptions, policies and implementation ordinances.

Alternative 2: County-Initiated Actions.

a) Urban growth areas adopted in July 2014.
b) Rural Land amendments to the Zoning Map, such as AG-20 to AG-10, FR-40 to FR-20 and R-20 to R-10, where needed.
c) Washougal UGA amendments to the Zoning Map to reflect county zoning and application of Urban Holding.
d) Vancouver UGA amendments to the Zoning Map to remove the Three Creeks Overlay.
e) Removal of Urban Holding in the Vancouver UGA area known as Fisher’s Swale.
f) New Public Facility zone.
g) Eliminate Comprehensive Plan Chapter 1 Table 1.6, Mixed Use footnote and subsequent Comprehensive Plan and Zoning changes.
h) Streamline commercial zones from three to two.
i) Zoning Map changes to include property owner site-specific requests, particularly within the Salmon Creek and Discovery planning areas.
j) Zoning Map cleanup of Urban Reserve application consistency, UR-10, UR-20 and UR-40; Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Map cleanup of Urban Holding application consistency.
l) At the request of property owners, sites that meet Board directives and other criteria. The new planning assumptions, policy direction, principles and values defined by the commissioners will be used in this alternative.

**Alternative 3: City-Requested Actions.**

a) Urban growth areas adopted in July 2014.
b) Expansion areas proposed by cities in July 2014.

After the scoping process, land use alternatives will be developed based on technical analysis, input from cities, the Board’s principles and values and results of the environmental scoping and analysis. From the DSEIS, a preferred alternative will emerge, providing a 20-year land supply and meeting the 2014 planning assumptions and policy directions.

**NEXT STEPS**

During four open houses in August, the public is invited to comment on the scope of impacts to be examined in the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement. All open houses will be 7 - 8:30 p.m. Here are the open house dates and locations:

- **Tuesday, Aug. 19**
  - Fort Vancouver Community Library, 901 C St., Vancouver
- **Wednesday, Aug. 20**
  - Lacamas Lake Lodge, 227 N.E. Lake Rd., Camas
- **Wednesday, Aug. 27**
  - Ridgefield Community Center, 210 N. Main Ave., Ridgefield
- **Thursday, Aug. 28**
  - Battle Ground Community Center, 9123 E. Main St., Battle Ground
Exhibit 2
Clark County Comprehensive Plan 2016 Update
Planning for growth 2015 – 2035
SEPA Alternatives – Issue Paper 5.1

Purpose
This memorandum provides a summary of events that have transpired since the Board of County Commissioners, now known as Board of Clark County Councilors (Board), initially discussed the environmental impact review process under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) on July 16, 2014.

Background
In July 2013, Clark County began the process of updating its Comprehensive Growth Management Plan to meet the 2016 periodic update requirement of Chapter 36.70A.140 RCW. Several issue papers have already been prepared to allow the Board to make decisions about the update:

- Issue Paper 4 – Population and Job Allocation: On June 24, 2014, the Board identified the methodology for allocating growth by UGA and adopted preliminary allocations for initial review (Res. 2014-06-17). It was revised as Issue Paper 4.1 to reflect the additional capacity for population and jobs not captured by the vacant land model and presented at a BOCC Worksession on September 24, 2014. Following the 2015 assessor’s population update, the issue paper was revised as Issue Paper 4.2.
- Issue Paper 5 – SEPA Scoping: On July 16, 2014, the Board discussed the environmental impact review process under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) and directed staff to proceed to scoping on development of alternatives.
- Issue Paper 5.1 provides a partial list of what has transpired from July 17, 2014 through March 11, 2015.

On July 16, 2014, the Board held a worksession on Issue Paper 5 - SEPA Scoping and instructed staff to inform the public about three proposed growth alternatives, advertise the county’s intent to prepare a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS), and provide an opportunity to comment on the scope of impacts to be examined in the SEIS. Highlighted below is a brief summary of events since July 16.

- July 17 Planning Commission review of Issue Paper 5

012711
- July 29  
  Press release 6946 – Open Houses to gather public input on scope of growth plan update
- July 30  
  Legal Notice – Intent to re-adopt 2007 EIS printed in Columbian
- July 29, 30  
  Legal Notice – SEPA threshold and scoping printed in Reflector, Columbian and Camas Washougal Post Record
- Aug 5  
  Camas/Washougal Post Record article - Camas hosts growth plan update workshop
- Aug 8  
  City/County Coordination Meeting
- Aug 10, 12, 13, 15  
  Open House advertisement – printed in Columbian, Reflector and Camas Washougal Post Record
- Aug 13  
  Reflector article – Open House to gather public input on scope of growth plan update
- Aug 17  
  Clark County Focus
- Aug 18, 20, 27, 28  
  Open Houses – SEPA scoping
- Sep 12  
  City/County Coordination Meeting
- Sep 18  
  Planning Commission – SEPA scoping update
- Sep 24  
  BOCC Worksession – SEPA scoping update
- Oct 10  
  City/County Coordination Meeting
- Oct 13  
  Neighborhood Associations of Clark County presentation on growth plan update by staff
- Oct 13  
  Press release 6992 – County prepares more information on growth plan alternatives
- Oct 14, 15, 17, 19  
  Open House advertisements – printed in Columbian, Reflector and Camas Washougal Post Record
- Oct 14, 15  
  Public Notice – Alternatives printed in Columbian, Reflector and Camas Washougal Post Record
- Oct 15  
  Press Release 6994 – Planners to brief commissioners on maps of growth plan proposals
- Oct 16  
  Planning Commission – review of alternatives
- Oct 17  
  Postcard mailed to property owners (quantity 9,625), notice of open houses
- Oct 22  
  BOCC Worksession – three alternatives
- Oct 29, 30  
  Open Houses - three alternatives
- Nov 6  
  Planning Commission – update on open houses
- Nov 14  
  City/County Coordination Meeting
- Jan 21, 2015  
  BOCC Worksession – progress to date on 2016 Comprehensive Plan update, key decisions, SEPA review and update, issues review and update. Stop Work Order issued to contractor drafting SEIS

The county received 209 comments from July 16, 2014 through January 21, 2015 on the comprehensive plan in general, SEPA scoping and process, the proposed three alternatives and planning assumptions.

- Feb 18  
  BOCC Worksession – review of proposed 4th alternative, City of Ridgefield and City of La Center request for UGA expansion
- Mar 11  
  BOCC Worksession – review of alternative 3.1 (Ridgefield, La Center, Washougal and Battle Ground requests for UGA expansion) and the proposed alternative 4 guiding principles, goals and options to be analyzed
Methodology
Since Clark County's 2007 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update, conditions in the county, as well as state and federal laws, have changed, requiring corresponding changes to the plan. The Board has adopted planning assumptions and principles and values that provide policy direction for reviewing and updating the county's growth management plan by June 2016.

As stated in Issue Paper 5, preparation of an EIS must include alternatives, including a 'no action' alternative that maintains the status quo. Alternatives that were reviewed by the Board on October 22 to be included in a supplemental EIS are as follows:

Alternative 1: No Action Alternative. This alternative is the adopted Comprehensive Plan as amended in July 2014, with the current urban growth boundaries, planning assumptions, policies and implementation ordinances. SEPA requires the inclusion of a no-action alternative.

Alternative 2: Rural and Urban Changes. The new planning assumptions, policy direction, changes in land use/zoning and principles and values defined by the Board were used in this alternative. This option supports job and population growth.
- FR-40/AG-20 to FR-20/AG-10, and R-20 to R-10, where appropriate
- Washougal UGA comp plan to zone consistency
- Expand Ridgefield UGA to include the Tri-Mountain Golf Course
- Single Rural Lands comp plan designation
- Single Rural Commercial comp plan designation
- Urban reserve (UR) changing urban reserve to a true overlay, and applying underlying rural zoning where needed
- Urban holding (UH) changing urban holding to a true overlay, recognizing the underlying zoning applied when the land was brought into a (UGA).
- Public facilities zone creation
- Single Commercial comp plan designation
- Removal of Three Creeks Special Planning Area
- Removal of UH in the Fisher Swale area of the Vancouver UGA
- Mixed Use comp plan to zone consistency
- Subarea comp plan and zone changes
- Arterial Atlas updates (includes Bicycles)

Alternative 3: Battle Ground and La Center. The cities of Battle Ground and La Center are considering expanding their urban growth areas to support job growth.
- Battle Ground’s request for 80 acres (currently zoned R-5) for employment
- La Center’s request for 56.55 acres (currently zoned AG-20) for employment

On February 18, 2015 Alternative 4 was presented by Board staff.

Alternative 4: Rural options. The preliminary focus is on parcels smaller than 9.5 acres in forestry and agricultural zoning districts.
- Recognize existing parcelization for parcels <9.5 acres
- AG -20 to Rural
  - 682 parcels / 2864 acres
- 554 developed, 128 undeveloped
- 68 in current use, 10%

- FR-40 to Rural
  - 844 parcels / 3673 acres
  - 680 developed, 164 undeveloped
  - 68 in current use, 8%

On March 11, the Board reviewed updated Alternatives 3.1, approved the creation of a new Alternative 4 based on the following, and discussed creating a new countywide planning policy that sets reasonable timeframes for review and possible action on Urban Reserve and Urban Holding areas.

**Alternative 3.1. Battle Ground, La Center, Ridgefield and Washougal.** The county received new requests to expand urban growth areas by La Center (school site), Ridgefield (large lot residential) and Washougal (large lot residential).

- Battle Ground’s request for 80 acres (currently zoned R-5) for employment
- La Center’s request for 56.55 acres (currently zoned AG-20) for employment
- A new La Center request for an additional 17 acres (currently zoned R-5) for a new school site
- A new Washougal request for 40.6 acres (currently zoned R-5) for residential
- A new Ridgefield request for 107.47 acres (currently zoned AG-20) for residential

**Alternative 4: Rural options. (Councilor Madore’s proposal)**

Guiding Principles and Goals:

1. **No de-designation of Resource Lands (AG or FR).**
2. Correct fundamental discrepancies between the actual predominant lot sizes and the existing zoning map.
3. Respect the actual rural character in each local area to provide better compatibility and consistency with adjacent properties.
4. Add clustering options to better aggregate parcels and preserve resource land and open space for agricultural, forestry, and non-residential use.
5. Allow a wider range of affordable lot size choices to fill obvious market gaps and provide a better balance.
6. Add flexibility needed to convert fallow land to more manageable economically viable agricultural and forest land.

Options to be analyzed:

- Forest zones: Include 20 and 10 acre minimum lot size areas where appropriate (considering the existing rural nature and predominant lot sizes)
- Agriculture zones: Include 5 acre minimum lot size areas where appropriate (considering the existing rural nature and predominant lot sizes)
- Rural zones: Include 1, 2.5, and 5 acre minimum lot size areas where appropriate (considering the already developed lots, the existing rural nature, and predominant lot sizes)
- Clustering Options to aggregate and preserve 70% of R, AG, and FR land into open space for agriculture, forest, or other non-residential uses.
NEXT STEPS
During two open houses, the public is invited to comment on the scope of impacts to be examined under SEPA. Both open houses will be 5:30 - 7:00 p.m.

- March 25, Ridgefield High School
- April 1, Hockinson High School

The BOCC will hold a hearing on April 14, 2015 at 10:00 a.m. to hear testimony from the public and then affirm which alternatives will be studied under SEPA.
Estimating Potential Rural Lots

Clark County, Washington

A formal Vacant Buildable Lands Model (VBLM) for determining future urban residential and employment land use capacity has been in place since the beginning of Clark County’s Growth Management Planning process. However, the VBLM excludes rural areas (areas outside of urban growth areas). Since rural capacity is a component of the overall capacity, a simplified less formal process has been created to account for rural capacity. The rural process is run separate from the urban VBLM and has not been incorporated into the main model at this time.

Rural land uses allow for larger lot sizes with an emphasis on resource lands while urban lands allow for higher density smaller residential lot sizes and locating of intensive job producing lands. Due to the differences in development intensity the rural model is less complex than the urban.

Rural Lots

Current or proposed rural zoning classifications have minimum parcel sizes ranging from 1 acre to 160 acres. Rural parcels are classified as either conforming or undersized parcels based on whether they meet the minimum parcel size for its current, or when applicable, proposed zoning classification. Parcel sizes are based on assessor acres.

Parcels are further classified as:

- Vacant
- With a house
- Other

Criteria for Classifications:

- Parcels with assessor’s primary property type codes for vacant or unused lands (PT1 codes 990 and above) are classified as vacant.
- Parcels with assessor’s primary property type codes for residential use (PT1 codes less than 90) are classified with a house.
- Parcels with all other assessor’s primary property type codes are classified as other.

Assumptions:

- Exempt properties are excluded from potential lot analysis.
- No reductions for constrained areas. It is assumed that a building envelope would be available on larger rural lots.
- There is no minimum acreage threshold for undersized vacant parcels.

Potential vacant rural lot (PVRL) capacity for each zoning classification is computed as

\[ PVRL = D - H + U \]

Where \( D \) is the number of potential dividable lots for conforming parcels, \( H \) is the number of existing homes on conforming parcels, and \( U \) is number of undersized vacant parcels.

\[ D = \text{assessor acres} / \text{zoning minimum parcel size} \]

*It should be noted assessor parcels may or may not be considered legal lots for planning purposes as defined by Clark County Code 40.520.010.
### Estimating Potential Rural Lots

**Clark County, WA**

#### ALTERNATIVE 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessor Acres</th>
<th>Conforming Vacant Lots</th>
<th>Undersized Vacant Lots (no minimum lot size)</th>
<th>Total Potential Vacant Lots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Zoning</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Potential Divisible</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-5</td>
<td>1203</td>
<td>2,648</td>
<td>3,851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-10</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR-40</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR-80</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AG-20</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,579</td>
<td>4,348</td>
<td>5,927</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Clark County GIS

#### ALTERNATIVE 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessor Acres</th>
<th>Conforming Vacant Lots</th>
<th>Undersized Vacant Lots (no minimum lot size)</th>
<th>Total Potential Vacant Lots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Zoning</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Potential Divisible</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-5</td>
<td>1,203</td>
<td>2,648</td>
<td>3,851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-10</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR-40</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR-80</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AG-10</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>1,497</td>
<td>1,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,861</td>
<td>5,887</td>
<td>7,748</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Clark County GIS

#### ALTERNATIVE 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessor Acres</th>
<th>Conforming Vacant Lots</th>
<th>Undersized Vacant Lots (no minimum lot size)</th>
<th>Total Potential Vacant Lots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Zoning</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Potential Divisible</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-5</td>
<td>1202</td>
<td>2,647</td>
<td>3,849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-10</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR-40</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR-80</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AG-20</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,578</td>
<td>4,347</td>
<td>5,925</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Clark County GIS

#### ALTERNATIVE 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessor Acres</th>
<th>Conforming Vacant Lots</th>
<th>Undersized Vacant Lots (no minimum lot size)</th>
<th>Total Potential Vacant Lots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Zoning</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Potential Divisible</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-1</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1,032</td>
<td>1,172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-2.5</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>2,898</td>
<td>3,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-5</td>
<td>1,538</td>
<td>4,861</td>
<td>6,399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR-10</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>813</td>
<td>997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR-20</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR-40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR-80</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AG-5</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AG-10</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>1,496</td>
<td>1,749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,973</td>
<td>12,192</td>
<td>15,165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Clark County GIS
Exhibit 1
Clark County Comprehensive Plan 2016 Update
Planning for growth 2015 – 2035

Purpose
This memorandum provides a basic framework and starting point from which the county and its cities may consider population and employment allocation.

Background
In July 2013, Clark County began the process of updating its Comprehensive Growth Management Plan to meet the 2016 periodic update requirement of Chapter 36.70A.140 RCW. Several issue papers have already been prepared to allow the Board to make decisions about the update:

- Issue Paper 4 – Population and Job Allocation: On June 24, 2014, the Board identified the methodology for allocating growth by UGA and adopted preliminary allocations for initial review (Res. 2014-06-17). The allocations were revised as Issue Paper 4.1 to reflect the additional capacity for population and jobs not captured by the vacant land model and presented at a BOCC Worksession on September 24, 2014.
- Issue Paper 5 – SEPA Scoping: On July 16, 2014, the Board discussed the environmental impact review process under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) and directed staff to proceed to scoping on development of alternatives. Issue Paper 5.1 provides a partial list of what has transpired from July 17, 2014 through March 11, 2015.

This issue paper (Issue Paper 4.2) will discuss the additional capacity for population and jobs not captured by the vacant land model reflecting an increase of 15,224 persons and 24,175 jobs from redevelopment and public sector jobs that will occur within the planning horizon.

It updates Issue Paper 4.0, to reflect recent information. Countywide forecasts adopted by the Board in Resolution 2014-06-17 are modestly adjusted to reflect the increase in existing population and jobs that occurred during 2014, to include City assumptions for project future growth through redevelopment as directed by the Board, and to be consistent with cities proposals for their respective UGAs. These
forecasts and allocations are intended to keep cities whole by not reducing or significantly expanding city UGAs.

Methodology
Allocation of population growth and jobs is a key step in the planning process. There are three options for allocating that can be used by the Board:

1) placing growth where it has historically occurred within the urban growth areas (UGA) as documented by U.S. Census;

2) allocating growth by UGA based on the vacant and buildable lands model plus the potential capacity for jobs and population by considering factors such as FPIAs, redevelopment, filling vacancies, etc.; or

3) allocating growth by UGA according to the proportion of the total county identified vacant and buildable lands (used since 1994).

The following are essential to the outcome regardless of which method is used:

- Maintain coordination and consistency with local comprehensive plans;
- Use official state population forecasts from OFM (already adopted);
- Use the employment projections from ESD (already adopted);
- Use estimates of the existing VBLM capacity for growth of the UGAs to inform decisions on allocation of growth targets;
- Continue using the inventory of available VBLM inventory information; a practice since 1994;
- Allow for flexibility where necessary;
- Consider impacts of the recent stormwater regulations on infrastructure needs. Identified vacant and buildable residential lands reflect a 27.7% infrastructure deduction;
- Carrying capacity is assumed on vacant or underutilized residential land are on net developable acres at units per UGA; Vancouver - 8; Battle Ground, Camas, Ridgefield, Washougal, at Woodland - 6; La Center and Yacolt - 4 units per net acre; and
- The urban/rural growth percentage split remains at 90/10. (Rural population growth is assumed to be 10% of the population forecast even though the GMA does not require a cap or formal allocation.)

Countywide Population Allocation
The following table shows the current population estimate, 2015 vacant lands model capacity, and the allocation of 2035 population forecast if the Board use method 3 as listed above. The cities have concerns that the allocation shows a reduction in capacity from the 2007 Comprehensive Plan. Additional allocation was added in order to reflect the existing comprehensive plans of the cities.

The 2035 population allocation to UGA's is based on determining the potential population that can be accommodated by the 2015 Vacant Lands Model (VLM) and figuring the share of the total potential VLM population by UGA. The 2035 estimate is calculated by applying the UGA share of the VLM to the total population for the urban area (114,322 = 102,890 + 11,432). The 11,432 represents 10% of population assumed for the rural area and 102,890 represents 90% urban allocation. 2015 VLM can accommodate the urban population and additional allocation.
The Board directed that the county acknowledge the 2007 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan adopted urban growth areas as a baseline for the 2016 update. Staff allocated 1,600 persons to the Battle Ground UGA, 5,832 persons to Ridgefield's UGA, 1,200 persons to La Center's UGA, and 6,200 persons to the Vancouver UGA. See table 1 below. Total population growth expected between 2015 and 2035 is 114,322 persons plus 15,224 persons totaling 129,546. The January 1, 2015 base year estimate of 448,845 plus 129,546 produces a 2035 estimate of 578,391.

Table 1: 2035 Population Forecast by UGA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Battle Ground</td>
<td>20,871</td>
<td>11,972</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>37,705</td>
<td>39,305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camas</td>
<td>22,843</td>
<td>11,255</td>
<td>34,410</td>
<td>73,628</td>
<td>73,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>62,205</td>
<td>11,432</td>
<td>73,628</td>
<td>73,628</td>
<td>73,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaCenter</td>
<td>3,209</td>
<td>3,233</td>
<td>6,714</td>
<td>7,914</td>
<td>7,914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridgefield</td>
<td>6,575</td>
<td>13,087</td>
<td>20,523</td>
<td>26,356</td>
<td>26,356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver</td>
<td>315,460</td>
<td>52,786</td>
<td>365,743</td>
<td>371,943</td>
<td>371,943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washougal</td>
<td>15,932</td>
<td>9,023</td>
<td>22,118</td>
<td>22,510</td>
<td>22,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodland</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yacolt</td>
<td>1,661</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>1,986</td>
<td>1,986</td>
<td>1,986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>448,845</td>
<td>114,322</td>
<td>563,167</td>
<td>578,391</td>
<td>578,391</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Clark County, Geographic Information System and Community Planning
Note: * 10% based on 90/10 urban/rural planning assumption. March 3, 2015 expansion request includes additional acreage for Washougal's UGA - 392 persons and Ridgefield's UGA - 832 persons; totaling an additional 1,224 persons.

Countywide Employment Allocation

The GMA does not dictate a data source that must be considered in planning for future employment. For the 1994, 2004, and 2007 planning efforts, the number of anticipated new jobs in Clark County was developed by the Washington State Employment Security Department. The forecasts were based on anticipated population growth, workforce participation, unemployment, and percentage of Clark County employees who commute to Oregon for work.

Table 2 below shows the number of net new jobs based on allocation method number 3 as listed above. The Board chose to plan for a total of 91,200 net new jobs. According to the 2015 vacant land model and additional land requested by the cities of Battle Ground, La Center and Ridgefield, the county has capacity for 101,153 net new jobs. Public sector employment is not accounted for in the model. ESD estimates up to 7,400 new public sector jobs over the next twenty years. We anticipate that most of those public sector jobs will occur on existing facilities, and therefore will not require new lands.
Table 2: 2015-2035 Employment Forecast by UGA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UGA</th>
<th>2015 VBLM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Battle Ground</td>
<td>9,933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camas</td>
<td>11,182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Center</td>
<td>1,324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridgefield</td>
<td>8,708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver</td>
<td>41,188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washougal</td>
<td>4,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yacolt</td>
<td>468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodland</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>*101,153</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Clark County, Geographic Information System and Community Planning

*Note: Existing assumptions of total potential jobs not captured by the vacant lands model increase the capacity by 16,775 jobs for redevelopment and 7,400 public sector jobs, thus increasing the total potential job capacity from 76,978 to 101,153.

Conclusion and Recommendation

Much has changed since Clark County first adopted its Comprehensive Plan in 1994. The county's demographic characteristics have continued to change. Community Planning recommends that this revised population and employment allocation be approved as they reflect new information.
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SEPA Scoping – Issue Paper 5

Purpose
This memorandum provides a basic framework and starting point from which the county and its cities will launch the environmental impact review process under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA). This process will be used to inform the public about three proposed growth alternatives, advertises the county’s intent to prepare a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS), and provide an opportunity to comment on the scope of impacts to be examined in the SEIS.

Background
In July 2013, Clark County began updating its Comprehensive Growth Management Plan to meet the 2016 periodic update requirement of RCW 36.70A.140. Community Planning prepared the following issue papers to help the Board of County Commissioners make decisions about the update:


This issue paper, Issue Paper 5, will discuss the environmental impact review process under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) and seek Board direction on development of alternatives.

SEPA Process
Enacted in 1984, the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) requires local governments to evaluate environmental impacts that could result from actions they approve or undertake. The most common evaluation is to discuss potential impacts of a proposed development on various resources and qualities of the environment listed on the SEPA checklist. There also are non-project actions that are reviewed, such as adoption of code language or a new plan or policy. The completed checklist is shared with federal, state and local agencies, Indian tribes, neighborhood organizations and interested parties.
Large development projects, such as an asphalt plant, and certain non-development projects, such as expansion of an urban growth area, require a more in-depth SEPA review, including, 1) identification and analysis of potential project-related impacts, and 2) consideration of possible alternatives to the proposed action. An environmental impact statement (EIS) is prepared, discussing any potential impacts. The county prepared an EIS in 2007, issuing both a draft EIS (DEIS) and a final EIS (FEIS). Comments on alternatives presented in the draft were used to determine a preferred alternative that was the focus of analysis in the FEIS.

For the 2016 update, the county is proposing to add to the 2007 environmental analysis, as needed, by preparing a supplemental EIS (SEIS). Under SEPA, analysis of a plan’s impacts is not required to be site-specific, but rather give an overview of impacts that could be expected under the alternatives.

The EIS process under SEPA begins with a scoping process. That is when the county seeks public input and Board direction to define issues related to the comprehensive plan update that will be addressed in the draft SEIS. The preferred alternative studied in the final SEIS and eventually adopted by the Board will reflect local jurisdictions’ input, Board directives, guiding principles and values and countywide planning policies. The SEIS and comprehensive planning process will end with adoption of an updated comprehensive growth management plan for Clark County.

**Methodology**

Since Clark County’s 2007 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update, conditions in the county, as well as state and federal laws, have changed, requiring corresponding changes to the plan. The Board has adopted planning assumptions and principles and values that provide policy direction for reviewing and updating the county’s growth management plan by June 2016.

As stated above, preparation of an EIS must include alternatives, including a ‘no action’ alternative that maintains the status quo. Possible alternatives for review in the EIS are listed below.

**Alternative 1: No Action Alternative.** This alternative is the adopted Comprehensive Plan as amended in July 2014, with the current urban growth boundaries, planning assumptions, policies and implementation ordinances.

**Alternative 2: County-Initiated Actions.**

a) Urban growth areas adopted in July 2014.

b) Rural Land amendments to the Zoning Map, such as AG-20 to AG-10, FR-40 to FR-20 and R-20 to R-10, where needed.

c) Washougal UGA amendments to the Zoning Map to reflect county zoning and application of Urban Holding.

d) Vancouver UGA amendments to the Zoning Map to remove the Three Creeks Overlay.

e) Removal of Urban Holding in the Vancouver UGA area known as Fisher’s Swale.

f) New Public Facility zone.

g) Eliminate Comprehensive Plan Chapter 1 Table 1.6, Mixed Use footnote and subsequent Comprehensive Plan and Zoning changes.

h) Streamline commercial zones from three to two.
i) Zoning Map changes to include property owner site-specific requests, particularly within the Salmon Creek and Discovery planning areas.

j) Zoning Map cleanup of Urban Reserve application consistency, UR-10, UR-20 and UR-40; Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Map cleanup of Urban Holding application consistency.


l) At the request of property owners, sites that meet Board directives and other criteria. The new planning assumptions, policy direction, principles and values defined by the commissioners will be used in this alternative.

Alternative 3: City-Requested Actions.

a) Urban growth areas adopted in July 2014.

b) Expansion areas proposed by cities in July 2014.

After the scoping process, land use alternatives will be developed based on technical analysis, input from cities, the Board’s principles and values and results of the environmental scoping and analysis. From the DSEIS, a preferred alternative will emerge, providing a 20-year land supply and meeting the 2014 planning assumptions and policy directions.

NEXT STEPS
During four open houses in August, the public is invited to comment on the scope of impacts to be examined in the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement. All open houses will be 7 - 8:30 p.m.

Here are the open house dates and locations:

Tuesday, Aug. 19  Fort Vancouver Community Library, 901 C St., Vancouver
Wednesday, Aug. 20  Lacamas Lake Lodge, 227 N.E. Lake Rd., Camas
Wednesday, Aug. 27  Ridgefield Community Center, 210 N. Main Ave., Ridgefield
Thursday, Aug. 28  Battle Ground Community Center, 9123 E. Main St., Battle Ground
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Purpose
This memorandum provides a summary of events that have transpired since the Board of County Commissioners, now known as Board of Clark County Councillors (Board), initially discussed the environmental impact review process under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) on July 16, 2014.

Background
In July 2013, Clark County began the process of updating its Comprehensive Growth Management Plan to meet the 2016 periodic update requirement of Chapter 36.70A.140 RCW. Several issue papers have already been prepared to allow the Board to make decisions about the update:

- **Issue Paper 1 – Comprehensive Plan Overview:** A summary of the county’s Planning Assumptions, 2013 vacant and buildable lands model (VBLM) inventory and population and employment projections.
- **Issue Paper 2 – Population and Job Projections:** Background information for a discussion with the cities and the town of Yacolt on population and job planning assumptions for 2015-2035. On Jan. 21, 2014, the Board adopted the state Office of Financial Management’s (OFM) medium population projection of 562,207 for the 20-year period ending 2035 (Res. 2014-01-09).
- **Issue Paper 3 – Employment forecast based on input from Washington Employment Security Department (ESD).** It was revised as Issue Paper 3.1 to include the 2014 VBLM information. On April 29, 2014, the Board adopted the high employment forecast of 91,200 net new jobs for the 20-year period ending 2035 (Res. 2014-04-01).
- **Issue Paper 4 – Population and Job Allocation:** On June 24, 2014, the Board identified the methodology for allocating growth by UGA and adopted preliminary allocations for initial review (Res. 2014-06-17). It was revised as Issue Paper 4.1 to reflect the additional capacity for population and jobs not captured by the vacant land model and presented at a BOCCE Worksession on September 24, 2014. Following the 2015 assessor’s population update, the issue paper was revised as Issue Paper 4.2.
- **Issue Paper 5 – SEPA Scoping:** On July 16, 2014, the Board discussed the environmental impact review process under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) and directed staff to proceed to scoping on development of alternatives.
- **Issue Paper 5.1 provides a partial list of what has transpired from July 17, 2014 through March 11, 2015.**

On July 16, 2014, the Board held a worksession on Issue Paper 5 – SEPA Scoping and instructed staff to inform the public about three proposed growth alternatives, advertise the county’s intent to prepare a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS), and provide an opportunity to comment on the scope of impacts to be examined in the SEIS. Highlighted below is a brief summary of events since July 16.

- **July 17** Planning Commission review of Issue Paper 5
• July 29  Press release 6946 – Open Houses to gather public input on scope of growth plan update
• July 30  Legal Notice – Intent to re-adopt 2007 EIS printed in Columbian
• July 29, 30  Legal Notice – SEPA threshold and scoping printed in Reflector, Columbian and Camas Washougal Post Record
• Aug 5  Camas/Washougal Post Record article - Camas hosts growth plan update workshop
• Aug 8  City/County Coordination Meeting
• Aug 10, 12, 13, 15  Open House advertisement – printed in Columbian, Reflector and Camas Washougal Post Record
• Aug 13  Reflector article – Open House to gather public input on scope of growth plan update
• Aug 17  Clark County Focus
• Aug 18, 20, 27, 28  Open Houses – SEPA scoping
• Sep 12  City/County Coordination Meeting
• Sep 18  Planning Commission – SEPA scoping update
• Sep 24  BOCC Worksession – SEPA scoping update
• Oct 10  City/County Coordination Meeting
• Oct 13  Neighborhood Associations of Clark County presentation on growth plan update by staff
• Oct 13  Press release 6992 – County prepares more information on growth plan alternatives
• Oct 14, 15, 17, 19  Open House advertisements – printed in Columbian, Reflector and Camas Washougal Post Record
• Oct 14, 15  Public Notice – Alternatives printed in Columbian, Reflector and Camas Washougal Post Record
• Oct 15  Press Release 6994 – Planners to brief commissioners on maps of growth plan proposals
• Oct 16  Planning Commission - review of alternatives
• Oct 17  Postcard mailer to property owners (quantity 9,625), notice of open houses
• Oct 22  BOCC Worksession – three alternatives
• Oct 29, 30  Open Houses - three alternatives
• Nov 6  Planning Commission - update on open houses
• Nov 14  City/County Coordination Meeting
• Jan 21, 2015  BOCC Worksession – progress to date on 2016 Comprehensive Plan update, key decisions, SEPA review and update, issues review and update. Stop Work Order Issued to contractor drafting SEIS

The county received 209 comments from July 16, 2014 through January 21, 2015 on the comprehensive plan in general, SEPA scoping and process, the proposed three alternatives and planning assumptions.

• Feb 18  BOCC Worksession – review of proposed 4th alternative, City of Ridgefield and City of La Center request for UGA expansion
• Mar 11  BOCC Worksession – review of alternative 3.1 (Ridgefield, La Center, Washougal and Battle Ground requests for UGA expansion) and the proposed alternative 4 guiding principles, goals and options to be analyzed
Methodology
Since Clark County’s 2007 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update, conditions in the county, as well as state and federal laws, have changed, requiring corresponding changes to the plan. The Board has adopted planning assumptions and principles and values that provide policy direction for reviewing and updating the county’s growth management plan by June 2016.

As stated in Issue Paper 5, preparation of an EIS must include alternatives, including a ‘no action’ alternative that maintains the status quo. Alternatives that were reviewed by the Board on October 22 to be included in a supplemental EIS are as follows:

Alternative 1: No Action Alternative. This alternative is the adopted Comprehensive Plan as amended in July 2014, with the current urban growth boundaries, planning assumptions, policies and implementation ordinances. SEPA requires the inclusion of a no-action alternative.

Alternative 2: Rural and Urban Changes. The new planning assumptions, policy direction, changes in land use/zoning and principles and values defined by the Board were used in this alternative. This option supports job and population growth.
  • FR-40/AG-20 to FR-20/AG-10, and R-20 to R-10, where appropriate
  • Washougal UGA comp plan to zone consistency
  • Expand Ridgefield UGA to include the Tri-Mountain Golf Course
  • Single Rural Lands comp plan designation
  • Single Rural Commercial comp plan designation
  • Urban reserve (UR) changing urban reserve to a true overlay, and applying underlying rural zoning where needed
  • Urban holding (UH) changing urban holding to a true overlay, recognizing the underlying zoning applied when the land was brought into a (UGA).
  • Public facilities zone creation
  • Single Commercial comp plan designation
  • Removal of Three Creeks Special Planning Area
  • Removal of UH in the Fisher Swale area of the Vancouver UGA
  • Mixed Use comp plan to zone consistency
  • Subarea comp plan and zone changes
  • Arterial Atlas updates (includes Bicycles)

Alternative 3: Battle Ground and La Center. The cities of Battle Ground and La Center are considering expanding their urban growth areas to support job growth.
  • Battle Ground’s request for 80 acres (currently zoned R-5) for employment
  • La Center’s request for 56.55 acres (currently zoned AG-20) for employment

On February 18, 2015 Alternative 4 was presented by Board staff.

Alternative 4: Rural options. The preliminary focus is on parcels smaller than 9.5 acres in forestry and agricultural zoning districts.
  • Recognize existing parcelization for parcels <9.5 acres
  • AG -20 to Rural
    • 682 parcels / 2864 acres
- 554 developed, 128 undeveloped
- 68 in current use, 10%
- FR-40 to Rural
  - 844 parcels / 3673 acres
  - 680 developed, 164 undeveloped
  - 68 in current use, 8%

On March 11, the Board reviewed updated Alternatives 3.1, approved the creation of a new Alternative 4 based on the following, and discussed creating a new countywide planning policy that sets reasonable timeframes for review and possible action on Urban Reserve and Urban Holding areas.

**Alternative 3.1. Battle Ground, La Center, Ridgefield and Washougal.** The county received new requests to expand urban growth areas by La Center (school site), Ridgefield (large lot residential) and Washougal (large lot residential).
- Battle Ground’s request for 80 acres (currently zoned R-5) for employment
- La Center’s request for 56.55 acres (currently zoned AG-20) for employment
- A new La Center request for an additional 17 acres (currently zoned R-5) for a new school site
- A new Washougal request for 40.6 acres (currently zoned R-5) for residential
- A new Ridgefield request for 107.47 acres (currently zoned AG-20) for residential

**Alternative 4: Rural options. (Councilor Madore’s proposal)**

Guiding Principles and Goals:
1. No de-designation of Resource Lands (AG or FR).
2. Correct fundamental discrepancies between the actual predominant lot sizes and the existing zoning map.
3. Respect the actual rural character in each local area to provide better compatibility and consistency with adjacent properties.
4. Add clustering options to better aggregate parcels and preserve resource land and open space for agricultural, forestry, and non-residential use.
5. Allow a wider range of affordable lot size choices to fill obvious market gaps and provide a better balance.
6. Add flexibility needed to convert fallow land to more manageable economically viable agricultural and forest land.

Options to be analyzed:
- Forest zones: Include 20 and 10 acre minimum lot size areas where appropriate (considering the existing rural nature and predominant lot sizes)
- Agriculture zones: Include 5 acre minimum lot size areas where appropriate (considering the existing rural nature and predominant lot sizes)
- Rural zones: Include 1, 2.5, and 5 acre minimum lot size areas where appropriate (considering the already developed lots, the existing rural nature, and predominant lot sizes)
- Clustering Options to aggregate and preserve 70% of R, AG, and FR land into open space for agriculture, forest, or other non-residential uses.
NEXT STEPS
During two open houses, the public is invited to comment on the scope of impacts to be examined under SEPA. Both open houses will be 5:30 - 7:00 p.m.

- March 25, Ridgefield High School
- April 1, Hockinson High School

The BOCC will hold a hearing on April 14, 2015 at 10:00 a.m. to hear testimony from the public and then affirm which alternatives will be studied under SEPA.
The area bordered by NE 50th Avenue on the west, NE 139th Street on the north, NE 72nd on the east, and NE 119th Street on the south has no approved Circulation Plan but is experiencing explosive growth. This area was brought within the Urban Growth Boundary in 2007.

Valley Estates adds 50 home sites.  
Jessie Hollow adds 46 home sites.  
Hilberg adds 36 home sites.  
Green Valley Estates adds 25 home sites with potential for future additions.  
NE 72nd Ave PUD adds 233 home sites.  
Century Bay adds unknown home sites.  
Pleasant Valley Acres adds unknown home sites.

In 2012 the Pleasant Highlands Neighborhood Association (PHNA) working with Clark County Planners developed and recommended a Circulation Plan for this area. The Circulation Plan is documented in the Clark County Community Planning staff report titled Transportation System: Pleasant Highlands dated May 24, 2012. The report recommends NE 60th Avenue as the north-south and NE 129th as the east-west streets for the Circulation Plan. This plan minimizes traffic disrupting intersections with NE 119th and NE 139th Streets and NE 50th and NE 72nd Avenues, all of which are currently below County standards for carrying development-generated traffic, and significant portions of which are not in any CIP plan horizon to meet County standards to accommodate development-generated traffic. The PHNA recommendations were never formally approved nor adopted by any governing body.

The 2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update (GMP update) maintains the concepts of the PHNA Circulation Plan but modifies the PHNA Circulation Plan to acknowledge road construction associated with developments already completed without an adopted Circulation Plan. The GMP update has not been approved so this modified Circulation Plan has not been approved nor implemented.

The GMP update now includes the newly constructed NE 58th Avenue in the new Valley Estates subdivision that runs from NE 119th Street to NE 124th Street. The Valley Estates subdivision NE 58th Avenue does not conform to the PHNA Circulation Plan because it was constructed to Local rather than Neighborhood Circulator standards. County standards say Local streets in general do not directly connect to arterials or collectors. Allowing the connection of Local NE 58th Avenue to NE 119th Street was a result of not having an approved Circulation Plan; there are pending questions as to whether it will meet the proposed NE 119th Street upgrade elevation.

North of Valley Estates across NE 124th Street the new Jessie Hollow subdivision proposes offsetting NE 58th Avenue to the east (NE 58th Place) to NE 127th Street where the street would offset back west to NE 58th Avenue to NE 129th Street. As proposed, the Jessie Hollow subdivision does not conform to the PHNA Circulation Plan nor the GMP update because it proposes construction to Local rather than Neighborhood Circulator standards.

The proposed Hilberg subdivision, three parcels to the west of Valley Estates, proposes adding a newly constructed NE 56th Avenue between NE 119th Street and NE 124th Street with an additional intersection to 119th Street—which does not conform to the PHNA Circulation Plan nor the GMP update.

Green Valley Estates to the west of Hilberg and north of NE 124th Street is proposing NE 124th Street as the only outlet.
All of the above projects connect to NE 124th street which does not meet even the lower Local standard. There are conflicting surveys showing the location of the center line for NE 124th Street and Valley Estates subdivision may have spoiled the alignment of NE 124th Street for future upgrades. NE 124th Street offsets to NE 123rd Street to connect to NE 72nd Avenue where NE 72nd Avenue is 2 lanes without a left turn lane. It is safe to say none of these issues would have occurred if there were an approved Circulation Plan for this area.

It is clear that development is taking place in advance of any approved circulation or transportation plan for this neighborhood. It is also evident that this development is invalidating the PHNA Circulation Plan and the proposed 2016 GMP update transportation plan – neither can ever be implemented now because developers have not been aware of and conformed to any plan. Both residents and developers need certainty on future transportation for this area.

We request that a Circulation Plan with local input be adopted as a part of a finalized Transportation Plan for all areas proposed and currently within the GMP concurrent with adoption of the 2016 GMP Update. We request that no further development be approved until the necessary infrastructure is in place.

____________________________________
Darrel VanCoevering and Michelle Girts
5406 NE 123rd Street
98686
360.546.2899
More from Dylan for the record if you don’t have it.

________________________
From: Dylan Normington [mailto:dylannormington@yahoo.com]  
Sent: Monday, April 13, 2015 5:08 PM  
To: Orjiako, Oliver  
Subject: Additional Public Comment

Dr. Orjiako,

I have an additional comment regarding Alternative 4.

RCW 36.70A.011 states "The legislature finds that this chapter is intended to recognize the importance of rural lands and rural character to Washington’s economy, its people, and its environment, while respecting regional differences. Rural lands and rural-based economies enhance the economic desirability of the state, help to preserve traditional economic activities, and contribute to the state's overall quality of life.

The legislature finds that to retain and enhance the job base in rural areas, rural counties must have flexibility to create opportunities for business development. Further, the legislature finds that rural counties must have the flexibility to retain existing businesses and allow them to expand. The legislature recognizes that not all business developments in rural counties require an urban level of services; and that many businesses in rural areas fit within the definition of rural character identified by the local planning unit.

Finally, the legislature finds that in defining its rural element under RCW 36.70A.070(5), a county should foster land use patterns and develop a local vision of rural character that will: Help preserve rural-based economies and traditional rural lifestyles; encourage the economic prosperity of rural residents; foster opportunities for small-scale, rural-based employment and self-employment; permit the operation of rural-based agricultural, commercial, recreational, and tourist businesses that are consistent with existing and planned land use patterns; be compatible with the use of the land by wildlife and for fish and wildlife habitat; foster the private stewardship of the land and preservation of open space; and enhance the rural sense of community and quality of life."

Alternative 4 would allow for residential lots that are too small for a "traditional rural lifestyle". Rural means rural, not suburban. By allowing these small lot sizes, Clark county's rural areas will lose their "traditional rural lifestyle". In addition, these small lot sizes will make it more challenging for farmers to purchase additional land in rural Clark County. For agricultural purposes, it is much easier for purchase land in larger blocks (i.e. only 1 seller for 20 acres instead of 4 sellers for 5 acres each). This will violate the legislature's finding that land use patterns should "permit the operation of rural-based agricultural...businesses".

Also, 5-acre lot sizes will make the rural areas of our county less compatible by wildlife and for fish and wildlife habitat. Smaller lot sizes will increase density and vehicular traffic in these areas, which will increase the number of incidents of wildlife-automobile crashes. Therefore, Alternative four will make the rural areas of our county less compatible for wildlife.

Thanks for accepting my testimony.

Best Regards,

Dylan Normington
Hello Fran:

This is to acknowledge receipt of your comment. We welcome and value all comment. Your comment will be made available to the Councilors and be entered into our index of record. Thank you.

Best Regards,

Oliver

From: TIPPIE FRAN HAMMOND [mailto:tipandfran@msn.com]
Sent: Monday, April 13, 2015 8:12 PM
To: Orjiako, Oliver
Subject: Alt 4 and the GMA

I am writing on behalf of my mother and a few other family members and friends that would be directly effected by Alt 4 in the Hockinson area. Many of these residents have spent their lifetimes on their properties and have expressed great concern for the property valuations and impacts on water tables, roads, schools, etc. that increased growth would bring. This type of reclassification should never happen without the proper infrastructure to support the growth or without ample opportunity for citizen input. Hopefully, this ill thrown-together Alt 4 will be trashed before further costs to all citizens of Clark County! Keep in mind, your comment opportunities on "the grid" are available only to those citizens that have internet service. Many that are just above Hockinson still do not have Comcast in their areas! This really limits input, especially from seniors!

Thank you for your services to Clark County, Mr. Orjiako.

Fran Hammond
9307 NE 81st Way
Vancouver, WA 98662
Public Comment
SEPA Alternatives

April 14, 2015
(7:30 a.m.)
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All Statements sorted chronologically

As of April 14, 2015, 7:34 AM

As with any public comment process, participation in Engage Clark County is voluntary. The statements in this record are not necessarily representative of the whole population, nor do they reflect the opinions of any government agency or elected officials.
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As of April 14, 2015, 7:34 AM, this forum had:

Attendees: 382
All Statements: 88
Hours of Public Comment: 4.4

This topic started on April 7, 2015, 5:27 PM.
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I submit for the record my objection to the inclusion of Alternative 4 for consideration and analysis in the SEPA Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement on the grounds that:

- It conflicts with the intent of the Growth Management Act by knowingly creating conditions that support suburban sprawl and diminish the size and productivity of agricultural lands; that set the stage for infrastructure failures, negative environmental impacts on air and water quality and wildlife protection; and that risk the depletion of ground and surface water supplies.
- It creates real financial risk to taxpayers in terms of wasted planning staff time; likely increases in property taxes to all property owners to cover infrastructure development, required environmental mitigations, and increases in property tax valuations; and costs to defend against likely lawsuits re non-compliance with GMA rules and regulations.
- It was developed contrary to customary and normal planning and public participation processes which violates the spirit, and possibly the fact, of the appearance of fairness doctrine as it is applied in Washington state.

Specifically in regards to the potential violation of the appearance of fairness doctrine: I understand that Councilor Madore may not be in technical violation of the appearance of fairness doctrine, but his actions are contrary to everything county government states they are doing to be more transparent. It is my understanding the Councilor Madore has had a major role in drafting and revising Alternative 4 in response to requests from County Citizens United (CCCU) a single, special interest group claiming to speak for rural landowners seeking redress from what they feel to have been a taking of their property rights by the GMA. It is also my understanding that Councilor Madore directed Peter Silliman, who is not a member of the Community Planning Department, nor a planner at all, to help these few individuals craft a plan to completely restructure rural and resource land zoning. I also understand that Councilor Madore, without consulting planning staff, circumvented the normal and customary practice for developing comprehensive plan information by having GIS staff work directly with him on Alternative 4. This action appears to have been a deliberate exclusion of the county’s professional planning staff and a direct contravention of the procedure used to vet the other Alternatives, all of which, in effect, a willful circumvention of the public process used to vet Alternatives 1-3.

I recently reviewed 123 pages of emails, released through an FOIA request for all emails between the dates of 10/01/2014 and 2/18/2015 of David Madore, Tom Mielke, Jeanne Stewart, Oliver Orjiako and Peter Silliman with the keywords: Carol Levanen; Susan Rasmussen; Growth Management Act; Rural Alternative; Alternative #4; and Clark County Citizens United.

By my count there are approximately 60 emails in this FOIA request that document the breadth and depth of input CCCU has had in the drafting of Alternative 4, to the exclusion of all other members of the public. There were no emails to or from any other groups or individuals, much less the planning staff, despite the expansive nature of the keywords “Growth Management Act; Rural Alternative; and Alternative #4.” In addition to the extent of email input from CCCU into the drafting of Alternative 4, in what was a most unusual circumstance, there was an individual who identified as being an officer of CCCU actually seated at the table with county councilors and representatives of the cities during the board work session on March 11, 2015. I am told that is neither usual nor customary procedure.
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These reasons are the basis of my concern that the development of Alternative 4 appears to violate both the Public Participation element of the GMA and the County's own public participation resolution. In my opinion, choosing to include Alternative 4 in the EIS analysis is a failure of the council's fiduciary responsibility to taxpayers and a failure of the council's ethical duty to serve a diverse public with fairness and impartiality. Therefore request that Alternative not be considered as an alternative for analysis in the SEPA process.

Finally, given Councilor Madore's often stated concerns about integrity and transparency, and his statements that other Boards and political bodies not hide behind attorney-client privilege, I am also requesting that the council waive all exceptions to the production of documents under the public records act, including the waiver of attorney-client privilege, and release to the public into this record all documents pertaining to advice they have received from counsel and all of the legal counsel public records to planning staff. I make this request so that we, the public, have full and transparent information regarding the county councilors' understanding of what laws, rules and regulations they may be choosing to ignore in going forward with including Alternative 4 in the EIS review. As a demonstration of his commitment to transparency I ask Councilor Madore to lead the council in waiving all privileges and to produce all documents between legal and planning staff and the councilors, and between legal and the county manager regarding this Comprehensive Plan update.

Judy ZEIDER inside Clark County (on forum) April 13, 2015, 11:03 PM

I am a resident of what is left of rural Clark County. I generally support Alternative #1 and definitely oppose Alternative #4. Alternative #4 would allow unplanned sprawl where public services are already stretched to immit. Staff estimates that Alternative #4 would add approximately 7,931 new lots to the rural areas bringing the total to potentially 17,321 new lots, some as small as 1 acre. My family is on a well and septic system. The addition of almost 8000 more wells and septic systems in rural Clark County would endanger groundwater. In addition, rural roads are crumbling, law enforcement and fire/EMS resources are stretched thin, and portable classrooms are installed around even newer schools in the Battle Ground School District. Thank you for considering my input.

1 Supporter

Michael Benson inside Clark County (on forum) April 13, 2015, 11:03 PM

Alternative 4 flies in the face of state law, the Growth Management Act, by knowingly creating conditions that:
- Support suburban sprawl and diminish the size and productivity of agricultural lands, creating over 17,000 new rural lots
- Sets the stage for the associated infrastructure failures, negative environmental impacts on air and water quality and wildlife protection
- Creates real risk to the depletion of ground and surface water supplies

Alternative 4 also creates credible financial risks to taxpayers in the form of:
- Increases in property taxes to all property owners and especially to some rural landowners
- Property value increases due to zoning so even if citizens don't divide and develop their land, taxes will still
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- More pressure on rural schools and public services, furthering tax increases
- Costs to defend against lawsuits re non-compliance with GMA process, rules and regulations
Alternative 1 is the best choice:
- Already plans for 7000 new lots according to population assumptions adopted by the county
- Stays out of legal entanglements, which keep taxes down, emergency services reliable and our water supply protected
I urge Councilors to not include Alternative 4 in the SEPA analysis

1 Supporter

Name not available (unclaimed)  April 13, 2015, 11:01 PM

I am a resident of what is left of rural Clark County. I generally support Alternative #1 and definitely oppose Alternative #4. Alternative #4 would allow unplanned sprawl where public services are already stretched to the limit. Staff estimates that Alternative #4 would add approximately 7,931 new lots to the rural areas bringing the total to potentially 17,321 new lots, some as small as 1 acre. My family is on a well and septic system. The addition of almost 8000 more wells and septic systems in rural Clark County would endanger groundwater. In addition, rural roads are crumbling, law enforcement and fire/EMS resources are stretched thin, and portable classrooms are installed around recently built schools in the Battle Ground School District. Judy Zeider

Christian Benson inside Clark County (on forum)  April 13, 2015, 10:18 PM

The development of Alternative 4 violates the county’s own resolution (2014-06-17), which adopted a population figure of 562,000 people with 90% of the increases to occur within the current UGAs and 10% to non-urban.

These assumptions are woven in to the planning of all Alternatives: 1, 2 & 3 but not Alternative 4. Alternative 4, with the potential for 17,000 new rural parcels (almost 8000 more than under two of the three alternatives), which would have the impact of increasing the total population at a minimum of 21,280 in the county forecast, all of which to occur in the rural area.

In order to keep the 90/10 split, the County would have to select a population increase for the entire county of 191,000. Such an increase in the rural area is not only unsustainable but it is in violation County’s resolutions and disregards GMA standards for planning.

By abiding by the principals of Smart Growth, 90% of population should occur within the urban growth boundary. Open space preservation supports smart growth goals by bolstering local economies, preserving critical environmental areas, improving community quality of life, and guiding new growth into existing communities.

Alternative 4 deviates from the resolutions that this board adopted in January and June. I therefore request that Alternative not be considered as an alternative for analysis in the SEPA process.
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1 Supporter

Name not shown inside Clark County (unverified)  April 13, 2015, 10:04 PM

I support Alternative 1, and waiting until additional commissioners are on the board to decide.

Name not shown inside Clark County (on forum)  April 13, 2015, 10:01 PM

In the interests of protecting our community and preserving our resources I support Alternative 1. Alternative 4 is a travesty and a blatant subversion of the process and was conceived in a vacuum.

2 Supporters

Karen Kumpula inside Clark County (on forum)  April 13, 2015, 9:40 PM

As a propert owner who would be effected by Alt 4 I am strongly against it. The infrastructure in my area, small farm roads, wells and water supply would not support the change of AG-20 to R-5. We have active farming in my community that would be severely impacted by Alt.4. This plan was created by a county councilor with no community planning experience. Alt 4 will raise taxes for rezoned properties. The County can only freeze their portion Of our taxes. They don’t control school Levys, ports, state funding. Please do not vote for alt. 4!

2 Supporters

Name not shown inside Clark County (on forum)  April 13, 2015, 9:39 PM

I support alternative 1 because it was developed when Clark County was growing at its fastest. Though the recession hit and the growth did not happen as expected, alternative 1 maintains room for future growth.

I oppose Alternative 4 for many reasons. It is not related to the the planning goals set forth in RCW 36.70a.020(1), (2), (8), (9), (10), (11), and (12). I feel there was not adequate public representation in the planning process, which violates 020(11).

As rural landowner, I feel that Alt 4 does not represent the desires of the rural landowner base. If Alt 4 is approved, it will change the character of Clark County from its current rural state to a less desirable (but more profitable for a select few individuals) suburban county.
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2 Supporters

John Fitzsimmons inside Clark County (on forum)  
April 13, 2015, 9:30 PM
I am in favor of alternatives 1-3. Thank You.

Name not shown inside Clark County (on forum)  
April 13, 2015, 9:27 PM
As alternate 2 and 3 are not in the best interests of ALL clark county citizens, and alternate 4 was thrown together by an incompetent that has absolutely no planning experience what so ever with no public input process and therefore is not a legal option, I support alternative one only.
On top of that, shame on the other councilors for not getting control of the rouge and even letting alt 4 even get as far as it has....we county residents shall not forget the lack of governance during election time!!!
1 Supporter

Alice Linker inside Clark County (on forum)  
April 13, 2015, 9:13 PM
Use land, especially agriculture and forests, will be vital to a healthy future for Clark County. I support Alt. 1.
2 Supporters

Name not available (unclaimed)  
April 13, 2015, 8:58 PM
I support Alternative 1, which preserves the large tracts of productive farmland and minimizes the subdivision on these parcels. Farmland is invaluable to our community and will serve us well as young, innovative citizens get into small acreage farming and support our local economy. We should focus on higher density developments on sites that have been abandoned or can be redeveloped and not gobble up additional natural open spaces, both farm and forest. These types of landcover are important to the quality of life and the high level of livability in our region. I strongly oppose Alternative 4, which has not been vetted and is some awful idea of Californication of SW Washington. The exact reason people leave California. We must work harder to combine our desire to provide for growth and balance the protection of prime farmland as such. People need to eat and the effects of climate change and drought in California only reinforces the importance of spreading out agricultural infrastructure. Our climate and lifestyles as well as values provide a perfect place for farmers to thrive, and the County should be helping not hurting these efforts.

Joling inside Clark County (unverified)  
April 13, 2015, 8:14 PM
Don Joling-
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I disagree with Alt 4 for many of the same reasons stated by others in the forum: One commissioner, untrained in urban growth and land management coming up with a last minute plan—behind closed doors at the behest of one small special interest group that has already lost in court.

No plan for how or who will pay for the infrastructure that will be required to support a potential 20,000 new residents, especially given Alt 4 is not zoned to provide that many jobs.

Water: As recently as the mid-1990’s, there was a moratorium on building in and around Battle Ground due to the lack of water. There’s currently a historic drought in California, and many of those residents will relocate to Washington in search of more relaxed water laws. It’s my opinion that our commissioner doesn’t realize that water in Clark County isn’t infinite.

Opening the county to yet another taxpayer funded defense of leadership only following the rules it sees fit to abide by, has to stop. Now.

Thank you.

Sue J Cannard inside Clark County (on forum)  
April 13, 2015, 7:13 PM

I support alternative one, the position of Friends of Clark County

4 Supporters

Craig Lane inside Clark County (on forum)  
April 13, 2015, 6:16 PM

As a resident of North County I do not support Alternative 4. I want alternatives considered that went through the normal, deliberative process rather than something thrown in at the last minute.

2 Supporters

David McDonald inside Clark County (on forum)  
April 13, 2015, 5:33 PM


1 Attachment

https://pd-oth.s3.amazonaws.com/production/uploads/attachments/1330tc7aw8g.4y7/BOCC-Ltr-FOCC_Comments.pdf (2.3 MB)

1 Supporter

Tim Trohimovich outside Clark County (on forum)  
April 13, 2015, 4:32 PM

Dear County Councilors:

Futurewise is very concerned about Alternative 4. As was explained in our November 13, 2014 letter enclosed, increasing densities in the county’s agricultural, forest, and rural areas will not protect the county’s agricultural and forest industries or rural character. The county also lacks the available water to support the rural dens...
2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update

What do you think about the four suggested land use and growth alternatives?

...eses and re-designations and rezones. Further, there is no need to increase the urban growth areas at this time, the county's planned 20 year population growth can be accommodated in the existing urban growth areas. This will save money for the county's taxpayers and ratepayers. Moving forward with Alternative 4 commits the county to years of litigation and ultimately having to reverse course like the last comprehensive plan update.

Save the taxpayers money, adopt Alternative 1.

Thank you for considering our comments.

Tim Trohimovich, AICP
Director of Planning & Law Futurewise
tim@futurewise.org

1 Attachment

John Karpinski inside Clark County (on forum) April 13, 2015, 3:49 PM

Dear Clark County Counselors:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on behalf of CCNRC and myself on Clark County's proposed 2015 Growth Management Act update.

I must inform the County that their planning efforts, and particularly Alternative 4, clearly and unequivocally violate Washington's Growth Management Act. Only the "No change" Alternative #1 complies with the Act.

Alternative 4 violates GMA requirements for public participation.

Washington's Growth Management Act requires "early, open, and continuous" public participation in the preparation of growth management plans.

Here, Alternative four was irregularly done outside of the normal public review process, and without benefit of County planning or legal staff input. See Columbian article of 4/13/15, incorporated by reference.

Also, Alt 4 was apparently designed to accommodate a disgruntled special interest group that repeatedly lost its GMA appeals;

See the following decisions in 95-2-0067c - Achen, et al v. Clark County, et al.


See also the following Opinions of the Growth Board AFTER the Poyfair remand

3 Achen, et al v. Clark County, et al, Compliance Order and Order of Invalidity
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II. LEGAL STANDARD TO EXPAND UGA'S NOT FOLLOWED:

The County did not follow the rules for expanding UGA boundaries, whether by sequencing, use of urban reserve, or avoiding protecting resource lands. This is error.

4. COUNTY DIDN'T FOLLOW THE STANDARDS FOR NEW URBAN GROWTH LOCATION OF RCW 36.70A.110(3).

The following legal requirements was not used in the County's Alternatives 2, 3 and 4:

'(3) Urban growth should be located first in areas already characterized by urban growth that have adequate existing public facility and service capacities to serve such development, second in areas already characterized by urban growth that will be served adequately by a combination of both existing public facilities and services and any additional needed public facilities and services that are provided by either public or private sources, and third in the remaining portions of the urban growth areas.

3. NO AVOIDANCE/PROTECTION OF AGRICULTURAL LANDS.

Clark County made no attempt to avoid existing Ag lands, allowing for the conversion of literally 1000's of acres of resource land into incomparsble zones that do not protect the resource lands.

This continues the County's illegal efforts to develop resource land that has repeatedly found by the Growth Board, Clark Co Superior Court, and Washington's Court of appeals to violate the Growth Management Act, RCW 36.70A.

See 95-2-0067c - Achen, et al v. Clark County, et al,
see also 07-2-0027 Karpinski, et al v. Clark County, et al, Final Decision and Order

Il County Growth plan violates GMA's requirements for rural planning in RCW 36.70A.070 (5)

Clark County's Growth plan violates the following rural protection provisions of RCW 36.70A.070 (5):

A RCW 36.70A.070 (5) (b):

'(b) Rural development. The rural element shall accommodate appropriate rural densities and uses that are not characterized by urban growth and that are consistent with rural character.

3 RCW 36.70A.070 (5) (c)

'(c) Measures governing rural development. The rural element shall include measures that apply to rural development and protect the rural character of the area, as established by the county, by:
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(i) Containing or otherwise controlling rural development;
(ii) Assuring visual compatibility of rural development with the surrounding rural area;
(iii) Reducing the inappropriate conversion of undeveloped land into sprawling, low-density development in the rural area;
(iv) Protecting critical areas, as provided in RCW 36.70A.060, and surface water and groundwater resources; and
(v) Protecting against conflicts with the use of agricultural, forest, and mineral resource lands designated under RCW 36.70A.170.

IV Growth management plan over allocates industrial land, leading to additional residential development and sprawl.

The Growth Plan over-allocates job land needs and allows conversion of "jobs" lands into housing by the County's watering down of the "no net loss" of industrial lands. This has previously been found by the WWGMHB to be in violation of the GMA in 95-2-0067c - See Achen, et al v. Clark County, et al.

V Conclusion

Each of the County Councilor's duties and oath of office requires you to follow all laws of the State of Washington; not just the laws you agree with. Please immediately fix these egregious violations of Washington's Growth Management Act, RCW 36.70A.

Sincerely yours,

John S. Karpinski

---

Jennifer Barnes inside Clark County (on forum) April 13, 2015, 3:43 PM

I am 100% AGAINST ALT 4 for many of the same reasons others have mentioned. Most importantly, this alternative completely ignores the fact that such changes require major and expensive infrastructure that is not in place. This is "a plan with no planning" or preparation and a terrible idea for Clark County.

---

Name not shown inside Clark County (on forum) April 13, 2015, 3:32 PM

We are longtime North County residents and are concerned about the need for an expedited decision on this issue – one that will affect many of us for decades to come. We ask the board and others involved in this process to defer this decision until the board has additional members to guide this process. Growth is not a bad thing, but such growth will require infrastructure improvements to our roads, schools, fire and other safety...
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systems. The people who desire accelerated growth are also those who would ask for waived impact and building fees, and refute the need to raise the funds (taxes) to meet these needs. The cost of this growth needs to be carefully evaluated. And we don’t see that these costs have been estimated or that there is consensus, particularly on the impacts of option 4. (It is very difficult to interpret option 4, as the color schematics aren’t similar to the other plans.) We repeat, please defer this decision until the expanded (voter-requested) board is populated.

Name not shown inside Clark County (on forum) April 13, 2015, 3:28 PM
There are so many things wrong about Alt4. First of all, zoning revises require due diligence in preplanning for all the infrastructure needed to serve the growth and needs of any new proposed development. Schools, roads, local community needs and marketability just to name a few. Let’s look at the areas affected by downsizing lot size and the impact it would have on each community. Schools. We are already at full capacity in most high schools. The roads, try driving on Hwy 503 and Main st. in Battle Ground. It’s beyond capacity now. Simply put, we all know the cart has to come before the horse. Plan ahead for growth. It is what the planning board is here to do. It is what they are trained to do. Who benefits from Alt4? Certainly not the majority of us. As a Realtor working with rural land sales I do not see any big demand for rural acre lots. The biggest issue I have is how can a person with no experience in zoning and planning just bring a proposition to the table? No to Alt4.

A.G. Flynn inside Clark County (on forum) April 13, 2015, 2:53 PM
Land use and growth alternatives as presented on this website are difficult to compare coherently. GIS or cartographic systems were not used properly to allow for across-the-alternative comparisons. Legends, colors and overlays should match on each proposal. Sadly this basic instrument was not used to citizens’ advantage. Shortcomings in basic presentation aside, it is clear that Clark County should WAIT to implement any plan proposals or alternatives until a full council is seated and sworn in 2016. Any attempt to foreclose on this important process before all five members are seated could open the county for lawsuits, frivolous and otherwise, by landowners on every side of this debate. At this date there is no need to decide the future of land use in Clark County. The State of Washington will allow deliberation in 2016, so no “straw man” arguments about timing need be advanced.

If comments are regarded by existing council electeds the first easy move is REJECTION of Alternative 4. Opening rural lands to sprawl and foolish infrastructure development will cause basic quality-of-life in our county to suffer. Several other agencies with high stakes have not been consulted on this poorly crafted proposal.

WSDOT, school districts and fire suppression organizations need to comment before it could even be considered viable. Summary: REJECT Alternative 4.

If the current panel of county representatives feels they must choose from the existing alternatives before they are joined by a full and complete council they would be wise to select Alternative 1 or Alternative 2. Either of these proposals allow Clark County to continue metered growth and actively seek compatible industry while maintaining good relationships with all municipalities, school districts and area service providers. Summary: Accept Alternative 1 or Alternative 2.

OVERALL - Clark County should wait to decide this issue until a full council is available to vote in 2016.
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- Alternative 4 should be rejected as incomplete and flawed.
- Alternative 1 is acceptable.
- Alternative 2 is acceptable.

Elizabeth Campbell inside Clark County (on forum)  
April 13, 2015, 2:53 PM

I support Alternative 2. It allows for ample, appropriate growth and business development in Clark County. I particularly oppose Alternative 4 which is contrary to the intent of the Growth Management Act. It would result in sprawl and an increased demand for services in our rural areas.

1 Supporter

Rachel Woodward Clark (unverified)  
April 13, 2015, 2:27 PM

I support option 1 or 2, I strongly oppose option 4. Option 4 is strongly against agriculture. After moving here from an area where farmers and farmland are cherished, I am surprised to see such option 4. Farming, livestock and open space should be supported and we should not be looking at extending the urban growth boundary and giving up so much undeveloped land to development of business parks and housing subdivisions. Homeowners are already feeling pushed off of their own properties by developers due to increasing taxes. Open space should be preserved for the public to enjoy.

Name not available (unclaimed)  
April 13, 2015, 1:37 PM

Alternative 1 is my vote and is best for our community.

Name not shown inside Clark County (on forum)  
April 13, 2015, 1:22 PM

The County Councilors should adopt Alternative 1. The current plan provides plenty of land for growth, keeps large acreage for farm and forest uses, avoids the costs of providing services to many small parcels located all over the county, and ensures we will have large enough parcels to provide for economic development/local jobs.

Name not shown inside Clark County (on forum)  
April 13, 2015, 11:42 AM

What makes Clark county a great place to live is the amount of farm land and open space; this (north Clark county) is a place where people want to come to get away from urban sprawl, breathe fresh air and experience the country. The extremely valuable resource and commodity which is Clark county is being and will be lost forever with each parcel of land developed for high density housing and unnecessary commercial use. Clark county would be better served by growing up instead of out, focusing on developing tourism, thinking about the affects of these growth alternatives on future generations, and remembering that these growth alternatives go
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against the Growth Management Act, and knowingly creates conditions that:
Support suburban sprawl and diminish the size and productivity of agricultural lands, creating over 17,321 new "rural lots"
Sets the stage for the associated infrastructure failures, negative environmental impacts on air and water quality and wildlife protection
Creates real risk to the depletion of ground and surface water supplies

Alternative 4 also creates credible financial risks to taxpayers in the form of:
Increases in property taxes to all property owners and especially to some rural landowners
Property value increases due to zoning so even if citizens don't divide and develop their land, taxes will still increase
More pressure on rural schools and public services, furthering tax increases
Costs to defend against lawsuits re non-compliance with GMA process, rules and regulations

1 Supporter

Name not shown inside Clark County (on forum) April 13, 2015, 10:06 AM

It is my opinion, and shared with a growing number of concerned citizens, that this "Alternative 4", currently being considered, is the creation of an inexperienced policy analyst (a member of the Councilors' staff), at the direction of a County Councilor; and it came to be only as a result of Councilors' relationship with Clark County Citizens United, a special interest group. It needs to be noted that CCCU alleges representation of "6,000" (sometimes 8,000) rural landowners in Clark County, although absolutely no documentation exists for this number to be verified.

CCCU does not represent all rural landowners but is receiving special treatment. This was unethically, and perhaps illegally, reinforced by that fact that CCCU was the only special interest group invited to the work session held on March 11, 2015, where CCCU was supposed to be representing rural land-owners. This action itself flies in the face of a goal of the Growth Management Act, "Citizen participation and coordination. Encourage the involvement of citizens in the planning process and ensure coordination between communities and jurisdictions to reconcile conflicts" (Goal #11).

Other community groups, such as the Clark/Cowlitz Farm Bureau, Friends of Clark County, Friends of East Fork, Clark County Food System Council or any number of rural neighborhood associations - of which none were invited to the table at a particular, well-attended and very public work session (March 11) - have not received the attention or the ear of the majority of the current County Councilors, and, in fact, conversations have been denied .... conversations, for example, regarding TDR's. TDR's have been suggested and encouraged by no fewer than three community groups for the last 20 years. Absolutely no consideration has been given to this program.

This is but one issue surrounding the development of Alternative 4 as an update to the Comprehensive Growth Plan. There are numerous violations that would be created by the acceptance of this alternative: suburban sprawl, critical depletion of ground and surface water available in rural areas, loss of productive ag land, potential infrastructure failures, increase in property taxes - and more.
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It is obvious that all continuing efforts to pursue Alternative 4 is an investment of taxpayer money on something that should never come to be, and, at worst, will result in sizeable lawsuits. This is an irresponsible or even unethical use of tax money.

2 Supporters

Name not available (unclaimed)  
April 13, 2015, 9:53 AM  
support alternative 1. Sue Cannard

George Espinosa inside Clark County (on forum)  
April 13, 2015, 9:42 AM

After attending most of the “Open Houses”, submitting at least two petitions and making numerous appeals to the BOCC since 2007, we have yet to see that all the public input and personal appeals has influenced the direction of this plan. When one studies the current boundaries of the City of Vancouver, and the area now in Urban Holding, you discover the area of Urban Hold is more than twice the size of the City. Then consider that none of the projected growth and job creation estimates have even come close to reality, one can only conclude this whole exercise is nothing more than an expansion of Government control by absorbing our Private Property Rights at the total expense of the property owners. I am not a Lawyer but have read many cases regarding property rights and believe that Property Rights are included in Constitutional right to Due Process, which has previously been denied in this case to the point it is my opinion it amounts to a “Taking” which demands we be compensated for being denied our intended lawful use of our properties.

Respectfully,

George L. Espinosa

2 Supporters

Name not available (unclaimed)  
April 13, 2015, 8:25 AM

In our view all four proposed maps are unsuitable. We believe the large parcels surrounded by small lots should be respectfully changed to mirror their neighbors. We own 80 acres located at 16104 NE 259th Street. The tax parcels are as follows: 986003678; 986027184; 226268000; 986027183. Our neighbors have 5 acre zoning to the north and to the west. South and adjacent of us, the zoning is ONE and two acre lots. Many houses surround us. We are located one mile north of Battle Ground main street. We have PUD water and a reservoir and pump station on our property. Fire Dist. #3 is less than a mile away. We have County road frontage. We plan to continue growing trees, but would like the option to create smaller farms in the future. We believe 5 acre mini farms are ideally suited for Clark County. We believe all ag-land should be zoned 5 acres, and all forest and should be zoned 10 acres. We also do not understand why some ag land on Alternative 4 is proposed for 5 acre zoning while our land on the edge of B.G. is proposed for 10 acre zoning. This new zoning will impact our personal financial retirement lives for many years to come. We thank you for all your hard work. But we believe in being realistic about an urban county being fair to the large landowners. Large land owners need to be treated with fairness and have their land zoned in a way that is reflective of their neighbors.

Sincerely, Dave and Valerie Larwick

Jeffrey Posey inside Clark County (on forum)  
April 13, 2015, 7:18 AM
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I support alternative 1. Although, there should be more wilderness area and agriculture land. We are using every square inch of Clark County and it is wasteful.

2 Supporters

Brian Grier inside Clark County (on forum)  
April 13, 2015, 7:15 AM

I think #4 is a bad idea. It would allow more development outside the current growth boundaries. This would create havoc with infrastructure. I prefer #1

3 Supporters

Vicki Kraft inside Clark County (on forum)  
April 13, 2015, 12:34 AM

I recommend adoption of Amendment # 4 for the 2016 Clark County Comprehensive Growth Management Plan. It addresses the real disparities Clark County rural landowners have been facing for the last 20 years. It provides for rural zoning which is more representative of the actual lot sizes. Previously zoning had been determined inaccurately based on aerial photos which make it extremely difficult at best to really know how many acres make up a lot or area. In addition, there were many rural lands with faulty soil data and designations. These designations should have been based on the 1972 NRCS soil manual but weren’t. Thankfully under this new amendment actual land size is being recognized and accounted for with new corresponding acreage zoning. This will prevent the lock nature of downzoning which put a gridlock on most rural landowners in 1994 when the current zoning structure was implemented. Under this new amendment, rural farmers and citizens will once again have the freedom and flexibility to sell off a small portion of their property or leave 1-2 acres to their children if they choose. My hat is off to the County Councilors for taking extra measures to make sure the rural citizens are heard - including the public open houses and this online forum. This newest amendment best reflects the voice and needs of local rural landowners. I’m hopeful we’ll see Amendment # 4 included for our rural community in the updated Clark County Comprehensive Plan.

JAN VERRINDER inside Clark County (on forum)  
April 12, 2015, 10:05 PM

Forget 4: sprawl, increased public services demand without a payment plan, traffic congestion, ruins the rural feel. I favor #1 or 2, and would prefer we file for extension until the 5 councilors under the Charter are seated.

3 Supporters

Russ Williams inside Clark County (on forum)  
April 12, 2015, 9:01 PM

I would prefer Option 1 or Option 2, as they support more gradual development and protect more of our environment. Also, they support a more modest increase on demand for expanded infrastructure. Option 3 is not as conservative, while Option 4, only recently presented, seems to have been developed with limited input, and minimal opportunities for widespread public evaluation and input.

3reg Bender inside Clark County (on forum)  
April 12, 2015, 8:58 PM

Statements sorted chronologically
As of April 14, 2015, 7:34 AM

http://peakdemocracy.com/2623
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I and I moved as far north into Clark County as we could afford to get away from sprawl. We are in favor of growth management that does not open the flood gates to mass development. Clark County has some of the most productive agricultural land in the state, and nothing is being done to conserve any of it.

We are 100% against alternative 4 for numerous reasons. Alternative 4 flies in the face of state law, the Growth Management Act, by knowingly creating conditions that: Support suburban sprawl and diminish the size and productivity of agricultural lands, creating over 17,321 new rural lots. Sets the stage for the associated infrastructure failures, negative environmental impacts on air and water quality and wildlife protection. Creates real risk to the depletion of ground and surface water supplies.

Alternative 4 also creates credible financial risks to taxpayers in the form of: Increases in property taxes to all property owners and especially to some rural landowners. Property value increases due to zoning so even if citizens don’t divide and develop their land, taxes will still increase. More pressure on rural schools and public services, furthering tax increases. Costs to defend against lawsuits re non-compliance with GMA process, rules and regulations.

3 Supporters

April 12, 2015, 8:11 PM

I am opposed to alternative 4 because it encourages endless development and growth which rapidly begets further development and more growth. This cycle is unsustainable, like a pyramid scheme which kicks the cost down the road to the next generation. Clark County must invest in quality of life practices such as preserving arable food producing and climate controlling larger parcels from becoming another strip mall.

1 Supporter

April 12, 2015, 5:24 PM

For sensible growth, the facts support Alternative #1. It already allows over nine thousand new rural parcels.
A sensible growth plan supports Alternative #1. It already has room for over nine thousand new rural parcels. Clark County will function the best when the greatest amount of growth occurs within the cities. Having to provide services and infrastructure beyond city limits is far more costly and impractical than developing land within the boundaries of our fine, well run Cities in the County. Creating over seventeen thousand new lots as would be permitted under alternative #4 would be an expensive disaster for the County, raise taxes on all the neighbors of the upzoned properties, and keep the cities where those services are already provided growing on a far more orderly basis. Paul Christensen

Rory Bowman inside Clark County (on forum) April 12, 2015, 3:48 PM

I was born and raised in Clark County, a fifth-generation Washingtonian. As such, I have watched the process and effects of suburban development in Clark County for almost all of my fifty years, and this gives me some perspective on how development can unfold and the many different impacts it can have: positive and negative, expected and unexpected.

Of the four alternatives on offer I support either Alternative 1 (no substantive change) or Alternatives 2 or 3.
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(Those small, mostly city-requested changes). I absolutely oppose Alternative 4.

Previous growth-management planning was completed before the 2008 economic downturn and predictions of greater economic and population pressures made then have not yet been fulfilled. In the absence of even those eleves of growth, no major change is warranted at this time, and so Alternative 1 is most appropriate. We planned for growth that did not happen, much as a parent might buy clothes for a growing child. Just as it would make no sense for such a parent to buy more even larger clothes, it makes no sense for us to discard Alternative 1, which Clark County hasn’t yet grown into.

Alternative 3 is more aggressive than present population numbers or available funds for infrastructure warrant, and will be a fine starting point as an aggressive-growth option during the next planning cycle, but is arguably too aggressive and expensive at this time, negatively impacting agriculture. With one set of too-large clothes, what reasonable parent would buy more?

Alternative 4 seems less like a serious professional proposal than a real-estate development wish list of the kind that was common in the late 1980’s and 1990’s, as incoming money sought to overbuild in the areas opened by I-205 with hope of fast returns on a southern-California development model. It does not show signs of serious input from trained development staff, and there is every indication that it was put forward by David Vadore and non-planning staff Peter Silliman and Don Benton, in violation of the newly-adopted county charter and standard land-use planning protocols and procedures. Completing the parents’ new clothes analogy, Alternative 4 is a whole stack of of too-big britches.

Alternative 1 is more than adequate for this planning cycle and the oddly aggressive Alternative 4 should absolutely be taken off the table. Given the current political situation in Clark County with the newly adopted council system, it would be even better if these discussions could be delayed until all five county councilors have been seated and had time to "get up to speed" on lawful and ethical planning methods. If such a delay is not possible, the conservative course is to hold position and not commit county resources to any major change.

Alternative 1 is much to be preferred of the three serious alternatives on offer.

- Rory Bowman, Post Office Box 202, Vancouver

3 Supporters

Name not shown inside Clark County (on forum) \ April 12, 2015, 3:32 PM

The timing of, and the process/resources used to bring alternative 4 to the comprehensive plan update for Clark County is, in my opinion, of concern:

- Late in the process, well after cut-off for new options.
- Rushed to the discussion.
- Presented by one councilor, with some assistance from a non-planner staff, and input from a limited number of citizen activists.

- Collaborative with local jurisdictions (schools, cities, transportation planners, water and power providers)
- Collaborative with county planning staff who are trained, and obligated to follow laws and best-practices in
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Following public involvement.

Consequence of Alternative 4
Encourages suburban sprawl.
Diminishes the size and productivity of agricultural lands.
Impacts forested areas (with related water quality risks due to septic tanks and deforestation).
Adds no road capacity, while increasing quantity of residents in rural areas.

Related environmental failures probable: water supply, water quality, air quality.

Pressure on rural schools (building capacity and transportation)
Straining public services like law enforcement, fire protection, and emergency medical response.
Most importantly:
Limits future necessary expansion of city urban growth boundaries when the county areas are too small and highly-parceled for job-lands, and built with rural housing. This will kill the city & county jobs producing ability in the next 20 years, further forcing our kids/grand-kids to leave to find a job/career elsewhere.

And, the risks, if it is adopted, to the county budget for legal defense.

I support alternative 2, cleans up some left-over issues, yet does not increase sprawl, keeps citizen costs low (taxes remain low).

5 Supporters

________________________

Name not shown inside Clark County (on forum)  April 12, 2015, 2:53 PM

I am in support of options 1 and 2 but would prefer this decision was postponed until the full 5 councilors are seated in January 2016. I am against option 4 as it makes the most changes with out any required review of the individual properties. There are many non-similar changes made that would be better handled on a case-by-case basis taking local factors into consideration.

1 Supporter

________________________

Name not shown inside Clark County (on forum)  April 12, 2015, 2:39 PM

I am in favor of delaying adoption of the GMA plan until the Council has 5 members and can have a full discussion without the pressure of a last minute addition to the alternatives addressed. Alternative 4 is too broad and creates future uncertainty. It is hard to compare its impact on future development in the County given that the maps for the various alternatives do not follow the same format. However, overall, it just takes too many scattered properties out of the rural, agricultural and forestry zones creating a random pattern of development that will make it a) hard for genuine farmers to carry on normal business, and b) making it almost impossible to respond to new residents requests for services that will be inevitable over time. Alternative 1 provides adequate growth opportunities with some minor adjustments. For example, I believe staff said option 3 offered a more open timeline for appeals and I would possibly in favor of this for those who were resident non-conforming lots prior to the adoption of the last Growth Management Plan. Or, I would possibly support a
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1 Supporter

Bill Baumann inside Clark County (on forum)  
April 12, 2015, 1:51 PM

I support alternative 2. I strongly oppose alternative 4. It was created in a back room by a special interest group and one councilor and does not take into account the interests of the entire county.

2 Supporters

Name not shown inside Clark County (unverified)  
April 12, 2015, 11:14 AM

I oppose Alt 4. It will further unbalance the ratio of developable land to farm land and threatens the future of Clark County's local food supply. David Madore continues to push his personal agenda which flies in the face of State law and policy and ignores the needs of our citizenry except for those of his big business buddies. NO ON ALT 4. Patty Ingraham

3 Supporters

Warren Neth inside Clark County (on forum)  
April 12, 2015, 10:51 AM

Board of Clark County Councilors,
Clark County is a rapidly urbanizing county and part of an ever-expanding metropolitan area. Our natural resources, rural character, great schools and neighborly community are a few of the reasons, which make Clark County a highly desirable community to live in. Your stewardship of the Comprehensive Plan process is crucial to preserving that livability.

Slow Food Southwest Washington does not believe that ALT 4 should be considered in this round of GMA updates. The proposal opens developments into Clark County's rural areas without consideration of:

1. The smaller parcel sizes that ALT4 proposes will put increased market pressure on our remaining agricultural and, out pricing larger lots for 'commercially viable farms', as described in the 2007 "Analysis of the Agricultural Economic Trends and Conditions in Clark County, Washington" by Globalwise.

2. How will these new, smaller parcel size designations be used in the future? Developing these smaller parcel sizes, without creating zones where they will be used in the long-term, will open the smaller parcel sizes to be used during Annual Review process anywhere in the rural area. I do not believe the discretionary procedure of clustering similarly sized lots will provide adequate direction for future clustering of similar sized lots that you have proposed.

3. T4 directs development toward Rural areas, which does not honor the considerable investment made to development toward Cities, Rural Centers, and Urban Reserves that Clark County has already made.
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Slow Food Southwest Washington questions:
Rural Character -
How will the 1 acre parcelization of Clark County's forest and fields effect traffic and other lifestyle benefits of Clark County’s rural character?

Property taxes - Has their been an assessment of how rural landowners taxes will raise as the new smaller zoned lots, as well as the houses and infrastructure they require as they develop?

Capitol Improvements - How does the BOCCC plan to pay for the new roads, utilities, sewer, fire districts, sheriff's presence and other Capitol Improvements as we open up 15,000 new parcels across our rural areas?

Water- Clark County’s rural residents are dependent on wells that draw from already stressed aquifers. Who will be monitoring the effect of new wells drilled and manage our water resources?

Process-
1. After the community had already given input during the first two years on ALT1, ALT2, ALT3, Council member Madore proposed ALT4, with minimal analysis and outreach to effected stakeholders.

2. At the March 11th, BOCCC Work Session Council member Madore continually insisted "No new parcels will be created". At the following Open House, Community Planning stated an estimated 15,000 new parcels would be created between ALT3 and 4.

3. The 2013 survey of AG20 and FR40 landowners called the Rural Census was not a scientific poll, vote or actual census. The questions left ambiguity and were loaded. Removing AG20 and FR40 based on this survey's not good stewardship of the Comprehensive Planning process nor Clark County's agriculture or forest resource lands.

Slow Food Southwest Washington requests:
1. Consider zoning options that would provide flexibility to family's who might want to share their land, not a blanket zoning policy that opens Clark County’s rural areas to subdivision.

2. Focus residential development to Cities, Rural Centers, and Urban Reserves.

3. Protect Clark County’s last large acreage parcels of class 1 growing soils. Develop Agricultural Production District’s, Transfer of Development Rights and Purchase of Development Rights as described in numerous reports developed by citizen led committees, such as Clark County Agriculture Preservation Strategies Report, Clark County Food System Council’s "Conserving agricultural food production in Clark County", Slow Food Southwest Washington's "Grow Clark County" recommendations.

4. Consider the Grow Clark County recommendation to develop policy that conserves farmland and strengthens the farm economy. More info here: www.slowfoodswwa.com/growclarkcounty

I look forward to talking further about these issues.
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Warren Neth
Executive Director
Slow Food Southwest Washington
360-771-1296
warren@slowfoodswwa.com
www.slowfoodswwa.com

3 Supporters

Olson inside Clark County (on forum) April 12, 2015, 8:19 AM

Alternative Four is flawed in many ways but among the most egregious is the unacceptable level of capitol costs such unplanned population increases will cost County taxpayers due to the 'leapfrog' nature of such development.

A second problem with Alternative 4 is the lack of professional guidance and citizen input that such projects demand. The last minute-hurried nature of the proposal left little or no time for meaningful public involvement or process.

I urge the Councilors to reject Alt-4 based on future costs and the lack of public transparency and input from Clark Co citizens outside the developer and 'stand to profit' supporters of the proposal.

2 Supporters

Bob Brewer inside Clark County (on forum) April 12, 2015, 7:28 AM

How can it be considered planning when properties within 100 yards of an elementary school remain zoned 5 acres or larger?

Communities thrive in close proximity to their schools and public facilities. Forcing families away destroys their community.

Sequestration of school adjacent properties sacrifices the safety of our littlest school children and is the death sentence to family centered communities.

Name not shown inside Clark County (on forum) April 12, 2015, 7:14 AM

WHERE WILL WE GET OUR FOOD, WE NEED MORE FARMS NOT HOUSES, THE PRICE OF LAND IS SO HIGH THAT YOU CANT AFFORD TO FARM UNLESS SOMEONE IS WORKING. WITH NEWHOUSING COMES MORE WATER USAGE WHERE WILL FARMS GET THEIR WATER/ DO ANY OF YOU SUPPORT YOUR LOCAL FARMER GO OUT TO A FEW FARMS AND YOU WILL SEE THEY FARM BECAUSE THEY LOVE IT NOT TO GET RICH.

Name not available (unclaimed) April 11, 2015, 5:52 PM
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I support Alternative 1.

Kathryn Ketcham inside Clark County (on forum)  April 11, 2015, 4:43 PM
I would like to comment in favor of Alternative 2 which I understand is Alternative 1 with some additions to Urban Growth Areas requested by some of the cities and a few corrections. This is a conservative choice which is responsive to some urgent needs.

I would also like to note that it is difficult to compare Options 1-3 with Option 4 on the available maps because the categories and color scheme are different.

That said, I oppose Alternative 4 for these reasons: 1) From the maps it looks like Alternative 4 increases residential lots without regard to maintaining Resource Lands including Forest and Agricultural land and, possibly, without regard of wetlands, riparian lands and wildlife habitat. 2) The addition of so many residential lots (I have heard figures ranging from 6,000-8000) with the associated non-permeable surfaces of rooftops, driveways, and access roads is a storm water management issue. 3) In addition, I am concerned about the cost of infrastructure for these diffuse residences and how it will be paid. No detailed plan for paying for the infrastructure has been presented.

Sincerely,
Kathryn Ketcham
123 W. 30th St
Vancouver, WA 98660
360-693-5373

2 Supporters

Name not shown inside Clark County (on forum)  April 11, 2015, 2:22 PM
Alt 4 is bad because it negatively affects environmental impacts on air/water quality/wildlife protection. It also creates risk to the depletion of ground and surface water supplies. Finally Alt 4 also creates credible financial risks to taxpayers in the form of: Increases in property taxes to all property owners and especially to some rural landowners.
The Best choice is Alt 1 still allows for the growth of 9,390 new rural parcels. Alt 1 keeps Clark County out of egal entanglements, which keep taxes down, emergency services reliable and our water supply protected. It minimizes pressure on rural schools and public services. Changes are not needed because growth assumptions of 2007 were never realized.

3 Supporters

Betty Montgomery inside Clark County (on forum)  April 11, 2015, 1:23 PM
'I am alarmed by the process underway. I respectfully request that no action be taken on selecting or dele
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...the alternatives until after the full, five-member council is seated in January 2016. I believe that the state will support the county's request for a postponement due to our newly enacted Home Rule Charter."

3 Supporters

Name not available (unclaimed) April 11, 2015, 1:09 PM

We need to extend deadline for public comment.
We need farmlands in Clark County! The key is to manage growth but not at the cost of losing precious small farms.
Donna Roberge

Name not shown inside Clark County (on forum) April 11, 2015, 12:21 PM

I support Alternative 1. The current Comprehensive Growth Management Plan was adopted in 2007 with overly optimistic population assumptions that were never realized. Alternative 1 still has room for population growth while protecting forests, agricultural land and ground water supplies. infrastructure and emergency services are designed to accommodate Alternative 1.

I oppose Alternative 4. It violates the State Growth Management Act by encouraging suburban sprawl and diminishing agriculture and forest lands. Alternative 4 would create an additional 17,321 new rural lots scattered razed over east and north Clark County. These additional lots will cause increased taxes for all county residents to provide infrastructure, including roads, schools, police, fire and other emergency services. Additional scattered development could affect watersheds and aquifers by creating more hardscape that encourages runoff rather than percolation into the groundwater. The changes in zoning will increase property taxes for those who do not subdivide. Current rural landowners who complain of the inability to reap economic benefits by subdividing their land ignore the fact that they have benefited economically for years from lower property tax rates for agricultural and forestry zoning. Wildlife habitat will decrease as more forest lands are cleared and farmlands are converted to subdivisions. All county taxpayers will be burdened with the costs of defending the county against lawsuits for violation of state law, when those funds in the county budget to be better used to serve current needs.

Name not shown inside Clark County (on forum) April 11, 2015, 12:19 PM

I support Alternative 1, the no change alternative as the growth assumptions of 2007 were never realized. Alt 1 still allows for the growth of 9,390 new rural parcels. Alt 1 keeps Clark County out of legal entanglements, which keep taxes down, emergency services reliable and our water supply protected.

Alternative 4 is a bad plan. It flies in the face of state law, the Growth Management Act, by knowingly creating conditions that:

• spur suburban sprawl and diminish the size and productivity of agricultural lands, creating over 17,321 new
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Rural lots

Sets the stage for the associated infrastructure failures, negative environmental impacts on air and water quality and wildlife protection

Creates real risk to the depletion of ground and surface water supplies

Alternative 4 also creates credible financial risks to taxpayers in the form of:

Increases in property taxes to all property owners and especially to some rural landowners

Property value increases due to zoning so even if citizens don’t divide and develop their land, taxes will still increase

More pressure on rural schools and public services, furthering tax increases

Costs to defend against lawsuits re non-compliance with GMA process, rules and regulations

1 Supporter

Name not shown inside Clark County (on forum)  
April 11, 2015, 11:26 AM

The Comp plan over estimated growth from 2007. Alternative 1 is the only one that makes sense. Why would the County want to increase urban sprawl and ruin the rural lifestyle, not to mention the added taxes and costs that would be required if Alternative 4 were adopted. Keep Clark County horse friendly with urban/rural buffers which can blend high density urban areas with low density rural areas and protect agriforest areas. Protect our watershed and our soil.

2 Supporters

William Maiden inside Clark County (on forum)  
April 11, 2015, 11:15 AM

Alternative 4 takes the county in absolutely the wrong direction. It would increase sprawl and put pressure on public services with no way to pay for them. It is a bad idea. By the way... It seems like this was a surprise to the county planning department. How could that happen?

Chuck Green inside Clark County (on forum)  
April 11, 2015, 10:53 AM

As a candidate for Clark County Council District 2, here is why I am opposed to Comprehensive Plan Alternative 4. I offer the following comments for the record, and a proposed solution.
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- *k Green
- Ridgefield

Beside the fact it was developed by one County Councilor, who will also be voting on it as a preferred land use alternative, and one special interest group, it has a number of flaws.

Take a look at the maps, which I am attaching to my post here. What do you get?

- Parcelization of rural Clark County into 1-5 acre parcels. It will add 8,000 new lots (see page 26, http://clark.wa.gov/thegrid/documents/2015_0414_BOCC_H_SEPACALT_STAFF_REPORT_and_ATTACHMENT\TS.pdf).

- No protection for small farms or other agricultural uses, including wineries.

- 8,000 large houses on these new lots, translating to 20,000 more people in the rural area.

- With 25-30 percent of Clark County workers commuting to Portland, this potentially adds 12,000 more vehicles a day crossing our already-overcrowded I-5 and I-205 bridges.

What do you also get?

- NO NEW JOBS. Other than a few service workers cleaning or doing landscaping at these new rural mansions, Alternative creates no new jobs.

- NO RELIEF TO I-5 CONGESTION. Those opposed to previous efforts to add capacity to I-5 across the Columbia River wanted Clark County to add jobs to reduce I-5 Bridge congestion. Alternative 4 does not alleviate I-5 Bridge congestion; it increases it.

- NO PROTECTION OF SMALL FARMS and other agricultural uses. If you want to see what you get when you have 1-5 acre rural lots, check out the Rolling Hills area south of Ridgefield.

- STRANGLING OF SMALL CITIES. Creating a ring of large, expensive houses around our small cities prevents future growth. Which means no new small city neighborhoods and no new jobs.

- INCREASED TRAFFIC CONGESTION ON RURAL ROADS AND THROUGH SMALL CITIES. With no rural services, retail areas, or job centers, 20,000 rural residents will travel southward into Vancouver and across the I-5/I-205 bridges, adding substantial traffic to substandard roads.

- NO ACCESS TO PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION. There is no way C-TRAN can afford to serve these outlying areas, nor are there sidewalks or paths for rural residents to use or to access C-TRAN.

- IMPACT ON GROUNDWATER. Rural lots will be served by wells and septic tanks, not water and sewer lines.

\*\*\*VALUE-BASED COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING PROPOSAL
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- Extend the current Comprehensive Plan one year (Alternative 1) as the "interim Comprehensive Plan." Extending the current plan one year allows two new councilors to have a say. It allows for the county to meet the state-imposed June 2016 deadline, staving off state sanctions.

- Undertake a broad, value-based community discussion on what should go into the Comprehensive Plan.

- Agree on values and performance measures with which to develop and evaluate the Plan.

- Include a comprehensive variety of community groups, such as Clark County Citizens United, Friends of Clark County, land conservation as well as the building and development community, and others, to provide input and discuss trade-offs of various options.

- Bring in a group such as WSU-Vancouver’s Initiative for Public Deliberation to facilitate a series of forums to capture community input.

- Allow County Planning staff to fairly and equitably develop and evaluate a plan for community review, before acted on by the FIVE County Councilors.

1 Attachment

2 Supporters

Name not available (unclaimed) April 11, 2015, 10:30 AM

I support Alternative 4. Most people living in the rural area are there because they wanted to live in the country. This alternative would be the best plan. Most landowners would not build houses on every parcel of land they own.

Garrett Hoyt inside Clark County (on forum) April 11, 2015, 9:40 AM

The Growth Management Act allowed Clark County to designate areas that were important resources areas for the county. In 1994 our elected leaders, citizen groups and came together and made decisions on what resources needed to preserved for our county. Alternative 4 is supported by a special interest group that disagreed with the GMA in 1994 and are trying to overthrow the will of the people that was decided 20 years ago. If Alternative 4 were adopted, it would be challenged in court and would likely lose (like happened last time). All of this is done at the taxpayers expense for the benefit of a special interest group. This option needs to be abandoned before sending it to the environmental process.

In the previous Comprehensive Plan, the county planned for growth because the county was growing quickly at the time. Then came the recession and growth slowed dramatically. Alternative 1 is the so-called 'do nothing' alternative, but in reality this alternative is saying that we've already planned for growth that didn't end up happening and that plan is still a good one. I fully support Alternative 1.
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I strongly support alternative 4.

Name not shown inside Clark County (on forum)  
April 11, 2015, 8:48 AM

Alternative 4 would allow development that would negatively impact the rural nature of our area and add further stress and add traffic to an already failing road (Sunset Falls Road), not to mention the impacts to the East Fork Lewis River. When I found out that a large chunk of land along the East Fork (thankfully currently owned by the Columbia Land Trust) was being considered for a housing development a few years ago, I was absolutely shocked. Who thought THAT was a good idea?? As a former land use planner, I understand the need to have consistency - but I do not agree with setting the land use and zoning to current use. That presumes that what we have been doing and what we are currently doing is the right thing. It should be set to the intended future use that is most appropriate for the area. It is ridiculous to increase density in an area that is surrounded by Weyerhauser, the East Fork Lewis River and the Gifford Pinchot National Forest (respectively) on 3 of its sides. My husband jokes that he would love to drive down our driveway and see a taco cart at the bottom of the hill so we don’t have to drive a half hour for a meal out, but he is kidding. That would be horrible and totally wreck the natural landscape that provides habitat for so many important flora and fauna. It is unfortunately the nature of American government to be short-sighted and focused on re-elections, but we need to do better for our children.

I didn’t ask for my property to be re-zoned to a more dense use as part of Alternative 4 and if it is approved, I’m tempted to fight to keep my current FR-80!

It Alternative 4 really is considered, I'd love to know how the County intends to fund to maintain the roadways put here in the stix as well as fix exponentially more power outages than they already do because more houses are being built out here.

3 Supporters

I'm Pike inside Clark County (on forum)  
April 10, 2015, 4:27 PM

I am supportive of Alternative 4.

Rita Dietrich inside Clark County (on forum)  
April 10, 2015, 3:57 PM

I strongly support Alternate 4 as it gives the rural landowner more flexibility in planning for the future and allows these parcels of land to be in compliance with the zoning.
2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update

What do you think about the four suggested land use and growth alternatives?

1 Supporter

Name not available (unclaimed)  
April 10, 2015, 2:28 PM

Mr. Malinowski, your memory is not exactly right—the courts actually concurred with the GMA, with one minor exception. The decision can be found in the link below:

Debbie Nelson inside Clark County (on forum)  
April 10, 2015, 12:19 PM

I strongly request that no action be taken on adopting or narrowing any of the alternatives until after the full, five-member council is seated in January 2016. I believe that the state will support the county’s request for a postponement due to our newly enacted Home Rule Charter.

4 Supporters

Tom Gibson inside Clark County (on forum)  
April 10, 2015, 10:42 AM

Clark County’s view that endless growth and urban sprawl is sustainable or good for the community is very curious because the only supporting evidence that this is so comes from third party interests who would profit from such delusional thinking. Apparently Clark County believes that there are no criteria or examples that would result in a determination that development of land should be moderated, that there are no larger principles in play regarding the environment or community that could result in moderating growth into our rural areas. Further it appears that rapidly depleting natural and human resources is seen as a goal to solving financial concerns and that those financial concerns are of paramount importance while no value is given to other uses of land other than building, retail and industry.

Tax policy has been to value land actively being farmed and providing the sole or main living source for at least one person in a household as residential if housing has been allowed in neighboring areas. Tax burdens have been placed on people’s profession if they are a farmer that don’t exist in any form for anyone else.

Currently Clark County imports almost a billion dollars a year in food while it produces less than 5% of food consumed in the county even though hundreds of land parcels exist in Clark County, which is a prime year round growing area with adequate water and labor, which are appropriate for this use. Since studies have shown that for every dollar spent buying food from a local grower create about $2.50 in the local economy it is unreasonable to say that the only productive use of so much of this land is for the tax revenues gained from mostly housing development. Housing development provides a short term profit for a local builder but almost as many liabilities as it does revenue and most of the expense of the housing is spent on goods, materials and labor that come from out of state so that economic gain is an illusion of growth that creates as many or more problems than it solves.

Cities in Clark County have only been able to keep up with the demands to keep roads paved, sewage treated, trash hauled, and children educated from the fees and taxes of even more development which means in essence that the only way to get out of the mess we created is to create an even bigger one and to keep doing so in a continuous loop as if there will never be any end to how much we can keep growing and developing.

The current land use alternatives, especially Alternative 4, provide more of the same tired old thinking that

44 Statements sorted chronologically
As of April 14, 2015, 7:34 AM
http://peakdemocracy.com/2623
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...

Communities in the county are increasingly at risk for being cut off from the most essential services by random acts of building sans any real community development and apparently the plan is to make people even more dependent on the government and other similarly sized enterprises that have the cash to steer government's thinking in this direction. County Councilors instead of getting the support they need to verify the validity of their ideas have chosen to avoid asking for this help and get advice from other sources that they prefer to work with, even without acknowledging that they and our government are apparently working in some kind of secret cabal whose goals and purposes can only be guessed at. Gold and wealth is worthless without agriculture.

Agriculture is the basis of all wealth. The real question is whether you want to keep your sovereignty or yield it to other people and countries. The focus of agriculture in this country has been growing commodity crops for chemical companies, middle men and distributors that make the majority of the profit in huge monoculture operations that tend to rely on high levels of mechanization and investment. Agriculture has started to shift away from this disastrous production model to growing food by and for people.

Clark County’s refusal to consider promoting agriculture and local food production or see it as having any value is both short sighted and potentially dangerous. In my opinion every community should set goals for what percentage of food eaten is from the local community and work to increase that amount as one of the most i’ve jobs programs they could participate in. Given the continuing drought in California, Eastern Oregon, Eastern Washington, which some predict could last generations as it has in the past, and our own water problems why are we as a nation giving our food sovereignty and be dependent on imports from other countries for the long term?

Clark County has been a leader in agriculture in some ways as evidenced by our very popular farmer’s markets but much more work needs to be done to develop a comprehensive plan to take care of the health of the people and the county. The current land use alternatives don’t speak to this at all and primarily serve as a guideline to help developers but do little to address how this development is going to impact everyone in Clark County.

4 Supporters

Susan Rasmussen inside Clark County (on forum)  
April 10, 2015, 10:01 AM

Alternative 4 is needed. It is the only plan recognizing the obligation to address the long-standing issues of rural landowners.

- Alt. 4 is the only plan employing an inclusive policy with the rural communities.
- The shift in policy is commendable. This recognizes the rural landowners as being significant stakeholders and gives merit to the issues in designing their futures.
- Alt. 4 is a step towards diversifying our rural economy and become less dependent on natural resources.
- Alt. 4 recognizes small-scale agriculture, family-owned woodlots, rural lifestyles.
- Counties across the state have moved towards friendlier rural growth provisions.
- 4.1 is exact status quo, Alt.2 nearly is...
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- The rural lands have been neglected over 20 yrs.
  Alt.1 would freeze these lands for 40 yrs.
- Alt. 4 would align rural zoning to correspond with the patterns of historical development.
- Alt.4 is a step forward in correctly defining Clark County’s Rural Character per GMA policy.

2 Supporters

Jim Malinowski inside Clark County (on forum)  
April 9, 2015, 10:20 PM

It is clear that many of the contributors to this forum have not read the GMA. The county violated the clear mandates of the GMA in their 1995 massive down zoning. CCCU won its lawsuit against the county for this reason. Judge Poyfair’s decision stated that “the result is a plan that gives little regard for the realities of existing rural development in direct contradiction of the terms of the GMA.” (See the Columbian article of April 6, 1997). The county has been acting in defiance of that court order ever since. We deserve better of our county government. Alternative 4 is a move in the direction of obeying the clear terms of the GMA and reducing the current high percentage of non-conforming lots in the rural areas of the county.

Jim Malinowski  
Amboy  
2 Supporters

Jerry Winters inside Clark County (on forum)  
April 9, 2015, 10:20 PM

I support Alt. 4. Ag. 20 needs to break down even more, 5s, and 1s. This would allow small home framing and build community. After a plan is adopted will there still be holding ie. Lt. Industrial overlay.  
Vancouver needs to increase the UGB it may not be the county’s job, but the city missed the boat!! It’s Clark County’s plan, why let Vancouver control the outcome!!

2 Supporters

Name not available (unclaimed)  
April 9, 2015, 9:15 PM

We support Alternative 4. It is the only appropriate choice as this is a county wide plan, not just a plan for the cities. The old plan before 1994 was working fine. We should just go back to that one. Small parcels that are less than 10 acres in the rural and resource lands is what this county and the people need and want. Then they can afford to buy, farm, forest and live on the land.

Dennis Karnopp inside Clark County (on forum)  
April 9, 2015, 9:09 PM

Clark County and Washington in general where a trashy state compared to Oregon and it’s land use zoning. We moved into Washington in 1979 and where appalled by the lack of zoning, it looked like trailer trash. I am firmly in favor of keeping the existing land use laws and zoning restrictions to keep Clark and Washington not
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I know that people want to use their property for whatever they want but, sometimes its to the determent to the community as a whole, and will lower growth and property values. Now we have Oregonians moving into Washington because of the tax structure and Clark County is slowly getting cleaned up, this transformation of wealth will definitely stop if the existing zoning and land use laws are relaxed.

2 Supporters

Name not available (unclaimed)  April 9, 2015, 7:24 PM
I support alternative #4 and suggest we make it rural 5 acre minimum. As a property owner and not just a group that has no financial investment in real property.

Terry Conner inside Clark County (on forum)  April 9, 2015, 6:30 PM
The citizens of Clark County did NOT ask for this.

Alt 4 is yet another half-cooked, special interest move, credited to the same rogue Councilour who continues to defy long standing protocol and logic. Alt 4 began as a direct violation of the HRC, having been directed by Madore to have his non-qualified protégé, Silliman whip up some maps, while he (Madore) tried his single hand at Planning. No experience, no intelligence, no vetting.

The brass tacks of Alt 4 are simply and tragically BAD for rural farmers, suburban landowners, and the County community that depends on and supports local farming.

Just a few of the bad results would be water shortage, taxes to support development of the 8000 lots, detachment of rural well being, violating the GMA curfew, future legal costs, further morale decline to citizenry, further animus towards the BOCC from Clark County residents.

4 Supporters

Tim Gaughan inside Clark County (on forum)  April 9, 2015, 5:43 PM
I am opposed to Alternative 4. This Alternative was composed, proposed and maps attempted to be modified midway through the open house process by a lone county councilor who has no apparent expertise or professional credentials to draft a land use plan to be considered under the GMA. Madore has ignored the planning process, advice of planning professionals and apparent dismay by legal staff. Alternative 4 appears to move against the grain of the primary intent of the GMA by promoting urban sprawl and future costs to all taxpayers in Clark County. This alternative has the potential of litigation and sanctions by the State.

3 Supporters

Kendall inside Clark County (on forum)  April 9, 2015, 4:46 PM
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I oppose Alternative 4 for the following reasons:

1. Phase 2 of the Growth Management Plan Update Process is scheduled to last 24 months. The time was initially spent getting Public Input on the three staff-proposed alternatives that concluded with the August and October 2014 hearings. The remainder of Phase 2 was to be spent analyzing the three established alternatives.

Instead, over 12 months into Phase 2 and after the August and October 2014 Public Hearings, one of the three County Councilors introduced a 4th alternative without meaningful consultation with the citizens or County planners. No public hearings have been held on Alternative 4. Instead, the County Councilor held “open houses” with the opportunity for hundreds of citizens (at each open house) to crowd around a room full of maps and make an attempt to get the attention of County staff (6-8) or County Councilors (3) to ask questions and have a meaningful conversation.

If the Clark County Council demands that the tardy Alternative proposed by one individual representative remain and be fully analyzed for it’s intended and unintended consequences, the Growth Management Act DEADLINE OF JANUARY 2016 MUST BE EXTENDED BY AT LEAST FOUR MONTHS.

2. I am very concerned about the costs to Clark County taxpayers if the Council decides to allow an unannounced Alternative 4 proposal 18 months into our 36 month process. If this Alternative is allowed to stand the County must, and will, be taken to court. If history is any indication, the County will be in costly litigation for up to, including Supreme Court litigation, 7+ years.

3. It is my understanding that Alternative 4 creates at least 8000 more parcels and that the current minimum 20 acre agricultural parcels will be reduced to as low as 5 and 10 acres. I value our local, productive farm lands and believe strongly that our working farms must be protected.

In this age of changing climate and reduced water supplies, we should treasure what good water we have left in Clark County. I have experience in managing farm land of approximately 1500 acres and know how difficult it is to farm on a 5 acre postage stamp-size plot with good farm practices which require crop rotation.

4. Adding over 8000 parcels with Alternative 4 will also make it difficult to supply water to all the new development. Wells are already drying up and Clark County Public Health must review all new private wells for adequate water availability to meet GMA regulations prior to the issuance of building permits.

5. It will also be very difficult to maintain the QUALITY of the water we have. With the addition of thousands of new lots and a steadily increasing population in our former agricultural areas, we will have to pave over ground and greatly increase runoff, contamination and pollution.

3. The costs to the taxpayers for the dramatic increase in the need for public services will be immense. The mass development of our county from 9300 to 17000+ parcels will benefit outside developers to the detriment of all citizens. I believe that a decision of this magnitude must be considered by the full 5-member Council required by our County charter.

14 Supporters
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I am grateful there is an Alt. 4.

The facts as presented at the public hearings: "6 of every 10 parcels in the Rural category do not conform to our current zoning map. Seven of every 10 parcels in the AG category do not conform to our current zoning map. Eight of every 10 parcels in the FR category do not conform to our current zoning map."

Are the land owners wrong? Or is the map & previous zoning wrong?

Clearly, the previous map (20 year old) was wrong, and is penalizing current land owners.

We clearly need to respect property ownership rights. We need a zoning map that at a minimum, reflects current reality. It is irresponsible to have 60-80% of rural land owners 'not in compliance' with current zoning law.

My understanding is that Alt 4 does that. Thank you!

3 Supporters

Name not shown inside Clark County (on forum) April 9, 2015, 10:18 AM

We need the combination of ALT 3 AND 4. Let's expand the UGB and create more local Jobs within the cities. The plan was poorly organized back 20 years ago, like a shotgun approach; we can do SO much better for this county and our communities! Not saying to make everything 1 acre lots but if there's a 40 acre parcel with 5's or 10's around it, maybe we need to have some adjustment. It's not like it used to be, farming, forest, etc. Plus how many people can afford 40 acres instead of a 10? We need a better plan and to have some consistency in zoning/UGB. If a person living on 40 acres wants to split their land into 10's for their children to start their own families/memories as they did growing up at that location, what's so wrong with that? And if not, that's their choice but it should be an option, and their right. By do this it's going to keep local families here, add local work, and create more tax dollars for the help of the community!

4 Supporters

Vichele Wollert inside Clark County (on forum) April 9, 2015, 10:04 AM

I am a Clark County resident of Vancouver. Although I am not a rural landowner or farmer, I contribute more than my fair share of county taxes on several properties in the city. I support local agriculture by being a committed consumer of local produce, pasture-raised eggs, and meat. I am a loyal customer who supports Clark County businesses, restaurants and farmer's markets that sell local farm products and I have purchased CSA farm shares. I am including this personal information as a preface to my comments because I have heard two councilors diminish the testimony of residents who do not own large amounts of rural land or who live in urban areas. All Clark County voices count when considering changes to the Growth Management Act and I hope you will consider mine.

I am opposed to Alternative 4 of the GMA for the following reasons:
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Alternative 4 was developed without the input of Clark County community planning experts. It was written by one councilor, who has no experience in planning, with the limited and biased feedback of one honored group of landowner advocates. It excludes important other stakeholder and expert information, which places Clark County at increased legal risk.

Alternative 4 threatens our water quality. Evidence-based research shows that urban sprawl pollutes water by removing native vegetation, increasing impervious surfaces, erosion, and pollution from cars and trucks on roads since more residents will need to drive.

Alternative 4 threatens our drinking water supplies. This option will create more rural lots than can be served by ground water supplies. Rural development is already contributing to wells going dry and Alternative 4 will exacerbate the problem.

Alternative 4 threatens our working farms and fertile land by paving over a precious, threatened resource. Once that is done, the loss of farmland cannot be regained.

Alternative 4 will cost taxpayers and ratepayers more money than they are spending now. Many peer-reviewed studies show that compact development saves taxpayers money in property taxes and community services.

Alternative 4 increases litigation risks and the costs of appeals to Clark County and its taxpayers. During the last GMA update, Clark County spent seven years in appeals, all the way to the Washington State Supreme Court. In the end, Clark County was mandated to take 1,500 acres of farmland out of the urban growth areas and re-designate it as Agriculture 20. These appeals are costly in terms of time and tax payer money.

The argument that all landowners should be able to develop their property as they wish, ignores the importance of carefully-crafted land use and zoning laws that benefit the greater good. Without a thoughtfully-developed, evidence-based plan for the control of future growth, quality of life and environmental protections are lost for current and future generations. Chaotic, self-interested development harms everyone. We purchase our property with the full knowledge and understanding that it can only be developed within certain legal restrictions. We can sell it, as I did with two CC zoned lots not conducive to residential housing, when its zoning and land use designation does not meet our future needs.

Alternative 4 should be abandoned as it is not a viable option for Clark County’s environmental and livability future.

16 Supporters

Loren Sickles inside Clark County (on forum)        April 9, 2015, 12:02 AM

I am in opposition to alternative 4 primarily on the basis of how this alternative was brought forward. The primary proponent has openly stated that no-one with knowledge of growth management, land-use or environmental laws was involved in the development of Alt 4. The formation of alternative 4 was done behind closed doors and without prior knowledge of the whole council or county staff. Alternative 4 should be, at the east, put on hold until the two new council members are installed, or scrapped altogether.
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the time constraints of State law the prudent path forward is to continue discussions focused on alternatives 1-3 as they are the only ones which have been thoroughly vetted by knowledgeable people.

13 Supporters

Esther Schrader inside Clark County (on forum)  
April 8, 2015, 11:05 PM

Anything is better than Alternative 4.

3 Supporters

Name not shown inside Clark County (on forum)  
April 8, 2015, 9:59 PM

While I really do not think Alt 1 is even viable anymore and Alt 2 is really bad in my opinion especially for my area I think Alt 3 has potential as does Alt 4. If we could work Alt 3 for the urban growth boundary areas and Alt 4 for the rural and Forestry and Ag plots I would see a seriously happy balance for all the landowners.

3 Supporters

Angela Pond inside Clark County (on forum)  
April 8, 2015, 9:58 PM

Alternative 3 gets my vote as the best option. Allow our smaller communities to develop and marginally expand boundaries. Alternative 4 is a thinly veiled attempt to develop the north county with thousands more homes. That sounds good...but wait...the homeowners will be working in Portland and there is no way to get there now without sitting in traffic for an hour or more each way. No plans in our lifetime to change this. Keep the north county rural, beautiful and producing goods on family farms.

10 Supporters

Linda Tubbs inside Clark County (on forum)  
April 8, 2015, 9:50 PM

Sadly, it appears feedback such as mine and others (including planners) is meaningless. I do not wish to live in Los Angeles. I would like to continue to be able to purchase local farm products. The entire process behind alternative 4 smacks of inside baseball. If there is sanity, it will not be adopted. Mr Malinowski--the court actually upheld the GMA--see the decision attached:

3 Supporters

Name not shown inside Clark County (on forum)  
April 8, 2015, 9:20 PM

I believe Alt 4 violates the Growth Management Act. It is also an insult to the qualified and talented staff who worked on putting together robust and viable alternatives. It risks lawsuits and more wasted money by the council. I live in north county and do not want to be surrounded by McMansions. I believe in the viability of
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Clark County's agricultural community.

11 Supporters

Varvin Case inside Clark County (on forum)  
April 8, 2015, 4:03 PM

I have examined maps of the four suggested land use alternatives. I have talked briefly with two county staff members. I think Alternative 4 is the most honest and realistic of those offered. In my area (although the plan does not benefit me) the plan coincides with existing parcel sizes. It is logical, drawing lines between larger and smaller forest zones along coinciding or conforming parcels. Alternative 4 preserves rural character while recognizing existing conditions. Selfishly, I would like my parcels to be located in smaller zones. But failing that, Alternative 4 is an intellectually honest portrayal of growth objectives in the county.

Varvin Case

7 Supporters
Comment JK for the index and FYI. Thanks.

From: John Karpinski [mailto:karpjd@comcast.net]
Sent: Monday, April 13, 2015 4:06 PM
Subject: Fwd: comments of John Karpinski/CCNRC on Clark County 2015 GMA update

Here is a copy of my GMA comments to the Clark Co Board.

John Karpinski

-------- Forwarded Message --------
Subject: comments of John Karpinski/CCNRC on Clark County 2015 GMA update
Date: Mon, 13 Apr 2015 16:01:29 -0700
From: John Karpinski <karpjd@comcast.net>
To: david.madore@clark.wa.gov, jeanne.stewart@clark.wa.gov, Tom Mielke <tom.mielke@clark.wa.gov>

John S. Karpinski
2808 E. 8th Street
Vancouver, WA 98661
360.694.0283 home
karpjd@comcast.net

Clark County Council

Re: Clark County 2015 GMA update, Alternatives 2, 3 and 4.
re: Clear and unequivocal violations of Washington's Growth Management Act, RCW 36.70A
re: Comments of CCNRC and John S Karpinski

Dear Clark County Counselors:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on behalf of CCNRC and myself on Clark County's proposed 2015 Growth Management Act update.

Sadly, I must inform the County that their planning efforts, and particularly Alternative 4, clearly and unequivocally violate Washington's Growth Management Act. Only the "No change" Alternative
Alternative 4 violates GMA requirements for public participation

Washington's Growth Management Act requires "early, open, and continuous" public participation in the preparation of growth management plans.

Here, Alternative four was irregularly done outside of the normal public review process, and without benefit of County planning or legal staff input. See Columbian article of 4/13/15, incorporated by reference.

Also, Alt 4 was apparently designed to accommodate a disgruntled special interest group that repeatedly lost its GMA appeals;
See the following decisions in 95-2-0067c - Achen, et al v. Clark County, et al.


See also the following Opinions of the Growth Board AFTER the Poyfair remand


II. LEGAL STANDARD TO EXPAND UGA'S NOT FOLLOWED:

The County did not follow the rules for expanding UGA boundaries, whether by sequencing, use of urban reserve, or avoiding protecting resource lands. This is error.

A. COUNTY DIDN'T FOLLOW THE STANDARDS FOR NEW URBAN GROWTH LOCATION OF RCW 36.70A.110(3).

The following legal requirements was not used in the County's Alternatives 2, 3 and 4:

(3) Urban growth should be located first in areas already characterized by urban growth that have adequate existing public facility and service capacities to serve such development, second in areas already characterized by urban growth that will be served adequately by a combination of both existing public facilities and services and any additional needed public facilities and services that are provided by either public or private sources, and third in the remaining portions of the urban growth areas.

B. NO AVOIDANCE/PROTECTION OF AGRICULTURAL LANDS.

Clark County made no attempt to avoid existing Ag lands, allowing for the conversion of literally 1000's of acres of resource land into incomparable zones that do not protect the resource lands.

This continues the County's illegal efforts to develop resource land that has repeatedly found by the Growth Board, Clark Co Superior Court, and Washington's Court of appeals to violate the Growth Management Act, RCW 36.70A.
See 95-2-0067c - Achen, et al v. Clark County, et al,
see also 07-2-0027 Karpinski, et al v. Clark County, et al. Final Decision and Order

III County Growth plan violates GMA's requirements for rural planning in RCW 36.70A.070 (5)

Clark County's Growth plan violates the following rural protection provisions of RCW 36.70A.070 (5):

A RCW 36.70A.070 (5) (b):

(b) Rural development. The rural element shall....accommodate appropriate rural densities and uses that are not characterized by urban growth and that are consistent with rural character.

B RCW 36.70A.070 (5) (c)

(c) Measures governing rural development. The rural element shall include measures that apply to rural development and protect the rural character of the area, as established by the county, by:

(i) Containing or otherwise controlling rural development;

(ii) Assuring visual compatibility of rural development with the surrounding rural area;

(iii) Reducing the inappropriate conversion of undeveloped land into sprawling, low-density development in the rural area;

(iv) Protecting critical areas, as provided in RCW 36.70A.060, and surface water and groundwater resources; and

(v) Protecting against conflicts with the use of agricultural, forest, and mineral resource lands designated under RCW 36.70A.170.

IV Growth management plan over allocates industrial land, leading to additional residential development and sprawl.

The Growth Plan over-allocates job land needs and allows conversion of "jobs" lands into housing by the County's watering down of the "no net loss" of industrial lands. This has previously been found by the WWGMHB to be in violation of the GMA in 95-2-0067c - See Achen, et al v. Clark County, et al.

V Conclusion

Each of the County Councilor's duties and oath of office requires you to follow all laws of the State of Washington; not just the laws you agree with. Please immediately fix these egregious violations of Washington's Growth Management Act, RCW 36.70A.

Sincerely yours,

John S. Karpinski
Comment from Mr. David McDonald. Thanks.

From: David McDonald [mailto:david@mcdonaldpc.com]
Sent: Monday, April 13, 2015 4:33 PM
To: Orjiako, Oliver
Subject: My comments on the update
Dear Councillors:

Please accept my comments on the proposed Comprehensive Plan update as the legal representative of Friends of Clark County and in my individual capacity. I am a 30 year resident of rural Clark County having lived the past 25 years in the same home in unincorporated Clark County in the Fairgrounds area. I became active in Growth Management issues in the County prior to the passage of the Growth Management Act in 1990 when I worked in support of the County’s Habitek project in the Vancouver Lake Lowlands. During the past twenty five years I have served in multiple volunteer capacities involving growth issues in Clark County including as a member of the Boundary Review Board of Clark County, including a term as Chair; a member of multiple task forces addressing growth related issues including: the Rural Centers Task Force, the Vacant Buildable Lands Committee, the Forest Conversion Task Force, the Agricultural Task Force and, early on, the Technical Advisory Committee.

In addition I helped draft legislation on growth issues including the first Sensitive Lands Ordinance for the City of Ridgefield. I have also been lead and/or co-counsel representing a number of different groups and individuals on land use issues including litigation in conjunction with, as well as opposing, our County’s land use policies. I have litigated cases in front of the WWGMB and the local Superior Court in support of, and in opposition to, our County’s land use policies. Finally, as a private citizen, I have testified more times than I can remember on land use policies as legislation and as applied to site specific projects, in front of Clark County Hearings Examiners, the Clark County Planning Commission, the Clark County Board of County Commissioners and the equivalent legislative bodies in the City of Ridgefield.

I have seen a lot of misinformation, and disinformation, regarding what has been dubbed the “Poyfair Remand” and, therefore, my initial comments are a summary of the history of the GMA in this county with a focus on providing the current councilors with a legal and factual history regarding Judge Poyfair’s decision, the subsequent actions by the County on Remand and the final finding of compliance. Any statements that the County is not in compliance with Judge Poyfair’s ruling are, at best, inaccurate.

It is with the foregoing background that I provide you with the following comments.

History of GMA Clark County

The legislature enacted the GMA in 1990 and 1991 largely “in response to public concerns about rapid population growth and increasing development pressures in the state, especially in the Puget Sound region.’” King County v. Cent. Puget Sound Growth Mgmt. Hearings Bd., 142 Wash.2d 543, 546, 14 P.3d 133 (2000) (quoting Alan D. Copsey, Including Best Available Science in the Designation and Protection of
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_Critical Areas Under the Growth Management Act, 23 SEATTLE U.L.REV. 97, 97 (1999)). I 547 qualified for the ballot but, before the election, the state legislature enacted the GMA. After decades of lax and optional land use regulations, the legislature's stated intent was to combat "**uncoordinated and unplanned growth.**" RCW 36.70A.010.1

"In seeking to address the problem of growth management in our state, the Legislature paid particular attention to agricultural lands." _King Cnty. v. Cent. Puget Sound Growth Mgmt. Hearings Bd., at 555_(emphasis supplied). Most importantly when determining the populations, and attendant zoning in the rural and resource lands areas, any innovative techniques used to create a variety of rural densities must be "consistent with the overall meaning of the Act, a development regulation must satisfy the Act's mandate to conserve agricultural lands for the maintenance and enhancement of the agricultural industry". _Id at 560_. The explicit purpose of RCW 36.70A.177 is to provide for creative alternatives that _conserve_ agricultural lands and _maintain_ and _enhance_ the agricultural industry. _Id at 561_(emphasis in original).

After the passage of the Growth Management Act, and prior to the County adopting its own plan, many attempted to circumvent the provisions of the Act. For example, in 1993, according to a County staff report drafted by then Planning Director Craig Greenleaf, the dawn of the GMA triggered an onslaught of property divisions not before seen in the County. Planning Director Greenleaf determined that "the rapid pace of development in Clark County which would undermine the goals of the Growth Management Act in the absence of emergency moratoria has continued at ever increasing rates". By October 1993, the Planning Division received an average of 135 permit applications per month, an increase of 17% from 1992. Subdivision applications increased over 1992 by 27%. Cluster subdivision applications averaged 6 per year between 1980 and 1989. The rate more than doubled to 13.3 per year.

According to this same staff report, areas that would have qualified for designation as natural resource lands were particularly hard hit. A comparison of the number of lots created for the months of May and June for the years 1992 to 1994 shows that while fewer than 40 new lots were created in 1992, that number had risen to over 270 for the same two month period by the year 1994.

Specifically, Planning Director Greenleaf stated:

---

1 "One of the primary purposes of the Act is to direct new growth into IUGAs or UGAs. The Legislature has determined by adoption of the GMA that directing growth to urban areas provides for better use of resource lands and more efficient uses of taxpayer dollars. A county must size an IUGA large enough to accommodate the growth that will be directed into it. A recognition of growth that has already taken place will prevent undue oversizing of the IUGAs. Likewise a recognition of the growth that will occur outside IUGAs (due to preexisting lots in rural areas) should not encourage growth in those areas but merely recognize its existence. The GMA requires counties to adopt policies, DRs and innovative techniques to prohibit urban growth outside of properly established IUGAs and UGAs. The more a county utilizes these techniques to funnel growth into urban areas, the more discretion is afforded under the Act in sizing IUGAs or UGAs." _C.U.S.T.E.R. v. Whatcom County_, WWGMHB #96-2-0008,
There has clearly been a significant increase in [large lot] segregation in recent years in response to potential changes in county code. The County Assessor's Office has few records from prior to 1989. In 1989 there were 117 segregation requests. In 1990, the year of the initial Growth Management legislation, the number of requests jumped to 789. In the month of April, 1993, during which the emergency ordinance was announced, there were requests for the segregation of 407 parcels, which represents an 800% increase from March of 1993, and is more than were received during the entire 1992 calendar year. From January 1990 to the inaction of the emergency ordinance on April 19, 1993, requests for the segregation of a total of 2,473 parcels have been received. At an estimated 5 acres per parcel, this corresponds to 12,365 acres, or over 19 square miles. The 2,473 parcels represent about 2,000 or more students added to local school districts. (Emphasis supplied).

As part of the GMA process, several focus groups were formed to address various issues. One such group was the Rural and Natural Resource Lands Focus Group which was divided into an agricultural group, a forest group and a mineral group. Those groups then made recommendations to the county staff, which in turn made recommendations to the Planning Commission and the BOCC. On October 13, 1994, Craig Greenleaf issued a staff report to the Planning Commissioners. In that report he concluded that:

In the work of the Forest Focus group, the delineation of the Rural Resource line was developed to recognize the difference in character of the two areas. Less parcelization has occurred in the area north of the East Fork and aerial photos also illustrated that much of the parcelization shown on the map did not actually have buildings constructed. Based upon this work and the need to support the population projections forecast for the rural areas, staff recommends a minimum lot size of five acres south and west of the Rural resource line and 10 acres north and east of the Rural Resource line.

In that report, Mr. Greenleaf proposed a matrix of alternatives including the use of Purchase of Development Rights, Transfer of Development rights and Conservation Easements to prevent further unmitigated building upon rural lands beyond the need for the 20 year
population projection. The Planning Commission agreed with the staff report and

Finally, in that document, Mr. Greenleaf stated that: "Cluster developments and rural Planned Unit Developments allow for significant increases in rural development densities, which *deplete and undermine agricultural and forest resource activities, and result in incompatibilities with existing rural uses.* (Emphasis supplied). ²

In 1994, after work by multiple task forces, scores of public hearings and intermediary lawsuits, our county adopted our first comprehensive plan. The plan was appealed by a myriad of parties and became known as the *Achen* appeal. The WWGMHB issued a Final Decision and Order (FDO) and there were 16 separate motions on reconsideration on which the WWGMHB ruled, many involved rulings with respect to whether the plans of the various cities were in compliance.

In 1995, while the matter was being appealed to the WWGMHB, Clark County executed a stipulation in WWGMHB Case No. 94-2-0014 stating that the County failed to enact interim development regulations designed to designate and protect critical areas and natural resource lands. Instead, the County relied on various combinations of existing non-GMA ordinances and zoning, which it admitted failed to meet the identification, designation or protection requirements of state law.

However, several appeals were taken from the WWGMHB FDO. Clark County Superior Court Judge Poyfair heard one such appeal. Judge Poyfair’s opinion reversed the WWGMHB Final Decision and Order (FDO) on several grounds and held the following: 1) The agri-forest designation violated GMA; 2) Failure to solicit meaningful public input for the ag-forest designation violated the public participation provisions of the GMA requiring early and continuous public participation in the development and adoption of the comprehensive plans; 3) The county failed to ensure a variety of densities in the rural area because it removed the designation of rural centers from its Community Framework Plan and set 5 acre minimum lot sizes based upon the OFM numbers. Most importantly, Judge Poyfair found there was substantial evidence in the record to support the County’s designation of agricultural resource lands. CCCU did *not* appeal that decision. On remand to the WWGMHB, the Board issued a Remand Order remanded the matter to the county. Order on Remand³. See *WWGMHB #95-2-0067*

After Judge Poyfair’s ruling, an appeal was taken to the Washington State Court of Appeals on the sole issue of whether or not the County was *required* to use the

² In April 1993, the County finally issued an emergency moratorium, but it was specifically limited to cluster subdivisions and planned unit developments in the rural areas. It specifically did not address the continuing parcelization and development of other rural areas, including as-yet undesignated and unprotected critical areas and natural resource lands.
OFM number in determining a cap on rural population allocations. The appellate court ruled that, although GMA did not require the county to use OFM’s projections as a cap on non-urban growth, it could use the OFM projection number if doing so would otherwise meet the goals of the Act. Specifically, the court stated:

Without so holding, we assume that the GMA permits a county to use OFM’s population projections when planning for lands outside its urban growth areas.


While the matter was pending in front of Judge Poyfair (his hearing was held on October 16, 1996), other actions were being taken on the *Achen* case because the County was attempting to take actions in response to the original *Achen* opinion by the WWGMHB that were not appealed to Judge Poyfair. On October 1, 1996, the WWGMHB issued a Compliance Order and Order of Invalidity regarding multiple issues. The WWGMHB found the County non-compliant on a number of issues. One such issued involved growth in the rural area. The WWGMHB found that the work on the population allocation, and zoning and designations, in the rural areas regarding rural, resource lands and urban reserve areas to be invalid.

While the matter was pending in the Court of Appeals on the sole issue of the use of the OFM number, Clark County went back to work to comply with Judge Poyfair’s order. As a result of the remand, the County engaged in an extensive public participation process as to both the rural activity centers issue and the agri-forest designation issue (Poyfair had ruled that the county had been non-compliant as to the public participation element in the development of the agri-forest zone and the elimination of the rural centers from the Community Framework Plan). There were no challenges to those processes. The County appointed a Rural Centers Task Force (upon

---

4 Clark County has adopted a maximum population projection, maximum market factor; maximum vacant lands analysis and maximum urban growth areas. It must be consistent with that process by minimizing rural growth and doing anything and everything available to direct new growth into the urban growth areas. The rural growth protection of 25.071 does not provide for any new lots and only a 95% build-out of existing lots. Given the evidence contained in this record particularly the neglect of Clark County to take action from 1991 through 1994 for rural and resource lands, the current failure to take effective steps to conserve resource lands once they were designated and prevent the kind of sprawl in rural areas that the Act is designed to prohibit, the present rural zoning code DRs adopted at the time of the CP and as part of Ordinance #1996-05-01 substantially interfere with the goals of the Act and are found to be invalid under the test provided in RCW 36.70A.300. Specifically CCC 18.302, 18.303 and those sections of Ordinance #1996-05-01 relating to resource lands, rural lands and urban reserve areas are declared to be invalid. Those sections substantially interfere with goals 1, 8, 9 and 10.” The county had allowed for a 5-acre minimum in the rural area, as opposed to a 10-acre minimum. The County and CCCU appealed the Order of Invalidity in part and Judge Nichols reversed the WWGMHB as to the validity of the 5-acre minimum in the rural area. Judge Nichols held that the county’s five-acre minimum for the rural area complied with the Act. Thus the current zoning of one dwelling unit per five acres is GMA compliant. The proposed reductions by Alternative #4 would be in contravention of that compliance.

which I served) to review the original Rural Activity Centers that had been deleted from the Community Framework Plan and do so in light of the new 1997 amendments to RCW 36.70A.070(5). It is important to note that the County undertook this process while Judge Poyfair’s opinion was being appealed to the Washington Court of Appeals.

The RCTF made recommendations that substantially expanded the boundaries of the designated Rural Centers (Amboy, Brush Prairie, Chelatchie Prairie, Hockinson, MeadowGlade—Farghar Lake was added later). For example, in the 2004 plan, Amboy had 400 acres in land use, Brush Prairie had 327 acres, Chelatchie Prairie had 523, Dollars Corners had 329 acres, Hockinson had 264 acres and MeadowGlade had 1308 acres. The county ultimately adopted the Rural Centers majority report asserting that the designation of the rural centers represented the use of innovative techniques within the rural element to create a variety of densities without diminishing the rural character. Thus, these rural centers acted in the way projected by GMA, to have some higher densities concentrically moving to the edge of the less dense five acre rural element and, if abutting to resource lands, permitting a buffer to those lands.

The task force started in December 1997 and ended in March 1998. The Task Force issued a majority report, a minority report and an alternative report. The Planning Commission recommended adoption of the minority report but the Board adopted the majority report (which had a 75% consensus). As to the remand on the agri-forest zone, the public participation process was robust:

The BOCC began its work regarding the 35,000 acres by appointing a 13-member task force composed of a variety of stakeholders with interest in this issue. The public participation process involved 17 different task force meetings at which public comment was solicited and received, four separate open house meetings resulting in written comment, two separate direct mailings to all property owners within the 35,000 acres, newsletters, press releases, ads and use of the County website. After the task force issued its final report to the planning commission (PC), the PC held a public hearing and issued a recommendation to the BOCC. The BOCC then held two public hearings on May 19, 1998, and May 28, 1998, and held four separate deliberative open meeting sessions. The public participation in this record was shown to be not only “early and continuous” but also extensive. The County should be justifiably proud of the manner in which it conducted this public participation process.

See WWGMHB #95-2-0067 Compliance Order (May 1999)

The WWGMHB found that the county was compliant with its designation of all but 3,500 of the 35,000 acres it designated on Remand. No party took exception to, or appealed, that 1999 Compliance Order on Poyfair’s Remand. Therefore, the

---

*See WWGMHB #95-2-0067 Compliance Order (May 1999)*

The WWGMHB found that the county was compliant with its designation of all but 3,500 of the 35,000 acres it designated on Remand. No party took exception to, or appealed, that 1999 Compliance Order on Poyfair’s Remand. Therefore, the

---

*http://www.gmhb.wa.gov/LoadDocument.aspx?did=871*
actions taken by the County are deemed valid. The Poyfair Remand formally ended in 2006 when the WWGMHB sent out notice to all parties requesting objections to the whether or not the County had complied with Judge Poyfair’s remand. No party replied and the WWGMHB held that “Based upon the foregoing, COMPLIANCE on the remaining issues in this case is found and the case is CLOSED” (upper case in original).

The RCTF spent hundreds of hours reviewing the various rural centers in the county, setting boundaries for those centers and focusing on concentrically increasing lot sizes from the “hub” of the rural centers out to their defined boundaries. The entire purpose was to allow a variety of densities as a part of the rural element. None of those decisions has ever been challenged. By 1999, the second comprehensive plan effort was launched. The state Office of Financial Management (OFM) projected a 20-year Clark County population increase to between 453,280 and 571,061 people. As adopted, the county’s 2004 plan assumed an annual growth rate of 1.69 percent, resulting in a projected mid-range population forecast of 517,741 (according to the current US census, Clark County’s 2014 population is 451,008 which is lower than the low end of the 1997 projection). Urban growth areas were expanded by 6,124 acres, or 9.57 square miles.

Fourteen appeals challenging the 2004 plan were filed with the hearings board. The appeals focused, in part, on a last-minute reduction in the assumed growth rate, moving it from 1.83 percent to 1.69 percent. There was no challenge to the rural element by the parties to the matter in front of the WWGMHB. The hearings board upheld the county’s plan on the issues raised. The court noted that:

In 2005, a new Board found the growth rate assumed in the 2004 plan was unrealistically low based on historic trends, and agreed to reopen the plan. Relying on county assurances for an increased local process, the city of Battle Ground and development petitioners withdrew their appeals. On Nov. 23, 2005, the hearings board issued its amended Final Decision and Order in the case of Building Association of Clark County v. Clark County, WWGMHG No. 04-2-0038c. The decision upheld the 2004 plan.

In the final findings of fact, the WWGMHB found the following:

“The County’s development regulations to conserve agricultural lands and prevent interference from incompatible uses are unchallenged and therefore deemed compliant… A property owner who wishes to change the designation of commercially significant agricultural land that also has an Urban Reserve or Industrial Urban Reserve overlay, must still meet the criteria for designation and zoning map changes outlined in CCC 40.50.010. Any

---

owner of commercially significant agricultural land would be obliged to do the same.... The limitations in county code at CCC. 40.50.010 deter the conversion of adjacent lands designated agricultural lands within the current twenty-year planning horizon" Decision at 48-49.

In June 2005, the Board of County Commissioners launched a two-year update process that culminated in adoption of a 2007 Comprehensive Plan amendment. The plan assumed a 2.2 percent growth rate for the first six years and a 2.0 percent growth rate for the remainder of the 20-year plan. Those assumptions resulted in a population forecast of 584,310, and urban growth areas were expanded by 12,023 acres.

The 2007 plan was appealed. The appellants were, in order, Karpinski, Clark County Natural Resources Council, and Futurewise, They were arguing that the county had erroneously moved 4,351 acres from agricultural designation to a non-resource designation, and included those lands within urban growth areas. As a result of the appeals process, the rezoning of about 1,500 acres was ruled invalid (1/3), and those lands were removed from urban growth areas and again designated as agricultural lands. All 1,500 acres had been zoned for employment lands. After approximately 7 years of litigation, the final order on compliance was issued by the WWGMHB on September 4, 2014.

Rural and Resource Land Element of CP

The Washington Supreme Court has emphasized that any county’s actions, although entitled to some deference, are constricted by the goals and requirements of the GMA. *King Cnty. v. Cent. Puget Sound Growth Mgmt. Hearings Bd.*, 142 Wash. 2d 543, 561, 14 P.3d 133, 142 (2000) (“Local governments have broad discretion in developing [comprehensive plans] and [development regulations] tailored to local circumstances.” *Diehl*, 94 Wash.App. at 651, 972 P.2d 543. Local discretion is bounded, however, by the goals and requirements of the GMA).

The statute provides for specific planning goals that are applicable to the allocation of population to the rural and resource land zones:

(1) Urban growth. Encourage development in urban areas where adequate public facilities and services exist or can be provided in an efficient manner.

(2) Reduce sprawl. Reduce the inappropriate conversion of undeveloped land into sprawling, low-density development.
(8) Natural resource industries. Maintain and enhance natural resource-based industries, including productive timber, agricultural, and fisheries industries. Encourage the conservation of productive forest lands and productive agricultural lands, and discourage incompatible uses.

(9) Open space and recreation. Retain open space, enhance recreational opportunities, conserve fish and wildlife habitat, increase access to natural resource lands and water, and develop parks and recreation facilities.

(10) Environment. Protect the environment and enhance the state's high quality of life, including air and water quality, and the availability of water.

(11) Citizen participation and coordination. Encourage the involvement of citizens in the planning process and ensure coordination between communities and jurisdictions to reconcile conflicts.

(12) Public facilities and services. Ensure that those public facilities and services necessary to support development shall be adequate to serve the development at the time the development is available for occupancy and use without decreasing current service levels below locally established minimum standards.

RCW 36.70A.020

In 1997, the Washington State Legislature amended the Growth Management Act in Senate Bill 6094. One aspect of the amendments concerned the Rural Element. Under §7(5), the purpose of the Rural Element is to limit areas of "more intensive rural development" as follows:

1. Rural development may consist of infill, development or re-development of "existing commercial, industrial, residential or mixed use areas;"

2. Limited small scale recreation and/or tourist uses "principally designed to serve the existing and projected rural population" which may be served by public services which "shall be limited to those necessary to serve the recreation or tourist" and shall not be allowed to expand "low density sprawl";
3. Limited intensification of development of non-residential uses and business, which, although not designed to serve the existing and projected rural populations, do provide job opportunities for rural residents;

4. A county shall adopt measures to minimize and contain the existing areas for intensive rural development as appropriate.

Therefore:

A. Lands should not extend beyond the logical outer boundary of the existing area or use and thereby allow a new pattern of low-density sprawl.

B. Existing areas should be clearly identifiable and contained within a logical boundary delineated predominately by the built environment.

C. The county shall establish the logical outer boundary of an area of more intensive rural development considering the following factors:

i. The need to preserve the character of existing natural neighborhoods and communities;

ii. Physical boundaries such as bodies of water, streets and highways and land forms and contours;

iii. Prevention of abnormally irregular boundaries; and

iv. The ability to provide public facilities and public services in a manner that does not permit low density sprawl.

The continuing purpose of the "Rural Element" factor in the Growth Management Act is to:

1. Preserve open space, the natural landscape and vegetation over the built environment;
2. Foster traditional rural lifestyles and rural-based economies;
3. Provide visual landscapes traditionally found in rural areas;
4. Only encourage land uses, which are compatible with the use of the land by wildlife and for fish and wild habitat;
5. Land uses which reduce the inappropriate conversion of undeveloped land into sprawling low-density development;
6. Land uses should not require the extension of urban governmental services; and

7. Land uses which are consistent with protection of natural surface water flows and ground water and surface water recharge and discharge areas.

Importantly, Rural character in the GMA has a visual element. Rural character is defined as patterns of land use where natural landscapes and vegetation predominate over the built environment and where traditional visual landscapes are provided. RCW 36.70A.030(15)(a) and (c). The rural element of a county plan must contain measures governing development that “assure visual compatibility” with surrounding rural areas. RCW 36.70A.070(5)(e)(ii). The visual element goes to densities as the increase in the number of residences, and the attendant development to those residences, affects the visual character of the rural area.

CURRENT PROCESS

Alternative # 4 constitutes site-specific, spot zoning created by circumventing the usual and customary public participation process system to satisfy the demands of a limited single interest non-diverse group of citizens with a specific and limited agenda. The Alternative was created with complete disregard of the County’s planning process and without any input from the Department charged with updating the County’s Comprehensive Plan. The site-specific zoning changes ignore, and violate, the statutorily mandated criteria for designating rural and resource lands. It fails to follow the mandates of the Washington Supreme Court and ignores years of development of the County’s own Comprehensive Plan and development regulations. It does not represent an “update” but rather is a tidal change by removing any Growth Management Act policies, processes and criteria for determining zoning for the rural and resource lands of the County.

There are those within the single interest group that has dominated the development of the Alternative #4 that are making inaccurate statements regarding the Poyfair opinion and the history of Growth Management in this County. It is important to note the individuals who identified themselves with the rural area to Councilor Madore, and specifically identify themselves with CCCU, were prominent figures on all of the task forces appointed by the County. Not only were they active participants but also they succeeded over many objections to obtaining higher densities than had originally bee proposed along with development regulations that allowed for increased uses and the development and implementation of the Rural Centers. The few individuals in this single interest group may claim that they are still waiting for the County to comply with the original Remand but, as set forth in detail above, Judge Poyfair’s order was fully complied with over 15 years ago, confirmed, and the case finally closed in 2006. The agri-forest designation was eliminated and the rural centers were returned to the plan were authorized.
Alternative #4 violates the edicts of the GMA and the County’s own resolutions that have been enacted as part of this process in the following ways:

1. The development, and consideration of, this alternative violates the Public Participation element of the GMA and violates the County’s adopted Public Participation resolution that the county passed in January 2014 (2014-01-10) and therefore should not be considered and should not be considered as an alternative in the SEPA process that had been ongoing until halted in January of this year.

2. The development of Alternative #4 violates the county’s own resolution (2014-06-17) in that it considers changes to the Comprehensive Plan that violate the county’s adoption of the OFM number, the 90/10 split on allocation of population between the Urban Growth Areas and the rural and resource land areas;

3. The development of Alternative #4 violates the County’s policies on the rural area, fails to protect rural and resource lands and fails to protect the rural character as defined by state statute;

4. The inclusion of Alternative #4 should be excluded from the SEPA process as it violates the Board’s Principle and Value to minimize the conversion of farmland in the rural area; and

5. Alternative #4 does not represent the actual “legal buildable” lots on the site specific zoning changes proposed in the Alternative.

Public Participation Element Violated

The first issue is whether the development of Alternative #4 meets the “public participation” component of the Growth Management Act. The answer is no, it does not meet either the letter or the spirit of that provision.

RCW 36.70A.130(2)(a) provides:

Each county and city shall establish and broadly disseminate to the public a public participation program consistent with RCW 36.70A.035 and 36.70A.140 that identifies procedures and schedules whereby updates, proposed amendments, or revisions of the comprehensive plan are considered by the governing body of the county or city no more frequently than once every year . . . .

RCW 36.70A.140 provides:

Each county and city that is required or chooses to plan
under RCW 36.70A.040 shall establish and broadly disseminate to the public a public participation program identifying procedures providing for early and continuous public participation in the development and amendment of comprehensive land use plans and development regulations implementing such plans. The procedures shall provide for broad dissemination of proposals and alternatives, opportunity for written comments, public meetings after effective notice, provision for open discussion, communication programs, information services, and consideration of and response to public comments. In enacting legislation in response to the board's decision pursuant to RCW 36.70A.300 declaring part or all of a comprehensive plan or development regulation invalid, the county or city shall provide for public participation that is appropriate and effective under the circumstances presented by the board's order. Errors in exact compliance with the established program and procedures shall not render the comprehensive land use plan or development regulations invalid if the spirit of the program and procedures is observed.

In this case, the county adopted a public process model in Resolution #2014-01-10 and adopted the Clark County Public Participation Plan and Preliminary Scoping Schedule (Public Participation Plan or PPP). The PPP first recognized the purpose of GMA is to ensure "early and continuous public participation" and requires that "local programs clearly identify schedules and procedures for public participation in the periodic update process" with a goal to "ensure broad participation by identifying key interest groups, soliciting input from the public and "insuring that no single group or interest dominates the process" (emphasis supplied).

The document also states that the county will coordinate with the cities on countywide planning issues and "will coordinate meetings to discuss issues and seek consensus with each municipality before taking final action".

In this case, Councilor Madore specifically excluded Planning Staff, including the planning director Oliver Orjiako and Gordy Euler, from participating in the development of the plan. Rather, according to e-mails discovered through a PRA request, the alternative was initially being developed between a few individuals who identify with one single issue special interest group and Peter Silliman (who has no background in planning of which I am aware and who did not work with any member of the planning department). Those e-mails show that Councilor Madore was being sent e-mails regarding this process to both his business (US digital) and county e-mail address but none of them appear to have been forwarded to staff, much less made known to staff.
This clandestine and exclusive method of developing a proposal that has widespread impact on every citizen of this county is exactly what the GMA is designed to prevent. There is no explanation for this action except that Councilor Madore deliberately excluded any individual from staff or the public that might have provided a different perspective than his own. This is purely and simply a result oriented Alternative completely void of complete, open and transparent public process. Therefore, what now appears to be Councilor Madore’s preferred alternative for the SEPA process violates both the statutory provisions of the GMA and flies in the face of the County’s own resolution passed in January 2014 (2014-01-10).

The lack of public process in the development of Alternative #4 pales in comparison with how the county has traditionally developed Comprehensive Plan Amendments (see history of public participation above). For example, in the 2004 review process, the county the County appointed a steering committee of elected officials from all Clark County cities and a technical advisory committee that included the planning staff of the local jurisdictions and the staff from special districts to develop the assumptions that Clark County would use to size its UGAs. These committees met regularly from 2000-2004 to examine data and make recommendations to the County Commissioners on various aspects of the comprehensive plan including assumptions on which to base the size of the urban growth areas (UGAs). The minutes of the Steering Committee show that a wide range of opinion and analysis based on studies done by diverse groups was gathered and evaluated.

GMA and the county’s own resolution require “early” participation by the public. As can be seen by the vetting of the other three Alternatives, they went through a much greater public process including but not limited to the following:

a) Vetted at Open Houses in August;

b) A City/County coordination meeting in September;

c) A scoping hearing before PC;

d) A second Councilor WS;

e) A second City County coordination meeting;

f) Review of Alternatives by PC in October;

g) BOCC WS on three alternatives on 10/22;

h) OH on 10/29-10/30;
i) Planning commission meeting on alternatives; and

j) A third City county coordination meeting.

Even before the August Open houses, all members of the public were able to meet with staff and view the alternatives in their development stages. Plus the county had issued a number of policy issue papers.

NONE of that was followed in the behind the scenes development of Alternative #4. Moreover, this Alternative has no analysis by staff so that at the 2 open houses where it was touted, staff could not answer the questions of the public because staff had no in the development of the alternative.

Therefore, Alternative #4 cannot be submitted for the SEPA process because it has not even gone through the required public process as set forth in GMA and the county’s own resolutions.

**Alternative #4 Violates The County’s Own Resolution (2014-06-17) In That It Considers Changes To The Comprehensive Plan That Violate The County’s Adoption Of The OFM Number, The 90/10 Split On Allocation Of Population Between The Urban Growth Areas And The Rural And Resource Land Areas**

Resolutions promulgated by this Board adopt two important numbers regarding population totals and allocations (2014-01-9 and 2014-06-17). At bottom, the County resolutions adopted a population figure of 562,000 people with 90% of the increases to occur within the current UGAs and 10% to non-urban. Alternative #4 would violate the Board’s own resolutions and Principles and values determinations by increasing the number of lots to over 17,000 (almost 8000 more than under two of the three alternatives), which would have the impact of increasing the total population at a minimum of 21,280 in the county forecast, all of which to occur in the rural area. Even assuming that the county could not increase its OFM number, in order to keep the 90/10 split, the County would have to select a population increase for the entire county of 191,000 people which dwarfs the high OFM number. Such an increase in the rural area is not only unsustainable but it is in violation of two of the County’s resolutions and disregards GMA standards for planning.

Moreover, the county is on a deadline, and a schedule imposed by this Board and the mandates of GMA. Even assuming that the County was to change its numbers, it would have to do so by starting the entire process over including notices of hearings. Engaging in that reckless conduct would no doubt result in this County being out of compliance with the GMA as it would not be able to make the June 2016 deadline.
In addition, adding this document to the SEPA process now increases the cost of the SEPA process by 50%. According to staff, the original allocation for consultants on the SEPA process was $100,000. By adding this ONE ill conceived alternative to the process at this date is going to cost the County another approximately $50,000 all to satisfy the site specific zoning requests of a single, special interest group of individuals whose primary goal is to eliminate GMA planning.

Such reckless disregard for the ordinances already passed, as well as the ongoing planning process to date, not to mention the additional costs, and justify the council rejecting this Alternative #4 as being part of this year’s Comprehensive Plan update.

The Development Of Alternative #4 Violates The County’s Policies8
On The Rural Area, Fails To Protect Rural And Resource Lands And Fails To Protect The Rural Character As Defined By State Statute

8 No single attribute describes the rural landscape. Instead combinations of characteristics that are found in rural settings impart the sense of what we commonly describe as rural. These factors are cumulative in nature and the more of these factors that are present influence feelings of whether a particular area is rural. In many cases these characteristics are subjective and frequently not all of them are found in each area. When describing rural conditions the public will often describe these areas in terms of a certain lifestyle. The factors listed below are those that usually describe "rural character."

- The presence of large lots;
- Limited public services present (water, sewer, police, fire, roads, etc.);
- Different expectations of levels of services provided;
- Small scale resource activity;
- Undeveloped nature of the landscape;
- Wildlife and natural conditions predominate; • closer relationship between nature and residents;
- Personal open space;
- A sense of separation from intense human activity;
- A sense of self-sufficiency; and • rural commercial supporting rural area population.

Planning for rural lands in Clark County is important for the following reasons:

- To maintain a rural character;
- To recognize their location at the urban fringe, where they are susceptible to sprawl development which can overwhelm the existing character, infrastructure and way of life;
- To serve as transition areas between urban and resource uses because urban and resource uses are dependent on each other, but are not always compatible;
- To provide services and goods that support resource activities;
- To supply nearby urban residents with locally harvested resource products which are fresh and often less costly;
- To allow the efficient provision of public facilities and services by clearly delineating between urban and rural uses so that growth is directed to more compact urban centers;
- To add an important dimension to the quality of life through the existence of rural lands, open space and natural or critical areas;
- To provide for the planned future expansion of urban uses, if necessary or needed, in the rural lands that border designated urban areas; and,
- To protect and enhance streams and riparian habitat necessary for sustaining healthy populations of salmonids.
I have set forth the broad requirements of GMA above. Recently, several Washington Supreme Court cases have re-emphasized that Counties cannot simply ignore the mandates of the act in setting zoning regulations in the rural areas. The Washington Supreme Court has been clear that the rural element must contain protective measures for rural areas to prevent site-specific rezones that circumvent the GMA. *Kittitas County v. EWGMHB*, 172 Wash.2d 144 (2011). The *Kittitas* case the County setting a 3-acre minimum zone complied with GMA. In rejecting the overall rural 3-acre minimum lot size, the Supreme Court held after lengthy analysis stated:

We hold that the Board properly interpreted and applied the law in finding that the County has failed to comply with the GMA’s requirements to develop a written record explaining its rural element, include provisions in the Plan that protect rural areas, provide for a variety of rural densities in the Plan, protect agricultural land, and protect water resources.


Alternative #4 suffers from many of the same infirmities that caused the Washington Supreme Court to reject the County’s plan, including its 3-acre minimum densities. Below are some of the descriptions that apply to what should be considered in addressing whether an action does, or does not, protect rural character and resource lands. Nothing in the record developed by Councilor Madore in his backroom work with GIS suggests any broad based public input as to any site-specific zone change much less how each and every one of his changes will enhance the rural character, much less protect resource lands. On the other end of the spectrum, Kitsap County’s CP on the rural element a maximum density of one dwelling unit for five acres.9

The Rural and Natural Resource Element is an integral part of the county’s 20-Year Plan. This element concentrates on how future land use needs within rural and resource lands will be met, and the methodology used to designate resource lands. This element emphasizes how rural and resource lands should be used in the future, supporting the ongoing and future resource activities (farming, forestry and mineral extraction) and encouraging such activities on a smaller scale in the rural non-resource lands. Together, this element in concert with the rest of the 20-Year Plan supports the long-range vision for Clark County.

9 "Rural character" refers to the patterns of land use and development established by a county in the rural element of its comprehensive plan.....That provide visual landscapes that are traditionally found in rural areas and communities".

Kitsap County has a maximum density in the rural area of one dwelling unit per five acres. This zoning allows for large amounts of undeveloped land and for the protection of critical areas and rural character. Additionally, Kitsap County, through the Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Plan and through goals and policies outlined in Chapter Ten "Parks" of the Comprehensive Plan, has a mission to
This abject failure to vet this Alternative with the public, and to insert it at this late stage of the proceedings where the County is already deep into the SEPA process that started last summer (see the County’s Timeline for scope of work adopted as part of its resolution 2014-01-10), is unfair to the majority of the citizens in this County.

Thus, Alternative #4 fails to comply with the rural element requirement of GMA and the current policies and elements of the Comprehensive Plan. Although anecdotal local circumstances can be considered in determining that changes to the minimum 5 acre lot sizes (and here Alternative 4 allows for substantially higher densities of 1 and 2.5 acre parcels), the Alternative totally fails to provide any details as to how the densities were arrived at (other than by a false claim that they accurately reflect what is “on the ground” a claim that cannot be verified by staff or legal counsel—see discussion below) existing.


Given the history of lot segregations in this county, there are many parcels that have been segregated that are not legal, buildable lots. At this juncture, if one assumes that Councilor Madore’s map is accurate, neither he, nor staff, nor legal counsel can state which, if any, of the lots he has designated for zone change are legal, buildable lots. As set forth above, there was a land rush of segregations of lots in the non-urban areas of the county during the development of the original County Plan. It is unknown if any of those lots became legal buildable lots. According to my understanding it could take anywhere from 30 minutes to 30 hours to determine whether any lot identified by Councilor Madore for up zoning would meet what he states are the reality of what is on the ground.

More importantly, it is unclear if this broad ranging Alternative that has tentacles that stretch into the majority, if not all, of the current comprehensive plan policies and development code regulations can legally be considered in the SEPA process as an SEIS.

Since there is no analysis, or consensus, as to whether Councilor Madore’s theory that his Alternative actually reflects the actual reality on the ground, there is no justification for it.

Conclusion

preserve parks and other visual landscapes for future generations. It was awarded the 2011 Governor’s Smart Communities Award for “Year of the Rural”.
The law says the following:

The legislature finds that uncoordinated and unplanned growth, together with a lack of common goals expressing the public's interest in the conservation and the wise use of our lands, pose a threat to the environment, sustainable economic development, and the health, safety, and high quality of life enjoyed by residents of this state. It is in the public interest that citizens, communities, local governments, and the private sector cooperate and coordinate with one another in comprehensive land use planning. Further, the legislature finds that it is in the public interest that economic development programs be shared with communities experiencing insufficient economic growth.

This planning process is not about a denial of private property rights. This planning process is about maintaining and updating legal valid county wide planning policies in compliance with state law that have been developed over years with the input of thousands of citizens, elected officials and county staff personnel and which keep our county in compliance with the worthy goals of a state wide law.

This is about public participation in a process that has been required by state law and acknowledged by this Board by several different resolutions. This is about honoring those lawful and statutorily mandated obligations. This is about respecting state law and the work that has been done by so many over so long a period of time.

Councilor Madore is simplifies the matter in a way that obfuscates the importance of countywide planning pursuant to the Act when he said the following on his public Facebook page:

"Some say that no citizen should have private property rights, that the "greater good" is served by requiring citizens to live in high density transit oriented inner cities and that rural properties should be left to nature, that government should buy up private property rights to prohibit any further rural development".

Although some "may" say what he states, although I have not heard any citizen ever say "no citizen should have private property rights", in fact the opposite is true. The protection of private property rights is woven into every GMA policy and statutory provision. No one has the right to do whatever they wish with their property, not even a single select group of like-minded individuals who happen to have Councilor Madore's ear. Zoning regulations go back to the early 1900s and have been repeatedly and constantly upheld. The constitution has a takings clause. If the actions taken by this
county over the past twenty-five years had constituted a "takings", then those individuals would be compensated.

One of the primary purposes of the Act is to direct new growth into IUGAs or UGAs. The natural consequence of implementing that purpose is that growth will occur at higher densities within well-designated urban growth boundaries. Such planning may result in higher density transit orient inner cities and rural areas are to be more natural. Such a result is consistent with the purpose and mandates of the law. The Legislature has determined by adoption of the GMA that directing growth to urban areas provides for better use of resource lands and more efficient uses of taxpayer dollars. This primary purpose is a statutorily mandated and, even though some may not like it, as our legal representatives, you must implement it.

Sincerely,

David T. McDonald.
Ridgefield, Washington
Attorney for Friends of Clark County
Hello Rich:

Thanks for following up. In the Alt.4 the three parcels are proposed as FR-10.

Best-Oliver

--- Original Message ---
From: Richard Carson [mailto:richcarson@g.com]
Sent: Monday, April 13, 2015 2:58 PM
To: Orjiako, Oliver
Cc: Cnty 2016 Comp Plan
Subject: Re: Comp Plan Question

I wanted to confirm that my property and my neighbors are proposed for Forest-10 (FR-10) in the new Alternative 4 of the comprehensive plan. The parcels are (PIN 206918014, 015, 016).
Please consider the attached comments in support of Alternative Option 1 of the comprehensive plan.

Thank you.

Sue
April 13, 2015

Dear Clark County Council:

My family owns a 20 acre farm in Ridgefield, Washington. I support Comp Plan Option 1. as the option most protective of existing agricultural lands, forest lands and natural resources. Option 1. still provides plenty of opportunity for planned growth as projected there would be an estimated 7,000 new lots according to population projections.

Taking a more conservative approach to expansion of the growth boundary is advisable so that we can avoid the public risk of costly litigation as was the case last time the comp plan was revised. Learn from the past!

By contrast, Option 4. allows significant parcelization across the rural landscape. Creation of many 1 acre lots and the expansion of residential development in the rural community will undermine the future viability of agriculture in Clark County. It will increase conflicts between residents and agricultural operations. It will place a greater demand on our water resources with the drilling of multiple single family wells – not an efficient use of our limited water resources especially as we are facing hotter summers. Lack of water rights for irrigation right now is a limiting factor for agricultural expansion.

Option 4. is a giant step backward in sustainable planning for our future and places a huge burden on taxpayers who will pick up the check for the necessary infrastructure to support all those one acre parcels.

Thank you for your consideration and I urge you to adopt Alternative Option 1.

Sincerely,

Sue Marshall
4316 NW 169th
Ridgefield, WA 98642
Dear Ladies and Gentlemen:

We attempted to send an email earlier that contained the documents that we hand delivered to the secretary of the Clark County Board of Councilors. It failed to send because the map attachments were too large. Attached are: our letter of 4-10-15, alternative rural forest options, our letter on comp plan 11-7-14.

Please take in to consideration our proposal.

Thank you for your help,

Alan Greene, & The Greene Family.
April 10, 2015

To: david.madore@clark.wa.gov       To: tom.mielke@clark.wa.gov
To: jeanne.stewart@clark.wa.gov      To: comp.plan@clark.wa.gov
From: alliedinca@gmail.com

Clark County Board of Councilors
David Madore, Tom Mielke, Jeanne Stewart
1300 Franklin Street, PO Box 5000
Vancouver, WA 98666-5000

Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Growth Management Plan Update - Comments
P. O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666-9810

Attention: Oliver Orjiako, Director

RE: Proposed Zoning Changes for Parcel Nos. 230277-000 and 230282-000 from FR-40 to FR-10.

Dear Ladies and Gentlemen:

We agree with the proposed changes in Alternative 4 except as applies to our family parcels Nos. 230277-000 and 230282-000 situated in Section 5, T4NR3EWM.

We respectfully request that the Alternative 4 data and the Alternative 4 map please be modified to include Parcel Nos. 230277-000 and 230282-000 as zoned FR-10, NOT FR-20.

Reference is made to our e-mail and mailed letter dated 11/17/2014, subject as above, addressed to and received by Clark County Community Planning on 11/18/2014.
Reference is also made to separate discussions in 2014, subject as above, between
Stan Greene and Clark County Board of County Councilors David Madore and Tom
Mielke, and Gordy Euler of Community Planning.

This letter is the written confirmation of the separate discussions held on April 1, 2015 at
Hockinson High School between Stan Greene, subject as above, and Clark County
Board of County Councilor David Madore, and also discussions with Oliver Orjiako, and
Gordy Euler of Community Planning.

Our parcels Nos. 230277-000 and 230282-000 are situated near Yacolt Mt. Please see
the attached maps enlarged from the Clark County Alternative 4 maps. Prior to the
Growth Management Act in 1994 our parcels were zoned R-5 and the parcels owned by
our neighbors to the North were zoned R-20. Alternative 4 proposes that the parcels
owned by our neighbors to the North become zoned FR-10. We believe an omission
occurred when our parcels were not also proposed in Alternative 4 for FR-10 zoning.

The adjacent parcels on the South border of our property are the parcels of our
neighbors which are “predominant lot sizes” of 1.5 acre and 5 acre parcels with homes.

There are more than 12 homes on property adjacent to or near our property. These
parcels are proposed in Alternative 4 to become zoned FR-10. Our property and the
property of our South and East neighbors border on and have direct access to a public
road, Yacolt Mt. Road. The homes on these “adjacent properties” are visible from our
property and from Yacolt Mt. Road and show the “actual rural character” of this local
area. (Quotes are from Alternative 4 with bold face and underline added.)
To the West and North of our property are 20 acre and larger acreage parcels of our neighbors which are proposed under Alternative 4 to become zoned FR-10. The area to the West and North of our property has few parcels, approximately 4 parcels we believe, which are 5 acre parcels. Several of the parcels do not border on any public road.

Why is our property which adjoins many small parcels with homes situated thereupon not proposed in Alternative 4 to be zoned FR-10 yet the areas to the West and North of our property which is forest or timberland that contains few small parcels is proposed in Alternative 4 to become FR-10?

Alternative 4 reads in part:

"Forest zones: Include 20 and 10 acre minimum lot size areas where appropriate (considering the existing rural nature and predominant lot sizes)"

"Guiding Principles and Goals:"

"2. Correct fundamental discrepancies between the actual predominant lot sizes and the existing zoning map."

"3. Respect the actual rural character in each local area to provide better compatibility and consistency with adjacent properties." (Bold face and underline added above.)

We have waited for more than 20 years to be able to hope for some reduction of the restrictions placed upon our land by the Growth Management Act. There are 5 brothers and sisters in Alan’s generation in our family. Each of us should be allowed to build a home for each of us on the family property and manage each of our properties as one tree farm to grow and produce commercial timber. We believe it would to be an alienation of our property rights if Clark County attempts to prohibit us from building
homes for ourselves, for our sons and daughters, and for our siblings on the property
which has been owned by our family for almost 60 years.

We also believe it would be inconsistent with above described “principles and goals” of
Alternative 4 to ignore the actual physical attributes of our neighborhood and of our
adjacent properties.

To attempt to zone our property as FR-20 would ignore the actual physical attributes of
our neighborhood.

To propose to zone as FR-10 the land to the North, which is different from the actual
rural character of our property and of the properties adjacent to our South and East
could be viewed by us as unequal treatment by Clark County.

Please, we respectfully request that the Alternative 4 data and the Alternative 4 map be
modified to include Parcel Nos. 230277-000 and 230282-000 to be zoned FR-10, NOT
FR-20.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Alan Greene
Stan Greene
P.O. Box 2844
Battle Ground, WA 98640

Enclosures: (4) maps Clark Co. 2016 Comp Plan Update Alternative 4 – Forest Zones
(1) page excerpt from Clark Co. Alternative 4: Rural options
(2) pgs: copy A. Greene letter to Clark Co. Community Planning, 11/18/14
Alternative 4: Rural options. (Councilor Madore’s proposal)

Guiding Principles and Goals:

1. No de-designation of Resource Lands (AG or FR).

2. **Correct fundamental discrepancies between the actual predominant lot sizes and the existing zoning map.**

3. Respect the actual rural character in each local area to provide better compatibility and **consistency with adjacent properties.**

4. Add clustering options to better aggregate parcels and preserve resource land and open space for agricultural, forestry, and non-residential use.

5. Allow a wider range of affordable lot size choices to fill obvious market gaps and provide a better balance.

6. Add flexibility needed to convert fallow land to more manageable economically viable agricultural and forest land.

Options to be analyzed:

- **Forest zones:** Include 20 and 10 acre minimum lot size areas where appropriate **(considering the existing rural nature and predominant lot sizes)**

- **Agriculture zones:** Include 5 acre minimum lot size areas where appropriate **(considering the existing rural nature and predominant lot sizes)**

- **Rural zones:** Include 1, 2.5, and 5 acre minimum lot size areas where appropriate **(considering the already developed lots, the existing rural nature, and predominant lot sizes)**

- **Clustering Options** to aggregate and preserve 70% of R, AG, and FR land into open space for agriculture, forest, or other non-residential uses.
To: comp.plan@clark.wa.gov From: alliedincati@gmail.com

November 17, 2014

Community Planning
Comp Plan Comments
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

RE: Proposed Zoning Changes for Parcel Nos. 230277000 and 230282000.

Dear Sirs:

We concur and support the written comments submitted by Carol Levanen at the open house meeting on 10/29/14.

It would be an injustice if Clark County were to ignore the established small existing parcels and attempt to zone them as FR-20.

Our parcels Nos. 230277000 and 230282000 are situated south of the first standard parallel north near Yacolt Mt. Prior to the Growth Management Act these parcels were zoned R-5. There are 5 brothers and sisters in my generation in my family. Each of us should be allowed to build a home for each of us on the family tree farm and also grow timber. All of the parcels across Yacolt Mt. Road and immediately south of our tree farm are 5 acre parcels with homes. It is an alienation of my property rights if Clark County attempts to prohibit us from building homes for ourselves on the property which has been owned by our family for almost 60 years. There are more than 12 homes near our property.

We know that Assessor's Parcel Account No. 230282-000, Tax Parcel No. 18 is a legal buildable lot or parcel as it was established as a separate parcel in 1948.

The following is an excerpt of the legal description for Assessor's Parcel Account No. 230282-000, recorded under Auditor's File No. 4866391 D on 6/25/12:

"This parcel is a legal lot. This parcel was created in 1949 when Clark County constructed Yacolt Mtn. Road, (re: Right of Way Deed, September 1, 1948, recorded under Auditor's File No. G08949, Book 448, Page 580) formerly known as Kelly Hill Road, said road construction in 1949 caused this parcel to be physically separated from the major portion of the SW 1/4 of the NE 1/4 of Section 5, T4 North, R3 East, WM. Subsequently, for this parcel, Assessor's Parcel Account No. 230282-000, Statutory Warranty Deed was recorded under Auditor's File No. G620280, image No. 849748, on December 4, 1972, and is that portion of the NW 1/4 of the SW 1/4 of the NE 1/4 of Section 5, T4 North, R3 East, Willamette Meridian, described as follows:
The distance measurements describing the legal dimensions of this parcel are according to the bearings taken, distance measurements made, and property line stakes set by the L. L. Knight survey of 1947. Along the parcel property lines established and marked by the L. L. Knight survey, the West property line fence was constructed in 1948 and the East and South property line fences were constructed in 1949. Thus the property lines of this parcel were established by survey and have been marked with property line fences since 1948 – 1949." (for further legal description refer to deed).

It is requested that the above described parcels be zoned for 5 or 6 acre family home sites which allow for growing timber.

Please add us to your mailing and update list at the above E-mail address and the below mailing address.

Sincerely,

Alan Greene
P.O. Box 2844
Battle Ground, WA 98604
Following comments were submitted online:

Parcel No: 256720000

Subject: Smaller than AG-20 zoning

Comments:
When we bought our 50 acre farm in 1992 we had the ability to partition it into 5 acre parcels. Part of the appeal of the farm was that we could have our children stay in the area and build a home if they so desired. Also there was an emergency plan built into the property in a time of financial distress such as in 2008. These two points were carefully thought out at the time of our purchase. When the Growth Management Plan of 1994 came into being we tried to divide our land like so many in Clark County. The cost would have been about $15,000, but there was no guarantee it would be processed because of the uncertainty of a moratorium by the county. That was a lot of money to gamble with, so we did not get it divided.

Basically we lost a large value in our property. In 2009 we had the economic distress as did everyone else. We were forced to sell part of the farm to maintain the rest. But because of the 1994 plan the smallest we could sell was 20 acres, and at about the same price as a 5 acre lot would have sold for. We now have 30 acres, but can do nothing with it, except have a small tree farm. Alternative 4 would at least bring our AG-20 lot closer to what it was when we purchased it. We are surrounded by mostly 5 acre lots both rural and agriculture. Agriculture on 30 acres is very difficult. (We had a neighbor call us to stop running a tractor in the field one night before a rain storm. We were in the middle of the field and it was too noisy for them. That was when we still had 50 acres.) Please consider Alternative 4 to bring our area back into conformity and possibly back to its original zoning.

Submitted by:
Steve & Denice Wisniewski

Email: rctf@tds.net

Address:
38209 NE 41st Ave
La Center, WA
I am resubmitting testimony for tomorrow. The previous email attachment was a draft version, not my final version.

I apologize for the inconvenience.
April 14, 2015

Clark County Councilors
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666-9810

Oliver Orjiako
Director, Clark County Community Planning
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666-9810

Dear Clark County Councilors and Dr. Orjiako:

I am submitting this testimony for the record in objection to the inclusion of Alternative 4 for consideration and analysis in the SEPA Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement on the grounds that

- It conflicts with the intent of the Growth Management Act by knowingly creating conditions that support suburban sprawl and diminish the size and productivity of agricultural lands; that set the stage for infrastructure failures, negative environmental impacts on air and water quality and wildlife protection; and that risk the depletion of ground and surface water supplies.
- It creates real financial risk to taxpayers in terms of wasted planning staff time; likely increases in property taxes to all property owners to cover infrastructure development, required environmental mitigations, and increases in property tax valuations; and costs to defend against likely lawsuits re non-compliance with GMA rules and regulations.
- It was developed contrary to customary and normal planning and public participation processes which violates the spirit, and possibly the fact, of the appearance of fairness doctrine as it is applied in Washington state.

Specifically in regards to the potential violation of the appearance of fairness doctrine: I understand that Councilor Madore may not be in technical violation of the appearance of fairness doctrine, but his actions are contrary to everything county government states they are doing to be more transparent. It is my understanding the Councilor Madore has had a major role in drafting and revising Alternative 4 in response to requests from Clark County Citizens United (CCCU) a single, special interest group claiming to speak for rural landowners seeking redress from what they feel to have been a taking of their property rights by the GMA. It is also my understanding that Councilor Madore directed Peter Silliman, who is not a member of the Community Planning Department, nor a planner at all, to help these few individuals craft a plan to completely restructure rural and resource land zoning. I also understand that Councilor Madore, without consulting planning staff, circumvented the normal and customary practice for developing comprehensive plan information by having GIS staff work directly with him on Alternative 4. This action appears to have been a deliberate exclusion of the county’s professional planning staff and a direct contravention of the procedure used to vet the other Alternatives, all of which is, in effect, a willful circumventing of the public process used to vet Alternatives 1-3
I recently reviewed 123 pages of emails, released through an FOIA request for all emails between the dates of 10/01/2014 and 2/18/2015 of David Madore, Tom Mielke, Jeanne Stewart, Oliver Orjiako and Peter Silliman with the keywords: Carol Levanen; Susan Rasmussen; Growth Management Act; Rural Alternative; Alternative #4; and Clark County Citizens United.

By my count there are approximately 60 emails in this FOIA request that document the breadth and depth of input CCCU has had in the drafting of Alternative 4, to the exclusion of all other members of the public. There were no emails to or from any other groups or individuals, much less the planning staff, despite the expansive nature of the keywords “Growth Management Act; Rural Alternative; and Alternative #4.” In addition to the extent of email input from CCCU into the drafting of Alternative 4, in what was a most unusual circumstance, there was an individual who identified as being an officer of CCCU actually seated at the table with county councilors and representatives of the cities during the board work session on March 11, 2015. I am told that this, too, is neither usual nor customary procedure.

These reasons are the basis of my concern that the development of Alternative 4 appears to violate both the Public Participation element of the GMA and the County’s own public participation resolution. In my opinion, choosing to include Alternative 4 in the EIS analysis is a failure of the council’s fiduciary responsibility to taxpayers and a failure of the council’s ethical duty to serve a diverse public with fairness and impartiality. I therefore request that Alternative not be considered as an alternative for analysis in the SEPA process.

Finally, given Councilor Madore’s often stated concerns about integrity and transparency, and his statements that other Boards and political bodies not hide behind attorney-client privilege, I am also requesting that the council waive all exceptions to the production of documents under the public records act, including the waiver of its attorney-client privilege, and release to the public into this record all documents pertaining to advice they have received from counsel and all of the legal counsel public records to planning staff. I make this request so that we, the public, have full and transparent information regarding the county councilors’ understanding of what laws, rules and regulations they may be choosing to ignore in going forward with including Alternative 4 in the EIS review. As a demonstration of his commitment to transparency I ask Councilor Madore to lead the council in waiving all privileges and to produce all documents between legal and planning staff and the councilors, and between legal and the county manager regarding this Comprehensive Plan update.

Sincerely,

Heather Tischbein
1119 NW 131st Way, Apt. A
Vancouver, WA 98685
Public Comment
SEPA ALTERNATIVES
April 10-April 13, 2015
(3:35 p.m.)
Hey Jacqui,

When a citizen who has not registered posts a response to a topic, they're asked whether or not they would like to post the response online or via another method. I've attached a screenshot of the page that citizens are presented for you're review.

**How do you want to share your statement?**

You have two choices:

1. **Online (sign in required)**
   
   Sign in, and we'll show your statement with or without your name on Engage Clark County. Which do you prefer?
   
   - Show my statement with my name
   - Show my statement without my name

2. **On Paper (sign in NOT required)**

   Instead of signing in to show your statement on Engage Clark County, you can download a PDF with your statement, then print and send it to Clark County however you wish (e.g. mail, fax, hand-deliver, etc.)

   Download my statement

At this point citizens make a choice. However, some do not, and for those who do not, and for those who do not complete all of the steps (in order to post their statement online) their statement is placed ‘off-forum’ where you and other administrators may see it.
For those who register but fail to verify their email address, they are sent an email to verify and when they are on the system a persistent verification message appears at the top of the page.

So, as you can see, we have designed the system in a way to advise people at every step about how they can post their statement online. Over the years we've made many changes and have managed to increase the number of people who leave online statements and we're always open to making changes to further improve!

You should know that while we've managed to get the majority of our clients up to a 60% online rate, the topic on the plan review is up to 80% and you've got over 90% of people who have completed the satisfaction survey having agreed to like using Engage Clark County. You can see more of the satisfaction survey's by logging in as an admin and going here: http://www.peakdemocracy.com/customers/4/accounts/2/portals/192/report?name=satisfaction_survey

The 'admin message' that you see is the way for an administrator to send a message to the author of the response. It is intended primarily for responding to a question a citizen may have posted in a response, or for clearing up mis-information.

Please let me know if there is anything else I might do to help.

Cheers,

Rob

Rob Hines
Director of Public Engagement
Peak Democracy, Inc.
510 666 6931 tel
866 506 4598 fax

---

On Apr 13, 2015, at 11:04, Kamp, Jacqueline <Jacqueline.Kamp@clark.wa.gov> wrote:

With those that posted without registering, do they get any kind of message that informs them that their comment will not be “Live” until they register? I'd like to assist those commenters with getting registered, but I'm curious as to whether they received a message on what they need to do to add their comment. We may have their email as part of our distribution list.

Under the one “Unverified” comment we have so far, I see that there is a link for an “admin message”. Could you explain what that does or how to best utilize it to assist people?

Thank you!

Jacqui
Good Afternoon, Chairman Madore:

Attached, please find a joint letter regarding Comprehensive Growth Management Plan Alternative 4 on behalf of the Columbia River Economic Development Council, the Greater Vancouver Chamber of Commerce, Identity Clark County, the Camas-Washougal Chamber of Commerce and the Battle Ground Chamber of Commerce. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this proposal.

Best regards,

Kimberly Pincheira
Director of Communications and Strategic Partnerships
D: 360 587.3181|O: 360.694 5006|kpincheira@cred.org
805 Broadway, Ste 412 | Vancouver, WA 98660 |cred.org
Clark County Board of County Councilors
Attn: David Madore, Chair
P.O. Box 5000
Vancouver, WA 98666-5000

Monday, April 13, 2015

RE: Alternative 4 - Rural and Resource Lands Changes

Dear Chairman Madore and County Councilors:

The business community thanks you for your aggressive approach to creating more opportunities for job creation to thrive in Clark County. We support your increase in the jobs-to-household ratio goal and believe that approach will help provide more Clark County residents with opportunities to work where they live.

In 2011, the Columbia River Economic Development Council (CREDC), in concert with its private, public and non-profit partners, studied the inventory of existing and future industrial lands and came to the conclusion that there were few truly shovel-ready options for significant acreage that would suit primary job creation. The conclusion of this study led the CREDC to adopt several industrial lands policies that express the need to preserve and protect the few significant sites that are remaining. Furthermore, our efforts are focused on applying all reasonable planning and development tools to ensure that those lands are ready and available when a significant employment opportunity arises.

In consultation with our private sector partners, as well as our local jurisdictions, we have serious concerns about how the proposed Alternative 4 will limit our ability to meet our aggressive jobs goals for the region. Specifically in areas where there are key transportation and other infrastructure investments needed for quality job growth, we anticipate this proposal will lead to incompatible uses and/or additional costs for development that will cause opportunities to look elsewhere.

We believe in strong property rights. We also understand the need for planning and predictability so that land owners do not make uninformed decisions about their property that ultimately lead to an inability to maximize the value and use of their land.

We respectfully ask that you work to find a solution that both provides for strong property rights and also avoids future tension and conflict between residential, commercial and industrial uses. We look forward to an opportunity to help shape a plan that adequately reflects the needs and values of our community.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this proposal.

Please see following page for signatories in support of this letter.

Page 1 of 2
We, the undersigned, support the comments submitted above on behalf of our respective organizations.

Russel Brent, Chair  
Battle Ground Chamber of Commerce

Brent Erickson, Executive Director  
Camas-Washougal Chamber of Commerce

Mike Bomar, President  
Columbia River Economic Development Council

John McKibbin, Executive Director  
Identity Clark County

Kelly Loyd, President/CEO  
Greater Vancouver Chamber of Commerce
Anderson, Colete

From: Richard Carson <richcarson@q.com>
Sent: Monday, April 13, 2015 2:58 PM
To: Orjiako, Oliver
Cc: Cnty 2016 Comp Plan
Subject: Re: Comp Plan Question

Just following up. I never got an answer to this question.

----- Original Message ----- 
From: Richard Carson
To: Orjiako, Oliver
Sent: Thursday, April 02, 2015 2:13 PM
Subject: Comp Plan Question

I wanted to confirm that my property and my neighbors are proposed for Forest-10 (FR-10) in the new Alternative 4 of the comprehensive plan. The parcels are (PIN 206918014, 015, 016).
Hello,
I strongly oppose the Alt4 plan. I have had 23 years of real estate sales and worked in rural land development and sales helping people with their land and real estate needs. I was born and raised here. We cannot afford to allow more growth without proper planning. I hope you take this and can use any of it to help us here in Clark Co. We need our planning team behind us. I trust our zoning and planning commission will protect our beautiful county.
There are so many things wrong about Alt4. First of all, zoning revises require due diligence in preplanning for all the infrastructure needed to serve the growth and needs of any new proposed development. Schools, roads, local community needs and marketability just to name a few. Let's look at the areas affected by downsizing lot size and the impact it would have on each community. Schools. We are already at full capacity in most high schools. The roads, try driving on Hwy 503 and Main St. in Battle Ground. It's beyond capacity now. Simply put, we all know the cart has to come before the horse. Plan ahead for growth. It is what the planning board is here to do. It is what they are trained to do. Who benefits from Alt4? Certainly not the majority of us. As a Realtor here working with rural land sales I do not see any big demand for rural acre lots. The biggest issue I have is how can a person with no experience in zoning and planning just bring a proposition to the table?

Thank you,
Patricia Bergren
Coldwell Banker United Brokers
360-798-6733
Pattysproperties.com
From: McCauley, Mark  
Sent: Monday, April 13, 2015 1:24 PM  
To: Orjiako, Oliver  
Cc: Euler, Gordon; Swanson, Axel; Silliman, Peter  
Subject: FW: Joint Business Community Comments on Alternative 4

For the record.

From: Kimberly Pinheiro [mailto:KPinheiro@credc.org]  
Sent: Monday, April 13, 2015 1:18 PM  
To: Madore, David  
Cc: Cnty 2016 Comp Plan; Stewart, Jeanne; Mielke, Tom; McCauley, Mark; Mike Bomar  
Subject: Joint Business Community Comments on Alternative 4

Good Afternoon, Chairman Madore:

Attached, please find a joint letter regarding Comprehensive Growth Management Plan Alternative 4 on behalf of the Columbia River Economic Development Council, the Greater Vancouver Chamber of Commerce, Identity Clark County, the Camas-Washougal Chamber of Commerce and the Battle Ground Chamber of Commerce. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this proposal.

Best regards,

Kimberly Pinheiro  
Director of Communications and Strategic Partnerships  
D: 360 567.3181 | O: 360.694.5006 | kpinheiro@credc.org  
805 Broadway, Ste 412 | Vancouver, WA 98660 | credc.org
Clark County Board of County Councilors  
Attn: David Madore, Chair  
P.O. Box 5000  
Vancouver, WA 98666-5000  

Monday, April 13, 2015  

RE: Alternative 4 - Rural and Resource Lands Changes  

Dear Chairman Madore and County Councilors:  

The business community thanks you for your aggressive approach to creating more opportunities for job creation to thrive in Clark County. We support your increase in the jobs-to-household ratio goal and believe that approach will help provide more Clark County residents with opportunities to work where they live.  

In 2011, the Columbia River Economic Development Council (CREDC), in concert with its private, public and non-profit partners, studied the inventory of existing and future industrial lands and came to the conclusion that there were few truly shovel-ready options for significant acreage that would suit primary job creation. The conclusion of this study led the CREDC to adopt several industrial lands policies that express the need to preserve and protect the few significant sites that are remaining. Furthermore, our efforts are focused on applying all reasonable planning and development tools to ensure that those lands are ready and available when a significant employment opportunity arises.  

In consultation with our private sector partners, as well as our local jurisdictions, we have serious concerns about how the proposed Alternative 4 will limit our ability to meet our aggressive jobs goals for the region. Specifically in areas where there are key transportation and other infrastructure investments needed for quality job growth, we anticipate this proposal will lead to incompatible uses and/or additional costs for development that will cause opportunities to look elsewhere.  

We believe in strong property rights. We also understand the need for planning and predictability so that land owners do not make uninformed decisions about their property that ultimately lead to an inability to maximize the value and use of their land.  

We respectfully ask that you work to find a solution that both provides for strong property rights and also avoids future tension and conflict between residential, commercial and industrial uses. We look forward to an opportunity to help shape a plan that adequately reflects the needs and values of our community.  

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this proposal.  

Please see following page for signatories in support of this letter.
We, the undersigned, support the comments submitted above on behalf of our respective organizations.

Russel Brent, Chair
Battle Ground Chamber of Commerce

Brent Erickson, Executive Director
Camas-Washougal Chamber of Commerce

Mike Bomar, President
Columbia River Economic Development Council

John McKibbin, Executive Director
Identity Clark County

Kelly Lowe, President/CEO
Greater Vancouver Chamber of Commerce
Greetings:
I’m writing you because I think you will include my comments in the official record and may have the most impact on the discussion.

I am very concerned about Councilor Madore’s last minute efforts to bow to the special interest group of which Susan Rasmussen is a member. I believe that if Alternative 4 is adopted, it will create huge infrastructure problems and costs so that individuals seeking to develop small lots have utilities as well as transportation opportunities. Alternative 4 is phenomenally short-sighted and obviously created by someone who knows nothing about planning. Plus, it will raise taxes of everyone in the county so that rural landowners can be served.

Please do everything you can to persuade the councilors to reject this option. Councilor Madore says he listens toagent arguments. If we are to take him at his word (which he’s proven we should not) then explain to him that his Alternative 4 will increase costs and reduce the opportunities for jobs in rural Clark County. Most employers seeking to relocate here need larger plots of land on which to build. Alternative 4 will remove those, consigning Clark county to be a bedroom community to Portland forever more.

Thanks for your time.
Best Regards,

Bill Baumann,
Box 817, Ridgefield WA 98642

And thanks for the good job you are doing under conditions of such extreme difficulty.
From: Dylan Normington [mailto:dylannormington@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, April 13, 2015 11:46 AM
To: Orjiako, Oliver
Subject: My public comment on Clark County's Comprehensive Growth Management Plan

Mr. Orjiako,

This is my public comment on Clark County’s Comprehensive Growth Management Plan.

Alternative 4 was prepared by a County Councilor without substantive input from Clark County staff. This Alternative should not be approved to move forward for the following reasons:

1) The presentation to the public on this Alternative was inconsistent and was not readily available to all residents of Clark County. There were two “open houses” held on this Alternative. Neither open house was held in the city of Vancouver, the largest incorporated area in Clark County. This made it a burden to residents in the Southern and Western portions of the County. In addition, there was different information presented at each open house and it is my understanding that Alternative 4 was modified between the Open Houses. Therefore, the public involvement process was not done correctly on this Alternative and therefore the Alternative cannot move forward because the presentation of the Alternative to the public violated processes and procedures mandated by Washington state law.

2) Councilor David Madore developed and promoted Alternative 4 prior to presenting the Alternative to the public for comment. This is a violation of the state’s processes and procedures for implementing a Comprehensive Growth Management Plan.

3) Alternative 4 does not address the County’s need for future commercial and industrial uses in the rural areas of Clark County.

4) Alternative 4 does not comply with state law. The County will incur costly legal bills if this Alternative is approved. I recommend that County Councilors do not approve Alternative 4 to move forward.

5) Councilor David Madore has violated the ex-parte requirements of preparing a Comprehensive Growth Management Plan. He has frequently consulted with and has taken recommendations from Clark County Citizens United, an entity that represents the interests of some, but not all, rural landowners. He has stated that Alternative 4 is a good alternative for the Growth Management Plan. He has not consulted with other groups that would oppose Alternative 4 (e.g. Friends of Clark County) and he has not conducted a poll, sample or vote of all residents of Clark County regarding this Alternative. In my opinion, state law has been violated by Councilor Madore.

Please accept my comments.

Thank you very much.

Dylan Normington
503 NW 108th St
Vancouver, WA 98685
More comments coming in and are provided to the councilors!

From: Dylan Normington [mailto:dylannormington@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, April 13, 2015 11:46 AM
To: Orjiako, Oliver
Subject: My public comment on Clark County's Comprehensive Growth Management Plan

Mr. Orjiako,

This is my public comment on Clark County's Comprehensive Growth Management Plan.

Alternative 4 was prepared by a County Councilor without substantive input from Clark County staff. This Alternative should not be approved to move forward for the following reasons:

1) The presentation to the public on this Alternative was inconsistent and was not readily available to all residents of Clark County. There were two "open houses" held on this Alternative. Neither open house was held in the city of Vancouver, the largest incorporated area in Clark County. This made it a burden to residents in the Southern and Western portions of the County. In addition, there was different information presented at each open house and it is my understanding that Alternative 4 was modified between the Open Houses. Therefore, the public involvement process was not done correctly on this Alternative and therefore the Alternative cannot move forward because the presentation of the Alternative to the public violated processes and procedures mandated by Washington state law.

2) Councilor David Madore developed and promoted Alternative 4 prior to presenting the Alternative to the public for comment. This is a violation of the state's processes and procedures for implementing a Comprehensive Growth Management Plan.

3) Alternative 4 does not address the County's need for future commercial and industrial uses in the rural areas of Clark County.

4) Alternative 4 does not comply with state law. The County will incur costly legal bills if this Alternative is approved. I recommend that County Councilors do not approve Alternative 4 to move forward.

5) Councilor David Madore has violated the ex-parte requirements of preparing a Comprehensive Growth Management Plan. He has frequently consulted with and has taken recommendations from Clark County Citizens United, an entity that represents the interests of some, but not all, rural landowners. He has stated that Alternative 4 is a good alternative for the Growth Management Plan. He has not consulted with other groups that would oppose Alternative 4 (e.g. Friends of Clark County) and he has not conducted a poll, sample or vote of all residents of Clark County regarding this Alternative. In my opinion, state law has been violated by Councilor Madore.

Please accept my comments.

Thank you very much.

Dylan Normington
J3 NW 108th St
Vancouver, WA 98685
Just FYI and for index and our record. Thanks.

From: Chuck Green [mailto:sjgreen@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, April 13, 2015 11:35 AM
To: Madore, David; Mielke, Tom; Stewart, Jeanne; McCauley, Mark; Orjiako, Oliver
Subject: Re: Your dissent is respectfully rejected.

Thank you for your quick and timely response, Councilor Madore.

By way of copying all three Councilors and others who were part of my original comment transmittal, I am requesting that your response to me be considered by all involved parties and that your response be added to the official public record for the Comprehensive Plan update.

Sincerely,

-Chuck Green
Ridgefield Resident

On Monday, April 13, 2015 8:40 AM, "Madore, David" <David.Madore@clark.wa.gov> wrote:

Chuck Green,

We hear a wide variety of opinions on each topic. Some prefer stagnation over prosperity, backwardness over progress, fear over responsible growth. It is reassuring to see that common sense is by far, the predominant voice that easily provides compelling reasons for moving our community forward. Your endorsement of Alternative 1, the "do nothing" option has been noted in the public record.

There are divergent views regarding the appropriate role of an elected representative. Some see that office as a license to overrule and to rule over the people and as a means to use the force of government to exploit the people. That corruption is easily corrected by respecting our foundational documents that authorize these positions in the first place.

The valid role of an elected representative is of course, to faithfully re-present the people as expressed by the consent of the governed. I encourage you to consider the preamble and first three sections of our state constitution:

"We, the people of the State of Washington, grateful to the Supreme Ruler of the Universe for our liberties, do ordain this constitution.

SECTION 1 POLITICAL POWER. All political power is inherent in the people, and governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, and are established to protect and maintain individual rights.
SECTION 2 SUPREME LAW OF THE LAND. The Constitution of the United States is the supreme law of the land.

SECTION 3 PERSONAL RIGHTS. No person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law."

I will continue to listen to and faithfully serve the citizens in compliance with those principles as intended by our wonderful form of representative government. As you should be aware, your statements regarding the Charter are exactly backwards from the truth. The fact is that the Charter will diminish representation of rural citizens from 100% (voting for all three county commissioners) to 40% (voting for 2 of 5).

We will continue to proactively work to move our community forward with all due diligence. We will fulfill our responsibility to analyze the four reasonable options in a timely manner to satisfy SEPA requirements including Alternative Four. Your dissent is respectfully rejected.

David

From: Chuck Green [mailto:sicigreen@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, April 13, 2015 7:02 AM
To: Madore, David; Mielke, Tom; Stewart, Jeanne; McCauley, Mark; Orjiako, Oliver
Subject: Comments for the Record, April 14 Comprehensive Plan Hearing

Good morning, County Councilors, Mr. McCauley, and Dr. Orjiako

I am submitting the attached for the written record for the April 14 Comprehensive Plan Update hearing. Time permitting, I do plan to speak these into the record, but in case I am not available to do so, please take these as my comments.

Thank you.

-Chuck Green
Ridgefield resident
360-449-2132
This e-mail and related attachments and any response may be subject to public disclosure under state law.
A letter from Chuck Green as FYI and index.

From: Chuck Green [mailto:siclgreen@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, April 13, 2015 7:02 AM
To: Madore, David; Mielke, Tom; Stewart, Jeanne; McCauley, Mark; Orjiako, Oliver
Subject: Comments for the Record, April 14 Comprehensive Plan Hearing

Good morning, County Councilors, Mr. McCauley, and Dr. Orjiako

I am submitting the attached for the written record for the April 14 Comprehensive Plan Update hearing. Time permitting, I do plan to speak these into the record, but in case I am not available to do so, please take these as my comments.

Thank you.

-Chuck Green
Ridgefield resident
360-449-2132
April 13, 2015

Clark County Councilors
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666-9810

Oliver Orjiako
Director, Clark County Community Planning
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666-9810

Comments submitted electronically for the Administrative Record for the April 14, 2015 hearing.

Dear Clark County Councilors and Dr. Orjiako:

I am submitting these comments for the record in advance of the April 14, 2015 hearing on the Comprehensive Plan update. Time permitting, I plan to be in attendance to read these into the record; however, I am submitting these in writing to inclusion in the record as well.

SEPA Process and Schedule

The current Comprehensive Plan process, including SEPA Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement development, would have the current three-person Council making a preferred alternative decision in November 2015. That would prevent the two new Council positions, under the adopted Home Rule Charter, from having a part in such an important policy decision.

I recommend that the County Council adopt Alternative 1, the current Comprehensive Plan, as the “Interim Comprehensive Plan”, and postpone the alternatives narrowing process until the new councilors take office in January 2016. Extending the current plan as the “Interim Plan” for approximately one year allows two new councilors to have a say. It allows for the county to meet the state-imposed June 2016 deadline, staving off state sanctions.

Although not required, the SEPA process should include an economic and financial impact assessment. Alternative 4, especially, is a blanket “upzone” and results in a de facto tax increase; it will increase property values, and thus property tax assessments, on most rural land. Clark County Councilors can only cap about ¼ of the total property tax assessment; the other ¾ is controlled by the State and other school and special districts.
Chuck Green Comments
Comprehensive Plan Update April 14 Hearing

6. This alternative adds population with no access to public transportation. There is no way C-TRAN can afford to serve these outlying areas, nor are there sidewalks or paths for rural residents to use or to access C-TRAN.

7. Alternative 4 impacts groundwater. These new rural lots will be served by wells and septic tanks, not water and sewer lines.

My Value-Based Planning Proposal

After talking with a number of people across the political spectrum at and subsequent to the Hockinson open house, I recommend that the county hold off on further developing and assessing alternatives and instead, undertake a broad, value-based community discussion on what should go into the Comprehensive Plan. As a candidate for County Council, if elected, I would be happy to champion such an effort. I do not have any financial gain realized in any of this effort nor am I associated with anyone who does stand to gain financially.

My Value-Based Plan process includes:

- Reaching community agreement or informed consent on values and performance measures with which to develop and evaluate the Plan.

- Inclusion, rather than exclusion, by involving a comprehensive variety of community groups, such as Clark County Citizens United, Friends of Clark County, land conservation as well as the building and development community, and others, to provide input and discuss trade-offs of various options.

- Bringing in a group such as WSU-Vancouver’s Initiative for Public Deliberation to facilitate a series of forums to capture community input.

- Allowing County Planning staff to fairly and equitably develop and evaluate a plan for community review, before acted on by the FIVE County Councilors.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Chuck Green
Ridgefield Resident
Candidate for Clark County Council District 2
Following comments were submitted online:

Parcel No: 190247000

Subject: Growth Management Plan

Comments:
We own 20 acres in Ridgefield that are currently zoned ag-20. We would love to divide our property into smaller parcels. According to the maps, both alternative 2 & alternative 4 will provide us the opportunity to divide into 2-10 acre parcels. This will be better for us than alternative 1 which is "do nothing" but we would prefer to divide into even smaller parcels such as five acre lots or even as small as one or two acre lots. Many of the parcels surrounding ours are five acres in size. There are also one acre lots close to us. Ten and twenty acre properties are unmanageable for most people today. We are one family among many that we have spoken with that attempt to maintain their property while working fulltime elsewhere. Hence, our property currently sits un-used. Please consider changing the current zoning to something that will be more beneficial to the large number of property owners with situations similar to ourselves.

Submitted by:
Alison Fulton

Email: fulton06@comcast.net

Address:
Ridgefield, WA
Parcels: 190247000/190248000

We own a 20 acre parcel, currently divided into two 10 acre tax parcels, that is adjacent to a cluster of less than 10 acre parcels. We believe the concepts behind Alternative 2 and 4 make sense given that the county must consider future needs of a growing population, a population that does not merely want to be located in dense urban housing within the urban boundaries of the various towns in the county.

It is not economically viable for us to maintain the 20 acre parcel as a farm. We could lease the property to a larger farm, but that does not cover our taxes on the property or the cost to carry the property. It makes sense to allow us to divide the parcel into 5 acre lots, which would give us the opportunity to build a home and use the land for our own farm needs and reduce our costs of holding that much unused acreage. In addition, it would provide an affordable option for three other families.

Thank you,

Michael Fulton
Fulton06@comcast.net

 Please consider the environment before printing this email.

If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender and immediately delete this message and any attachment hereto and/or copy hereof, as such message contains confidential information intended solely for the individual or entity to whom it is addressed. The use or disclosure of such information to third parties is prohibited by law and may give rise to civil or criminal liability.
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From: NoReply@Clark.Wa.Gov
Sent: Saturday, April 11, 2015 12:15 PM
To: Cnty 2016 Comp Plan
Subject: 2016 Comp Plan comments submitted

Following comments were submitted online:

Parcel No:

Subject: Alternative 4 support

Comments:
My property is currently zoned AG-20. Across from my 70 acre farm luxurious houses are being built on 3/4 acre lots. 88th St. is being considered for an alternative artillery. It is also slated for an improvement for the bridge over 5th Plain Creek. A better use of my 70 acres would be to have it zoned for 2.5 to 5 acre parcels. This would be a much better use of my land at some time in the future.

Respectively submitted, Frank Grobli

Submitted by:
Frank Grobli

Email: fgrobli@gmail.com

Address:
17802 NE 88th St
Vancouver, WA 98682
Dear whom it concerns...
Will you see that this letter gets to the commissioners before this coming Tuesday meeting on April 14, 2015.
Our family representatives will also attend and have comments if there is an opportunity.
Thank you,
Alina Ahola McElveny

With respect: To the commissioners,
In September 2012 we three Ahola sisters inherited "tenants in common" 49.05 acres (forest Tier II) east of Hockinson (Tax parcel # 2053840)
This 49.05 acres is the reminder of our Finnish immigrant Grandfather Eliel Ahola's 1905 Homestead. 
Grandpa Ahola and his wife Hilda, raised 10 children on this Homestead. My Father, Eliel and Hilda's youngest living son took over the care of the Homestead in 1939 paying off two mortages put on during the Big Depression of 1930's.
My Father Alfred Ahola and MOM Ruth raised 7 children on this beloved land.
The rest of the 160 acre tree farm (except for 2.2 WN corner acres) are owned by our Ahola siblings and my son Mickael McElveny.
In 2013 we had the 160 acres surveyed, hired a professional Forestor, submitted a Timber Management Plan, communicated with the Fish and wildlife so they could inspect and designate properly and ecologically our two creeks, and we have continued to consult our family lawyers.
On legal advice we have changed the designation from Forestry to Timberlands, in preparation to divide this last 49.05 acres.
As instructed by the Forestry people, we have carefully marked all the boundaries of the separate pieces of this family land.
Now in 2015, or 2016, we three sisters want to divide the 49.05 acres inherited from our Mother's trust.
Alice "Ahola" Chandler would receive 18% (9 acres), to add to her 15 acres, (Tax#205455 & #205410). Donna "Ahola" Andrews would receive 49% (24 acres) as her fair share.
and I, Alina "Ahola" McElveny would receive 33% (16 acres), having already received 6 acres which my son owns.
Zoned at 40 acres, as it is now, or 20, or 10 acres which you say it WILL possibly be, you can see that this is NOT possible.
We need the new zoning under the Comprehensive Growth Plan to be 5 acres as are almost all the lands around us
to the West, South, East and about 1/2 of the North boundary which we share with what was logged off and replanted school land, but we now know that 80 acres of school land was sold to PLUM Creek, a large concern that manages forest products, mineral extraction and property development.

We used your Clark County interactive maps to attempt to count how many smaller lots are all around us in our neighborhood, extending from 189th St to the north, to beyond 139th St to the South, to below 212th ave to the West and East up over the hill to the EAST including and farther East of Bonanza road which borders the Ahola Homestead on the east border. We think there are about 264 or possibly 300 lots of small size. We counted hundreds of lots from 5, 6 and 7 acres the average acreage size. These mostly have homes built on them.

Will you help us? What do you advise??

Yours to help,

truly,

Alina "Ahola" McElveny
22501 NE 159th St.
Brush Prairie, WA 98606
Greetings,
I wanted to follow-up on my comments at this week's April 7th BOCCC Hearing.

Slow Food Southwest Washington would like to offer to put together a tour of a collection of Clark County's mid-sized farms and infrastructure to help you better understand the economic and social value of these mid-sized farms in Clark County's rural areas. If we can get commitment from at least two of the BOCCC members, I would be happy to put that together. We could also try to have some of the possible partners from the Ag land conservation and economic development sector join the tour.

As I said at the BOCCC hearing, I appreciate that you have gone forward with your considerations in ALT4, because of concerns you have heard from rural citizens. Over the last decade plus, rural citizens have worked on a number of reports that advocate for Purchase of Development Rights, Transfer of Development Rights or Agricultural Production Districts. I wanted to send you links to each of these reports to make them more easily accessible:

Analysis of the Agricultural Economic Trends and Conditions in Clark County, Washington April 2007

Clark County Agriculture Preservation Strategies Report March 2009

Rural Lands Task Force Recommendations March 2010

Promoting Agricultural Food Production in Clark County, NOV 2013

Considering the significant and continued advocacy for Purchase of Development Rights, Transfer of Development Rights or Agricultural Production Districts, I feel it prudent that the BOCCC make efforts to at least explore the option further.

I wanted to offer you this short video that tells the story of agricultural land conservation pretty concisely:
http://www.pbs.org/food/features/lexicon-of-sustainability-land-trust/

That video provides a good short story of how the program works generally and how it effects a farm family. To help the county get through the fine details of developing a farmland conservation program, in Washington State, we have the Office of Farmland Preservation. Here is a link to their department: http://ofp.scc.wa.gov
In the short-term, the USDA is offering $332 Million to pay for easements or technical assistance in developing land conservation programs. Applications are due May 15th, it would be great to have the BOCCC's and community planning's support on submitting the proposal. Here are more details:

Many Counties in WA and across the country have developed these programs. Two nearby county's that would be willing to provide feedback and help with the details are Thurston County and Clackamas County. Here is a link to Thurston County:
http://www.co.thurston.wa.us/planning/workingland/workingland-home.htm

King County is a much larger program, but lots to learn from their model. I have attached the actual "DEED OF AND AGREEMENT RELATING TO DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS" that King County uses, in case that is helpful. Here is their website:

Thank you for the opportunity to share this information. I hope it provides some information for your inquiries into Purchase of Development Rights, Transfer of Development Rights or Agricultural Production Districts.

Please feel free to give me a call to discuss this more and talk about the opportunity to tour Clark County's mid-sized farm economy.

Thank you,
Warren Neth

---
Warren Neth
Executive Director
Slow Food Southwest Washington
www.slowfoodswwa.com
(cell) 360-771-1296
DEED OF AND AGREEMENT RELATING TO
DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS

THIS DEED AND AGREEMENT is made this _____ day of ____________, 199__, BY
AND BETWEEN

hereinafter referred to as “Grantors,” AND KING COUNTY, a political subdivision of the State
of Washington hereinafter referred to as “Grantee.”

WHEREAS:
The Grantors are the present owners of the lands described in Exhibit A which is attached hereto
and incorporated herein by reference (the “Land”).
The Grantors recognize that the Land is Farmland or Open Space Land as defined in King County
Ordinance No. 4341, and they desire to cooperate with the Grantee in preserving land devoted to
agricultural and open space uses.
The Grantors are willing to grant and convey to the Grantee the Development Rights in the Land as
such rights are defined in King County Ordinance No. 4341 (said rights being the interest in and the right
to use and subdivide land for any and all residential, commercial, and industrial purposes and activities
which are not incident to agricultural and open space uses), on the terms and conditions and for the
purposes hereinafter set forth. The Grantee is willing to purchase the Development Rights in the Land and
accept this instrument of conveyance.
The Grantee has determined that the acquisition by the Grantee of Development Rights in Farmland
and Open space Land will benefit the public through the preservation of property devoted to agricultural
and open space uses.
The grant and conveyance of Development Rights by the Grantors to the Grantee will preserve the
Land for activities consistent with agricultural and open space uses in perpetuity in accordance with the
specific terms and conditions hereinafter set forth.
NOW THEREFORE WITNESSETH, that the Grantors, for and in consideration of
DOLLARS lawful money of the United States of America, paid to the
Grantors by the Grantee, the receipt whereof is hereby acknowledged, and the Grantors being therewith
fully satisfied, do by these presents grant, bargain, sell, transfer and convey unto the Grantee forever all
Development Rights in respect to the Land, hereby perpetually binding the Land to the restrictions limiting
permitted activities to agricultural and open space uses as specifically delineated in the covenants, terms,
and conditions contained herein, and do also grant such interests, rights and easements, make such
covenants, and subject the land to such servitudes as are necessary to bind the Land in perpetuity to such
restrictions.
The Grantors and Grantee hereby agree that the Land shall be bound by and permanently subject to
the following restrictive covenants, terms, and conditions. None of these covenants, terms, and conditions
shall be construed as allowing a use that is not otherwise permitted by applicable state and local laws,
codes, standards, and ordinances.

REstrictions on use of the land

I. Uses Restricted to Agricultural and Open Space Uses; Agricultural and Open Space Uses Defined. Use of the Land is permanently restricted to solely agricultural and open space uses.
A. “Agricultural uses,” as used herein, means:
(1) The growing, raising, and production of horticultural and agricultural crops, including, but not limited to, vegetables, berries, other fruits, cereal grains, herbs, hay, and silage, and the processing and the marketing for off-premises consumption of such crops grown, raised, or produced on the Land;

(2) All forms of animal husbandry, including the processing and marketing for off-premises consumption of the animals raised on the Land or the products of the same;

(3) The lying fallow or disuse of the Land.
Agricultural uses do not include the construction, habitation, or other use of a dwelling unit, except to the extent such use is specially reserved in this instrument.

B. “Open space uses,” as used herein, means:

(1) Agricultural uses as defined above;

(2) Non-agricultural uses that conserve and enhance natural, scenic, or designated historic resources and that do not permanently compact, remove, sterilize, pollute, or otherwise impair the use of the soil on the Land for the raising of horticultural or agricultural crops.

Neither open space nor agricultural uses include the following: The construction, habitation, or other use of a dwelling unit, except to the extent such use is specifically reserved in this instrument; construction or expansion of buildings or structures for non-agricultural uses; the construction or use of golf courses, parking lots unassociated with agricultural uses, athletic fields, campgrounds, or vehicle raceways or animal raceways other than those principally used for the exercise of animals grown, raised, or produced on the Land. Open space uses may include trails for non-motorized use by the public that are maintained and owned by or for the benefit of a government agency or are maintained and owned by a non-profit conservation agency.

II. Reservation of Dwelling Unit(s). The Grantors reserve the right to the use of ________ single-family units(s) on the Land for the sole purpose of accommodating the Grantors and their successors in interest to the Land, the farm operator, or the families of such persons, or for accommodating agricultural employees of the owner or operator and their families. No more than ________ dwelling units in total will be permitted regardless of whether the Land is subdivided by the Grantors or by any successor in interest of the Grantors. If the land is subdivided, the number of dwelling units allocated to each subdivided parcel out of the total number of dwelling units specified above shall be indicated in the deed to each such parcel and on the face of any plat or other instrument creating the subdivision or conveying an interest in the Land, however, failure to indicate the number of such dwelling units thereon shall not invalidate or otherwise affect the restriction of the total number of dwelling units on the Land. The dwelling unit(s) shall be (a) permanent or mobile structure(s) designed and used for single-family residential occupancy.

III. Further Restriction on Use of the Land. Potential uses of the Land are limited in that the Grantors, their heirs, successors, and assigns shall only be entitled to use, lease, maintain, or improve the Land for agricultural and open space uses, and they shall comply with the following terms, conditions, restrictions, and covenants, which are permanently binding on the Land:

A. No subdivision of the Land that reduces any parcel to less than 20 acres shall be permitted. EXCEPT THAT the Grantors, their heirs, successors, and assigns may elect to subdivide the Land resulting in the creation of a parcel or parcels less than 20 acres in size where each of the following requirements are met: (1) a reserved homesite is attached to each parcel of the Land, after the subdivision; and (2) the reserved homesites on the subdivided parcels would not increase the density of housing on the Land, which means the total acreage prior to the subdivision, to more than one reserved homesite per 35 acres. All restrictions imposed by this instrument shall survive any subdivision.

B. No more than 5 percent of the Land, or of any parcel thereof resulting from a subdivision of the Land, shall be covered by structures and/or non tillable surfaces. “Structures” shall include but
are not limited to residences, barns, machine sheds, permanent greenhouses, associated structures, retail and processing facilities, surfaced parking areas, surfaced driveways, surfaced roadways, and surfaced pads. Temporary shelter for soil-dependent cultivation of horticultural or viticultural crops is not considered a structure. “Non-tillable surfaces” shall include but are not limited to asphalt, concrete, gravel, and any other cover material not normally associated with cultivation of the soil.

C. No mining, drilling, or extracting of oil, gas, gravel, or minerals on or under the Land shall be permitted that causes disruption of the surface of the Land to any extent inconsistent with agricultural uses, and no part of the surface of the Land shall be used for storage or processing of gas, oil, or minerals taken from the Land, other than storage for the private use of the occupants of the Land.

D. No subsurface activities, including excavation for underground utilities, pipelines, or other underground installations, shall be permitted that cause permanent disruption of the surface of the Land. Temporarily disrupted soil surfaces shall be restored in a manner consistent with agricultural uses, including restoration of the original soil horizon sequence within a reasonable period of time after such installation.

E. No dumping or storage of non-agricultural solid or liquid waste, or of trash, rubbish, or noxious materials shall be permitted.

F. No activities that violate sound agricultural soil and water conservation management practices shall be permitted.

G. No signs shall be erected on the Land except for the following purposes:
   1. to state the name of the property and the name and address of the occupant;
   2. to advertise any use or activity consistent with the agricultural or open space uses as herein defined; or
   3. to advertise the property for sale or rent.

IV. Restriction on Use of the Land to Satisfy Open Space Requirements for Development or Use of Other Real Property. Except as is otherwise provided below, in the event that an application is made at any time to a federal, state, or local governmental authority for permission to use of any other real property including, but not limited to, real property that is contiguous to any of the Land hereby restricted, which proposed use is conditioned by such government authority on the existence of a specified quantity of open space or other restrictions on development, the Land shall not be used to contribute toward the satisfaction of any such open space requirement. This restriction shall not apply if the proposed use of the other real property is an agricultural or open space use, as defined herein.

ADDITIONAL COVENANTS AND AGREEMENTS

The Grantors and Grantee further agree as follows:

Covenant Against Encumbrances. The Grantors covenant that they have not done or executed, or allowed to be done or executed, any act, deed, or thing whatsoever whereby the Development Rights hereby conveyed, or any part thereof, now or at any time hereafter, will or may be charged or encumbered in any manner or way whatsoever.

Remedies. If the Grantors, their heirs, successors, assigns, agents, or employees violate or allow the violation of any of the terms, conditions, restrictions, and covenants set forth herein, then the Grantee will be entitled to all remedies available at law or in equity, including, but not limited to, injunctive relief, rescission of contract, or damages, including attorneys’ fees and court costs reasonably incurred by the Grantee in prosecuting such action(s). No waiver or waivers by the Grantee, or by its successors or assigns, of any breach of a term, condition, restriction, or covenant or of any other term, condition,
restriction, or covenant contained herein.

**No Alteration or Amendment.** The terms, conditions, restrictions, and covenants contained herein shall not be altered or amended unless such alteration or amendment shall be made with the written consent of the Grantee, or its successors or assigns, and any such alteration or amendment shall be consistent with the purposes of King County Ordinance No. 4341, as heretofore or hereafter amended.

**Restrictions Binding on Successors.** The Grantors and Grantee agree that the terms, conditions, restrictions, and covenants contained herein shall be binding upon the Grantors, their agents, personal representatives, heirs, assigns, and all other successors in interest to the Land and possessors of the Land, and shall be permanent terms, conditions, restrictions, covenants, servitudes, and easements running with and perpetually binding the Land.

**Transfer of Rights by Grantee.** The Grantee agrees that the Development Rights to the Land shall not be sold, given, divested, transferred, or otherwise reconveyed in whole or in part in any manner except as provided in King County Ordinance No. 4341, as heretofore or hereafter amended. The Grantors, their personal representatives, heirs, successors, or assigns, shall be given the right of first refusal to purchase the Development Rights in the Land provided such disposition and reconveyance be lawfully approved.

**Condemnation.** If the Land is subject to any condemnation action, and if a mutually acceptable agreement as to the compensation to be provided to the Grantee is not reached between Grantee and Grantors within a reasonable period of time, the Grantors will request that the Grantee be made a party to such action in order that it be fully compensated for the loss of, or devaluation in, the Development Rights hereby conveyed.

**No Affirmative Obligations; Indemnification.** Grantee, in purchasing the Development Rights and related interests described herein, assumes no affirmative obligations whatsoever for the management, supervision or control of the Land or of any activities occurring on the Land. Grantors shall indemnify Grantee and hold Grantee harmless from all damages, costs (including, but not limited to, attorneys' fees and other costs of defense incurred by Grantee), and other expenses of every kind arising from or incident to any claim or action for damages, injury, or loss suffered or alleged to have been suffered on or with respect to the Land. This provision shall be binding upon the Grantors for so long as they hold fee title to the Land, and shall bind their successors in interest to the fee title to the Land.

**Grantee's Right to Enter onto the Land.** After giving reasonable notice to the possessors of the Land, the Grantee or its authorized representative shall have the right to enter from time to time onto the Land and into structures located thereon for the sole purposes of inspection and enforcements of the terms, conditions, restrictions and covenants hereby imposed.

**Severability.** If any section or provision of this instrument shall be held by any court of competent jurisdiction to be unenforceable, this instrument shall be construed as though such section or provision had not been included in it, and the remainder of this instrument shall be enforced as the expression of the parties' intentions. If any section or provision of this instrument is found to be subject to two constructions, one of which would render such section or provision invalid, and one of which would render such section or provision valid, then the latter construction shall prevail. If any section or provision of this instrument is determined to be ambiguous or unclear, it shall be interpreted in accordance with the policies and provisions expressed in King County Ordinance No. 4341.

**IN WITNESS WHEREOF,** the parties have hereunto set their hand and seals the day and year first above written.

**GRANTEE**

**GRANTORS**

**KING COUNTY**
BY ______________________________                    ______________________________

STATE OF WASHINGTON    )
COUNTY OF KING         ) SS

On this _____ day of ____________, 1997, before me, the undersigned, a Notary Public in and for
the State of Washington, personally appeared ____________________________, and
____________________________, husband and wife, to me known to be the individuals described in
and who executed the within and foregoing instrument, and acknowledged that they signed the same as
their free and voluntary act and deed for the uses and purposes therein mentioned.

WITNESS my hand and official seal hereto affixed the day and year first above written.

Notary Public in and for the
State of Washington, residing
at
My appointment expires
April 8, 2015

TO: BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS

RE: COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES/COMMUNITY PLANNING

We have been following the alternatives presented for proposed changes to the comprehensive plan, and would like to comment.

We are wholly in favor of the changes proposed in Alternative Four. We feel these are fair and equitable for rural landowners. Agriculture has changed a lot over the years, and there is no longer any need for large tracts to be set aside for farming. Five and ten acres are sufficient. The other alternatives do not begin to adequately address the problems rural landowners face in order to make the best decisions about their land.

Please consider Alternative Four as the only reasonable choice.

Ed Sarkinen, landowner

Elaine Sarkinen, landowner

22713 NE 152nd Avenue, Battle Ground, WA 98604
David Madore
April 10 at 11:22pm · Edited ·

Speak up while there is time – your future property zoning:
Three days remain for you to record your voice in the public record on Alternative 4, the proposed rural property zoning for the next 20 years.
http://www.clark.wa.gov/engageclarkcounty/…

Your few minutes to weigh in on your preferences will provide one more way that we can hear from our neighbors that own rural property.

Some say that no citizen should have private property rights, that the "greater good" is served by requiring citizens to live in high density transit oriented inner cities and that rural properties should be left to nature, that government should buy up private property rights to prohibit any further rural development.

Yet, the overwhelming feedback I hear in person from rural land owners is that private property is far better off in their hands than in government hands. They want their freedom, flexibility, and private property rights restored.

Skamania County's declared State of Emergency is an example of government gross mismanagement of our rich forests by the US Forest Service squandering our natural resources.
http://clark.wa.gov/.../docum/.../SkamaniaCountyResolution107.pdf

Who do you say should own the property rights of rural land in Clark County?

What do you think about the four suggested land use and growth alternatives?

---

20 Statements On Forum

1)2 Pike inside Clark County

I am supportive of Alternative 4.

Like · Comment · Share

Eric Cordova, Allen Hoff and 2 others like this.

2 shares

View 4 more comments
Like · Reply · April 11 at 11:13pm

Alvin Fischer We are developing the way in which property is useful for all people, regardless of economic class. The fact that we pay taxes for roads and many other things we have in common, regulations for the safety of all people, means that the community and individuality are both important for our time and time to come. It's not one and not the other, it's "both and".
2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update

"What do you think about the four suggested land use and growth alternatives?"

All On Forum Statements sorted chronologically

As of April 10, 2015, 7:37 AM

As with any public comment process, participation in Engage Clark County is voluntary. The statements in this record are not necessarily representative of the whole population, nor do they reflect the opinions of any government agency or elected officials.
2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update

What do you think about the four suggested land use and growth alternatives?

As of April 10, 2015, 7:37 AM, this forum had:
Attendees: 139
On Forum Statements: 16
All Statements: 18
Minutes of Public Comment: 54

This topic started on April 7, 2015, 5:27 PM.
2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update
What do you think about the four suggested land use and growth alternatives?

Jim Malinowski  
April 9, 2015, 10:20 PM

It is clear that many of the contributors to this forum have not read the GMA. The county violated the clear mandates of the GMA in their 1995 massive down zoning. CCCU won its lawsuit against the county for this reason. Judge Poyfair's decision stated that "the result is a plan that gives little regard for the realities of existing rural development in direct contradiction of the terms of the GMA." (See the Columbian article of April 6, 1997). The county has been acting in defiance of that court order ever since. We deserve better of our county government. Alternative 4 is a move in the direction of obeying the clear terms of the GMA and reducing the current high percentage of non-conforming lots in the rural areas of the county.

Jim Malinowski  
Amboy  
1 Supporter

Jerry Winters  
April 9, 2015, 10:20 PM

I support Alt. 4. Ag. 20 needs to break down even more, 5s, and 1s. This would allow small home framing and build community. After a plan is adopted will there still be holding ie. Lt. Industrial overlay. Vancouver needs to increase the UGB it may not be the county's job, but the city missed the boat!! It's Clark County's plan, why let Vancouver control the outcome!!

Supporter

Dennis Karnopp  
April 9, 2015, 9:09 PM

Clark County and Washington in general where a trashy state compared to Oregon and it's land use zoning. We moved into Washington in 1979 and where appalled by the lack of zoning, it looked like trailer trash. I am firmly in favor of keeping the existing land use laws and zoning restrictions to keep Clark and Washington not becoming trailer trash again. I know that people want to use their property for whatever they want but, sometimes its to the determent to the community as a whole, and will lower growth and property values. Now we have Oregonians moving into Washington because of the tax structure and Clark County is slowly getting cleaned up, this transformation of wealth will definitely stop if the existing zoning and land use laws are relaxed.

Terry Conner  
April 9, 2015, 6:30 PM

The citizens of Clark County did NOT ask for this.

Alt 4 is yet another half-cooked, special interest move, credited to the same rogue Councilour who continues to defy long standing protocol and logic. Alt 4 began as a direct violation of the HRC, having been directed by Madore to have his non-qualified protégé, Stillman whip up some maps, while he (Madore) tried his single hand at Planning. No experience, no intelligence, no vetting.
2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update

What do you think about the four suggested land use and growth alternatives?

Then, the brass tacks of Alt 4 are simply and tragically BAD for rural farmers, suburban landowners, and the County community that depends on and supports local farming.

Just a few of the bad results would be water shortage, taxes to support development of the 8000 lots, detachment of rural well being, violating the GMA curfew, future legal costs, further morale decline to citizenry, further animos towards the BOCC from Clark County residents.

2 Supporters

Tim Gaughan

April 9, 2015, 5:43 PM

I am opposed to Alternative 4. This Alternative was composed, proposed and maps attempted to be modified midway through the open house process by a lone county councilor who has no apparent expertise or professional credentials to draft a land use plan to be considered under the GMA. Madore has ignored the planning process, advice of planning professionals and apparent dismay by legal staff. Alternative 4 appears to move against the grain of the primary intent of the GMA by promoting urban sprawl and future costs to all taxpayers in ClarkCounty. This alternative has the potential of litigation and sanctions by the State.

4 Supporters

Suzanne Kendall

April 9, 2015, 4:46 F

I oppose Alternative 4 for the following reasons:

1. Phase 2 of the Growth Management Plan Update Process is scheduled to last 24 months. The time was initially spent getting Public Input on the three staff-proposed alternatives that concluded with the August and October 2014 hearings. The remainder of Phase 2 was to be spent analyzing the three established alternatives.

Instead, over 12 months into Phase 2 and after the August and October 2014 Public Hearings, one of the three existing County Councilors introduced a 4th alternative without meaningful consultation with the citizens or agreement of County planners. No public hearings have been held on Alternative 4. Instead, the County Councilor held “open houses” with the opportunity for hundreds of citizens (at each open house) to crowd around a room full of maps and make an attempt to get the attention of County staff (6-8) or County Councilors (3) to ask questions and have a meaningful conversation.

If the Clark County Council demands that the tardy Alternative proposed by one individual representative remain and be fully analyzed for it’s intended and unintended consequences, THE Growth Management Act DEADLINE OF JANUARY 2016 MUST BE EXTENDED BY AT LEAST FOUR MONTHS.

2. I am very concerned about the costs to Clark County taxpayers if the Council decides to allow an unannounced Alternative 4 proposal 18 months into our 36 month process. If this Alternative is allowed to stand the County must, and will, be taken to court. If history is any indication, the County will be in costly litigation for up to, including Supreme Court litigation, 7+ years.
3. It is my understanding that Alternative 4 creates at least 8000 more parcels and that the current minimum 20 acre parcels will be reduced to as low as 5 and 10 acres. I value our local, productive farm lands and believe strongly that our working farms must be protected.

In this age of changing climate and reduced water supplies, we should treasure what good water we have left in Clark County. I have experience in managing farm land of approximately 1500 acres and know how difficult it is to farm on a 5 acre postage stamp-size plot with good farm practices which require crop rotation.

Adding over 8000 parcels with Alternative 4 will also make it difficult to supply water to all the new development. Wells are already drying up and Clark County Public Health must review all new private wells for adequate water availability to meet GMA regulations prior to the issuance of building permits.

Finally, it will be very difficult to maintain the quality of the water we have. With the addition of thousands of new lots and a steadily increasing population in our formerly agricultural areas, we will have greatly increased runoff, contamination and pollution.

4. The costs to the taxpayers for the dramatic increase in the need for public services will be immense. The mass development of our county from 9300 to 17000+ parcels will benefit outside developers to the detriment of the citizens who elected this County Council. I believe that a decision of this magnitude must be considered by the FULL 5-member Council required by our new charter.

Supporters

John Ley

I am grateful there is an Alt. 4.

The facts as presented at the public hearings: "6 of every 10 parcels in the Rural category do not conform to our current zoning map. Seven of every 10 parcels in the AG category do not conform to our current zoning map. Eight of every 10 parcels in the FR category do not conform to our current zoning map."

Are the land owners wrong? Or is the map & previous zoning wrong?

Clearly, the previous map (20 year old) was wrong, and is penalizing current land owners.

We clearly need to respect property ownership rights. We need a zoning map that at a minimum, reflects current reality. It is irresponsible to have 60-80% of rural land owners 'not in compliance' with current zoning law.

My understanding is that Alt 4 does that. Thank you!

3 Supporters

Name not shown

April 9, 2015, 10:18 AM
We need the combination of ALT 3 AND 4. Let's expand the UGB and create more local jobs within the cities. The plan was poorly organized back 20 years ago, like a shotgun approach; we can do SO much better for this county and our communities! Not saying to make everything 1 acre lots but if there's a 40 acre parcel with 5's or 10's around it, maybe we need to have some adjustment. It's not like it used to be, farming, forest, etc. Plus how many people can afford 40 acres instead of a 10? We need a better plan and to have some consistency in zoning/UGB. If a person living on 40 acres wants to split their land into 10's for their children to start their own families/memories as they did growing up at that location, what's so wrong with that? And if not, that's their choice but it should be an option, and their right. By do this it's going to keep local families here, add local work, and create more tax dollars for the help of the community!

4 Supporters

Michele Wollert

April 9, 2015, 10:04 AM

I am a Clark County resident of Vancouver. Although I am not a rural landowner or farmer, I contribute more than my fair share of county taxes on several properties in the city. I support local agriculture by being a committed consumer of local produce, pasture-raised eggs, and meat. I am a loyal customer who supports Clark County businesses, restaurants and farmer's markets that sell local farm products and I have purchased CSA farm shares. I am including this personal information as a preface to my comments because I have heard two councilors diminish the testimony of residents who do not own large amounts of rural land or who live in urban areas. All Clark County voices count when considering changes to the Growth Management Act and I hope you will consider mine.

I am opposed to Alternative 4 of the GMA for the following reasons;

Alternative 4 was developed without the input of Clark County community planning experts. It was written by one councilor, who has no experience in planning, with the limited and biased feedback of one honored group of landowner advocates. It excludes important other stakeholder and expert information, which places Clark County at increased legal risk.

Alternative 4 threatens our water quality. Evidence-based research shows that urban sprawl pollutes water by removing native vegetation, increasing impervious surfaces, erosion, and pollution from cars and trucks on roads since more residents will need to drive.

Alternative 4 threatens our drinking water supplies. This option will create more rural lots than can be served by ground water supplies. Rural development is already contributing to wells going dry and Alternative 4 will exacerbate the problem.

Alternative 4 threatens our working farms and fertile land by paving over a precious, threatened resource. Once that it done, the loss of farmland cannot be regained.

Alternative 4 will cost taxpayers and ratepayers more money than they are spending now. Many peer-reviewed studies show that compact development saves taxpayers money in property taxes and community services.

Alternative 4 increases litigation risks and the costs of appeals to Clark County and its taxpayers. During the
2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update
What do you think about the four suggested land use and growth alternatives?

...ut GMA update, Clark County spent seven years in appeals, all the way to the Washington State Supreme Court. In the end, Clark County was mandated to take 1,500 acres of farmland out of the urban growth areas and re-designate it as Agriculture 20. These appeals are costly in terms of time and tax payer money.

10 Supporters

Loren Sickles

April 9, 2015, 12:02 AM

I am in opposition to alternative 4 primarily on the basis of how this alternative was brought forward. The primary proponent has openly stated that no-one with knowledge of growth management, land-use or environmental laws was involved in the development of Alt 4. The formation of alternative 4 was done behind closed doors and without prior knowledge of the whole council or county staff. Alternative 4 should be, at the least, put on hold until the two new council members are installed, or scrapped altogether.

Given the time constraints of State law the prudent path forward is to continue discussions focused on alternatives 1-3 as they are the only ones which have been thoroughly vetted by knowledgeable people.

8 Supporters

Esther Schrader

April 8, 2015, 11:05 PM

* nything is better than Alternative 4.

_ Supporters

Name not shown

April 8, 2015, 9:59 PM

While I really do not think Alt 1 is even viable anymore and Alt 2 is really bad in my opinion especially for my area I think Alt 3 has potential as does Alt 4. If we could work Alt 3 for the urban growth boundary areas and Alt 4 for the rural and Forestry and Ag plots I would see a seriously happy balance for all the landowners.

4 Supporters

Angela Pond

April 8, 2015, 9:58 PM

Alternative 3 gets my vote as the best option. Allow our smaller communities to develop and marginally expand their boundaries. Alternative 4 is a thinly veiled attempt to develop the north county with thousands more homes. That sounds good...but wait...the homeowners will be working in Portland and there is no way to get there now without sitting in traffic for an hour or more each way. No plans in our lifetime to change this. Keep the north county rural, beautiful and producing goods on family farms.

9 Supporters

me not shown

April 8, 2015, 9:50 PM
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Sadly, it appears feedback such as mine and others (including planners) is meaningless. I do not wish to live in Los Angeles. I would like to continue to be able to purchase local farm products. The entire process behind alternative 4 smacks of inside baseball. If there is sanity, it will not be adopted.

#### 7 Supporters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name not shown</th>
<th>April 8, 2015, 9:20 PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I believe Alt 4 violates the Growth Management Act. It is also an insult to the qualified and talented staff who have worked on putting together robust and viable alternatives. It risks lawsuits and more-wasted money by this council. I live in north county and do not want to be surrounded by McMansions. I believe in the viability of Clark County's agricultural community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 10 Supporters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marvin Case</th>
<th>April 8, 2015, 4:03 PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have examined maps of the four suggested land use alternatives. I have talked briefly with two county staff members. I think Alternative 4 is the most honest and realistic of those offered. In my area (although the plan does not benefit me) the plan coincides with existing parcel sizes. It is logical, drawing lines between larger and smaller forest zones along coinciding or conforming parcels. Alternative 4 preserves rural character while recognizing existing conditions. Selfishly, I would like my parcels to be located in smaller zones. But failing that Alternative 4 is an intellectually honest portrayal of growth objectives in the county. Marvin Case</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From: CenturyLink Customer <ckeller360@q.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 09, 2015 6:06 PM
To: Cnty 2016 Comp Plan
Cc: Colleen Keller
Subject: comments to the EIS/current planning effort

To: Clark County Community Planning
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

From: Carl and Colleen Keller
Brush Prairie, WA 89606
Ckeller360@q.com

April 8, 2015

This responds to the Clark County Planning Commission’s current planning efforts. In particular, we understand the planning team currently seeks to identify alternatives for the proposed Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) on the modified Comprehensive Growth Management Plan. We trust that our comments/recommendations will be appropriately considered/acknowledged.

General:

1. Please identify the reasons that have necessitated the current planning revisions to the 2007 Plan. Also state how often future revisions/modifications are anticipated, and what might dictate any future revisions. Once completed, we are concerned how long the EIS would realistically remain in effect before any future Plan revision could be needed and what could necessitate revision to the Plan.

2. Please identify when the draft EIS will be issued as a draft for public comment and if there will be scheduled public hearings on the draft EIS before the document is finalized and subsequent decisions made.

3. Unless the Growth Management Plan specifically provides bonafide provisions that protect the environment, and preserve rural, historic, cultural, wildlife, natural areas and farmland for Clark County, we firmly believe that revisions to the Plan itself must first be established to address these issues (along with human urbanization) before examining alternatives in the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

Specific:

1. While we recognize that this planning effort focuses on community and urban development, the action alternatives do not provide convincing legal or sound basis for protecting the factors listed in No. 3 (above). We believe that appropriately recognizing the environment, including rural, historic, cultural, wildlife, natural areas, agricultural, and farmland areas in Clark County is of paramount importance while accommodating human growth, expansion, and development.

We urge that this environmental review process be used to establish protection for farmland and agricultural use, so that landowners can make a living off their land and not be taxed off of it. Preserving farmland in an economically viable way would help mitigate the need for landowners to chop their land into small parcels that can lead to unsightly, hard-to-manage growth that creates an onerous burden on the taxpayer.
Other than political and economic reasons for urban growth into the more “rural” areas of Clark County, the EIS alternatives must examine the necessity to maintaining the rural, historic, and cultural presence of the county, including past agricultural uses and farming. The EIS must identify positive (and negative) impacts from creating human growth opportunities into these aforementioned properties. Additionally, impacts to wildlife and their habitat resources) must also be disclosed from potential human growth into previously non-impacted or undeveloped lands in the county.

2. The EIS must clearly define the administrative and physical boundaries for each alternative that will be determined. There should not be overlap between/among the alternatives.

3. During the environmental evaluation process, we believe all proposed alternatives must be equally examined in order to provide a comprehensive, fact-finding disclosure that will enable decision-makers to make most informed decisions in selecting a “preferred alternative.” Although there is some overlap among the alternatives currently proposed, each of them should have their individual parameters, initiatives, and variables that should be objectively analyzed separately to provide a basis for comparison among all alternatives.

4. We support community development and growth within the contiguous “cities” of Clark County (as currently proposed in Alternative 3), that provide the “hubs” for county urbanization. However we don’t see that there are any residential and business growth restrictions in the more rural areas of the county and are quite concerned with possible uncontrolled human expansion into wildlands, forests, farmlands, and wildlife habitat. We believe this must be recognized in a prudent manner during this planning effort!

5. There should be a section in the upcoming EIS to outline any alternatives that have been considered to date, but ruled out for further evaluation along with reasoning why they were no longer considered.

6. The EIS should evaluate short-term, long-term, and cumulative effects for each of the EIS alternatives being evaluated. This would help in the data gathering and analysis of this growth planning effort. Reasonable timeframes should be spelled out for these three terms.

7. The EIS must clearly outline the existing and proposed boundaries for human growth in the county. Any proposed expansion or modification to the current mapped boundaries must be explained/justified.

8. We strongly recommend that “best public use” as applicable to this revised Comprehensive Growth Management Plan and EIS effort, must be explained clearly.

9. As appropriate, the EIS should appropriately identify and define mitigation for preserving the rural, historic, and cultural attributes of human expansion likely in the county.

10. We strongly oppose reducing the zoning of 20 acre parcels (currently ) down to 10 or 5 acre lot sizes within the confines of the EIS, as identified in Alternates 2 and 4. This would reduce the land character, diminish rural settings, restrict open space, and create opportunities for uncontrolled development throughout the county, thereby further changing the rural and natural character of the county.
O'Donnell, Mary Beth

From: Snodgrass, Bryan
Sent: Thursday, April 09, 2015 1:17 PM
To: Cnty 2016 Comp Plan; Orjiako, Oliver
Cc: Eric Eismann (e.eismann@e2landuse.com) (e.eismann@e2landuse.com);
    jeff.niten@ci.ridgefield.wa.us; 'erin.erdman@cityofbg.org' (erin.erdman@cityofbg.org);
    Mitch Kneipp (mkneipp@ci.washougal.wa.us)
Subject: joint cities letter for April 14 comp plan hearing
Attachments: 4 14 15 joint cities ltr final.pdf

Oliver
Attached please find a finalized joint cities letter for the April 14 hearing, which I am also copying to the County plan input address. Thanks, let me or others know if there are questions. BRS

Bryan Snodgrass | Principal Planner

CITY OF VANCOUVER, WASHINGTON
Community and Economic Development Department
415 W 6th Street • Vancouver, WA 98660

P: (360) 487-7946 | TTY: (360) 487-8602 |
www.cityofvancouver.us | www.cityofvancouver.us/socialmedia
April 8, 2015

Councilor David Madore, Chair  
Councilor Tom Mielke  
Councilor Jeanne Stewart

Subject: April 14, 2015, hearing on EIS alternatives and adjusted growth assumptions for the Clark County Comprehensive Plan.

Honorable Councilors:

On behalf of the cities of Clark County, we offer the enclosed testimony for the April 14 hearing. We appreciate the opportunity for input.

EIS Alternatives

As cities we support including Alternative 3 to evaluate the cities UGA proposals, and do not object to having some form of a rural alternative. However, the extent of rural changes envisioned in Alternative 4 raises significant concerns about impacts to cities in this process and beyond:

- Alternative 4 was originally discussed as simply recognizing existing lots, but County data indicates it would allow for future creation of 11,006 more new rural and resource building lots than could be created under current zoning.
- A significant portion of this growth would be adjacent or near to existing urban areas, impacting cities in two ways: In the short term, it would add to the demand for roads, schools, and other public services within urban areas; in the long term, it would create small parcelization that could prevent or limit future urban development for jobs or other purposes.
- From a process standpoint, including Alternative 4 as envisioned would add significantly to the time and cost of the upcoming EIS review and Comprehensive Plan update. Including it in the EIS will also create widespread community expectations that something similar be adopted.
• Adopting Alternative 4 as envisioned could pose substantial legal risk to the overall Comprehensive Plan update. It allows widespread density increases on resource lands and rural lands next to them, which appears inconsistent with the past emphasis by the Courts in Clark County and elsewhere on resource land protection.

Some of these concerns impact Clark County more directly than cities, but as partners and neighbors in this adoption process, cities will not be immune. We urge the Board to consider the following adjustments:

EIS Recommendations:

1) To avoid precluding efficient future urban growth, only include properties 1 mile or more from existing UGAs in Alternative 4.
2) To make Alternative 4 consistent with its stated vision of recognize existing legal lots, only include properties which were segregated before 1994 in the Alternative. Segregation information is readily available from assessor data and can be easily incorporated into the mapping.
3) Ensure that the EIS analyze the full range of Alternative 4 impacts to public services, as well as the following as required by law:
   a) Impacts to adjacent cities - WAC 197-11-060(4)(b)
   b) Long as well as short term impacts -WAC 197-11-060(4)(c)
   c) Consideration of similar impacts from other current projects also calling for rural intensification, such as the proposed Rural Industrial Land Bank, and proposed removal of limits on the number of employees in rural home occupations. - WAC 197-11-060 (3)(b)

Growth Forecasts and Assumptions

The cities continue to support Board’s overall objectives stated throughout this process of emphasizing jobs over housing growth, and of keeping cities “whole” by not forcing unrequested reductions or expansions of Urban Growth Areas (UGAs) beyond the site specific UGA changes the cities have proposed. We support the new modest adjustment to the original growth forecasts and allocations proposed by staff, provided that they continue to support these objectives, as we understand they are intended to do.

However, we oppose more fundamental changes to the assumptions, such as requests to increase the countywide population forecasts to match the past 50-year trend, or to significantly increase the assumed amount of residential lands needed for infrastructure. These or other changes that increase residential land supplies beyond the current proposal are not
technically warranted, would undermine the jobs priorities you have set, and would impose unwanted UGA changes on the cities. Please refer to our November 2014 correspondence for documentation. Overall, we believe the updated assumptions proposed provide sufficient amounts of land for local jurisdictions to fully accommodate growth.

Assumptions Recommendations:

1) Adjust growth forecasts and allocations as necessary to maintain consistency with city proposals for expanding/maintaining UGAs
2) Avoid larger changes in assumptions which undermine jobs goals or force unrequested UGA reductions or expansions.

We again appreciate the opportunity for input, and the inclusive process that you and your staff have led. The cities do have concerns about the process in which Alternative 4 has been developed in recent weeks. Some of this may be a result of the difficulties in expanding what had been a concise Comprehensive Plan update process focused on jobs and a handful of site specific UGA changes, and then grafting onto it widespread density changes throughout the rural area. As noted in Board discussion at the March 11 work session, there is no requirement that rural changes be completed by June 2016, as there is for the urban changes. As the process moves forward, we respectfully request you consider options for decoupling the two processes.

Sincerely,

[Signatures]

City of Battle Ground
City of Camas

City of La Center
City of Ridgefield

City of Vancouver
City of Washougal

City of Woodland
April 9, 2015

Councilor David Madore, Chair
Councilor Tom Mielke
Councilor Jeanne E. Stewart

Subject: April 14, 2015 County public hearing on the Comprehensive Plan update

Honorable Councilors:

On behalf of the City of Vancouver, we offer the following in support of the joint cities letter dated April 8, 2015, findings in regard to growth assumptions. City correspondence, as well as County staff documents, indicates that existing UGAs with the cities’ site specific expansions are fully adequate to accommodate anticipated long term growth. This letter provides further documentation in light of a recent Columbian article on population growth that occurred in 2014.

• As reported by the Columbian, the US Census bureau estimates Clark County population grew 1.7% during calendar year 2014, slightly faster than other counties in the region for that year. The article did not report however, that individual years vary considerably, and in 2012 and 2013 Clark grew more slowly than Washington and Multnomah Counties.

• For this Comprehensive Plan update process, the Board last year adopted the OFM Medium long term forecast projecting 562,000 persons countywide by 2035, or an average increase of 1.12% per year, over 20 years. However, the OFM forecast did not assume every single year would meet the 20-year average, and in fact projected faster growth in the early years. The OFM Medium long term forecast is already being used by RTC for local long term transportation planning, and is fully reasonable for this update process, with whatever minor adjustments are needed to keep cities whole.

• The amount of land provided to accommodate growth is equally driven by development assumptions as well as forecasts. Last year the Board adopted assumptions that provide extra padding to ensure more than adequate 20-year residential land supplies are provided:
  ➢ The Board increased the previous market factor assumption of the amount of additional residential land that must be added to account for otherwise developable land that won’t develop over 20 years for market reasons.
  ➢ The Board retained a second similar assumption, the not-to-develop factor, which further assumes 10% of unconstrained vacant residential land and 30% of underutilized land also won’t develop for 20 years, also for market-only reasons.
  ➢ The Board retained existing assumptions for the amount of residential land that won’t develop for environmental reasons, or will be used for infrastructure.
The Board retained existing assumptions for how densely urban residential land will develop, despite County Assessor data indicating clearly changing development patterns. Single family residential land is assumed to develop at an average density of 5 units per acre, despite the fact that new single family lots created in urban zones countywide since the last plan update in 2007 have a median density of 7 units per acre. The data further show that almost ¼ of all urban single family lots created for development countywide since 2007 are less than 5000 square feet in size, yet the land supply calculations assume all such lots will remain undeveloped for 20 years.

Beyond these technical forecasting issues are the policy impacts on the ground. This Board has mentioned a desire to change the weather, not just predict it. Improving the countywide ratio of jobs to housing was discussed at length during last year’s adoptions. If population forecasts and residential land supplies are now significantly increased, jobs forecasts and supplies will then also have to be increased that much more, just to keep pace with, let alone improve, the current ratios. This would likely result in significant UGA expansions for cities, many of which are still catching up from the local 2007 expansions, the largest in state history.

Large UGA expansions in this update may outstrip the region’s ability to provide adequate urban facilities and services. If the Board wishes to build conservatism into capital facilities planning, it could assume high levels of per capita demand for facilities. It could also assume faster than average growth will occur in the first 6-10 years of the forecast, an approach Clark County explicitly adopted in the last update. Either approach is preferable from a facilities planning standpoint to simply increasing population growth forecasts and residential land supplies, which in turn leads to more housing growth, greater need for facilities, and higher costs.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input, and for similar opportunities in the past. As indicated in the joint cities letter, we request the Board maintain the general course it has set in this process regarding long term growth planning, with adjustments as noted in Issue Paper 4.2, provided they keep cities whole and do not trigger UGA changes they have not requested. UGA changes should also not be somehow mathematically triggered by rural policy. If new rural growth is enabled to the point where the County believes the previously assumed 90/10 urban-rural split is no longer appropriate, it should change that ratio, which has never been considered a goal, accordingly.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Bryan Snodgrass, Principal Planner, City of Vancouver Community and Economic Development Dept.
Following comments were submitted online:

Parcel No: 233488000

Subject: 2016 Growth Plan-ALT4

Comments:
We need the combination of ALT 3 AND 4. Let's expand the UGB and create more local Jobs within the cities. The plan was poorly organized back 20 years ago, like a shotgun approach; we can do SO much better for this county and our communities! Not saying to make everything 1 acre lots but if there's a 40 acre parcel with 5's or 10's around it, maybe we need to have some adjustment. It's not like it used to be, farming, forest, etc. Plus how many people can afford 40 acres instead of a 10? We need a better plan and to have some consistency in zoning/UGB. If a person living on 40 acres wants to split their land into 10's for their children to start their own families/memories as they did growing up at that location, what's so wrong with that? And if not, that's their choice but it should be an option, and their right. By do this it's going to keep local families here, add local work, and create more tax dollars for the help of the community!

Yes this option would benefit my land, but also being a local Land Surveyor and my soon to be wife being an Engineer, this option would be a benefit for our jobs, family, and futures. Just one of the many ways that this Alt could help support and benefit the OUR community!

Submitted by:
Mark Boon

Email: mboon@live.com

Address:
118733 NE 274th Street
Battle Ground, Washington
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM
March/April 2015

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Karen Gilliland

Address: 35809 NE 31st Ave La Center

Open house location: ☑ April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson

Comment: Property ID 259345000

Our current zoning is PR-40 We own 19.76 acres immediately to our south is 10 acres. To the north are 5 acres or less.

Not one altar does anything except keep us the same. We are unable to care for 20 acres any more. This is a physical and financial hardship we need to sell half just to keep our home.

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: Kmz98620@yahoo.com

Other ways to comment:

Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2014update/comments

E-mail your comment to us:
comp.plan@clark.wa.gov

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOCC Hearing.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
Clark County Community Planning
Comp. Plan Alt.
PO Box 9810
Vancouver WA 98662
WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT RIDGEFIELD HIGH SCHOOL, 2630 SOUTH HILLHURST ROAD, RIDGEFIELD, WA. 98642

RECEIVED APR 09 2015

CCCU WOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR COMMENTS REGARDING CHANGES PROPOSED IN ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES TO THESE AREAS THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.

2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC RURAL ZONES TO REFLECT SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS

3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.

4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE AND FAMILY OWNED WOODLOTS

5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/URBAN HOLDING LAND OverlayS THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS

6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND RETURN THIS FORM TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. OR CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS

SIGNATURE

ADDRESS

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

OTHER COMMENTS

________________________________________

012873
PLEASE SELECT ALTERNATIVE 4!!!

Our great-grandfather, John H. Fletcher, was elected Clark County Assessor in 1874 and again in 1882; he was a prune rancher along the Columbia.

Our family has tried to responsibly manage agricultural or forest land in Clark County ever since. But we have found the restrictive zoning treatment of forest land in the 1994 CGMP very difficult to work with.

I am currently 82 years old, living on my husband’s tree farm in King County but still actively involved with family tree farm operations in Clark County and I beg you to make estate planning and generational land transfer more reasonable for owners of forest land in Clark County. Please give us forest landowners more flexibility to manage our lands, and help us to keep our children and grandchildren in sustainable, managed forestry. We family tree farmers are much better stewards of the land than the large industrial landowners!

Sincerely,

Patricia Lee Witter (& family)
15200 Cedar Falls Road SE
North Bend, WA 98045

425-888-3216
lklw@comcast.net
March 26, 2015


Introductions:

- Heather Tischbein, Former Yacolt / North County resident, Clark Farm Forestry Association: Heather referred to the group as an ad-hock coalition of groups in Clark County with concerns and interest in growth management and interest in Alternate 4 in its current form. Range of concerns include tax implications of Alt 4; water availability — access — recharge; GMA process being adhered to correctly and the new charter separation of power stipulations being appropriately being adhered to, whose voice is being considered for speaking, concern of quality of life, and what the true facts are.

- Bianca Benson, Executive Director of Friends of Clark County / La Center resident: She spoke about the makeup of Friends of Clark County.

- Val Alexander, Board member of Friends of Clark County, farm owner in La Center, stated she was fine with anyone in the room speaking on her behalf. Councilor Stewart stated for the record Val Alexander would be submitting written documents as well.

- Anne Lawrence, a Board member of the Clark-Cowlitz Farm Bureau, Owner of Storytree Farms and a Founding member of the Food Systems Council said she was concerned about how the proposed Alternative 4 of the Comprehensive Grown Management Plan update may take valuable farm land out of production and referenced a document they produced while serving on the Agriculture Preservation Advisory Council.

- Stacey Righter, North County Farm person, Secretary of the Clark-Cowlitz Farm Bureau, Second Vice President for the Washington State Young Farmers and Ranchers Board, associated with Dobbins farms.

- Richard Dyrland, Semi- retired, hydrologist, Board of Directors for Friends of the East Fork Lewis River, Fish First, and Friends of Clark County.

- Warren Neth, Slow Food SWWA Chapter Chair, Clark County Food Systems, 5th Generation farm resident in Ridgefield speaking on rural character.

- Gretchen Starke, Conservation Chair, Vancouver Audubon, Board member of Friends of Clark County, Clark County resident for 40 years speaking on habitat and endangered species.

- Sydney Reisbick, President of Friends of Clark County, resident 1974, speaking on financial issues on Alterative 4.
Dyrland spoke about surface and ground water and spoke about water concerns in relation to the recharge rate. Reisbig also joined the discussion stating her concerns of loss of water. Alexander stated she has already lost one well due to development. Righter also spoke about water issues.

Reisbig stated that water from Clark Public Utilities has chlorine and other things in it not beneficial / friendly to plants. Tischbein inquired about these issues at the open house and county staff responded the issues were not being looked at regarding alternative 4 but suggested the Department of Ecology should monitor it. Further discussion ensued about water impacts regarding Alternative 4.

Starke spoke about surface and ground water in relation to endangered species.

Tischbein spoke about her concerns with the Councilors in them acting for the common good for the taxpayers in representing all citizens.

Lawrence spoke about her concerns with her interactions with Councilor Madore. She states she feels like he isn't really listening. She also spoke about the Agriculture Preservation Advisory Council. She stated the group's preference is Alternative 1.

Neth stated he feels Alternative 4 is bucking the trend of the planning they have been doing over 20 years.

Stewart spoke about notes she took at the Alternative 4 work session. She spoke about the cities deadlines.

Starke spoke about the capital facilities plans.

Stewart thanked the group for coming and participating. She inquired about suggestions / preference of the current alternatives.

Tischbein stated Alternative 1 allows for more conversations on the bigger picture.

Benson spoke about the forest and AG parcels in relation to tax breaks.

Stewart stated she thinks Alternative 1 is just a way to stop the process. She stated she would like to find a responsible balance and not sure she has seen that alternative yet. She said she would be responsible but fair.

Starke spoke about the balance. She spoke about the members of Clark County Citizens United. She spoke about the Critical Areas Ordinance. She stated compromise is great as long as we keep the values of Clark County.

Neth spoke further about the members of Clark County Citizens United and spoke about his concerns with Alternative 4 in regards to AG lands.

Righter spoke further about the members of Clark County Citizens United. She also stated her concerns with alternative 4 in regards to AG lands. She stated she didn't think the true voices of rural Clark County are being heard.

Jeanne E. Stewart, Councilor

Date
Following comments were submitted online:

Parcel No:

Subject: GMA update

Comments:
As a concerned citizen of Clark County, WA, I am submitting the following questions and comments about the GMA alternatives.

Process
Did the process used to draw up Alternative 4 comply with the GMA requirements for public participation, and the Home Rule Charter process requirements?

Consider: This alternative was written by a single, small group of special interests, who stood to profit, and one County Commissioner. The county planners, the other commissioners, Clark County cities, and other interested groups and individuals were not given the opportunity to provide input. Alt 4 was then presented (actually pushed) as another alternative to the three existing alternatives that complied with the standard GMA and Home Rule Charter processes.

Property rights
Of the properties plotted into smaller lots with Alternative 4, how many of the current property owners owned their property prior to 1994? These landowners may have a legitimate grievance.

Landowners who purchased their property post-1994 GMA knew exactly what they were buying. If they were speculating, they knew it was a risk. They have not been denied economic use of the property they bought. GMA does not promise maximum profits from property.

Cost of residential growth
What is the real cost of Alternative 4? Alternative 3? Alternative 2?

The costs of residential growth in terms of required services far exceed what comes in via taxes and impact fees. Unbiased studies consistently more than a $20,000 gap per new home. To pay for this gap, taxes go up or services decline. Before you choose an alternative that adds new residential lots, please obtain concrete, mathematical analysis of the actual financial costs to the people who already live here.

Yes, new residents will spend money and contribute to the community, but they will also add to increased traffic congestion, increased air and water pollution, and decreased options for local food production.

Summary
Alternative 4 should not be considered a viable alternative, due to non-compliance with the GMA and Charter processes, and the loss of irreplaceable agricultural and forest lands. Experts in our planning department have prepared other, better alternatives.

However, I do think some accommodation could be made for property owners who owned their property prior to 1994. Does Alt 2 incorporate this?

In addition, whatever alternative or combination of alternatives you choose, please carefully consider all of the costs to existing residents when providing additional land for residential development. Is it possible we have enough residential land at this time?

Thank you,
Karen Beall
312 Riverview Dr.
Ridgefield, WA 98642

Submitted by:
Karen Beall

Email: karen_beall@comcast.net

Address:
312 Riverview Dr.
Ridgefield, WA
PUBLIC COMMENT

IN ADDITION TO OPEN HOUSES

MAR 17 – APR 9, 2015
April 8, 2015

Councilor David Madore, Chair
Councillor Tom Mielke
Councillor Jeanne Stewart

Subject: April 14, 2015, hearing on EIS alternatives and adjusted growth assumptions for the Clark County Comprehensive Plan.

Honorable Councilors:

On behalf of the cities of Clark County, we offer the enclosed testimony for the April 14 hearing. We appreciate the opportunity for input.

EIS Alternatives

As cities we support including Alternative 3 to evaluate the cities UGA proposals, and do not object to having some form of a rural alternative. However, the extent of rural changes envisioned in Alternative 4 raises significant concerns about impacts to cities in this process and beyond:

- Alternative 4 was originally discussed as simply recognizing existing lots, but County data indicates it would allow for future creation of 11,006 more new rural and resource building lots than could be created under current zoning.
- A significant portion of this growth would be adjacent or near to existing urban areas, impacting cities in two ways: In the short term, it would add to the demand for roads, schools, and other public services within urban areas; in the long term, it would create small parcelization that could prevent or limit future urban development for jobs or other purposes.
- From a process standpoint, including Alternative 4 as envisioned would add significantly to the time and cost of the upcoming EIS review and Comprehensive Plan update. Including it in the EIS will also create widespread community expectations that something similar be adopted.
• Adopting Alternative 4 as envisioned could pose substantial legal risk to the overall Comprehensive Plan update. It allows widespread density increases on resource lands and rural lands next to them, which appears inconsistent with the past emphasis by the Courts in Clark County and elsewhere on resource land protection.

Some of these concerns impact Clark County more directly than cities, but as partners and neighbors in this adoption process, cities will not be immune. We urge the Board to consider the following adjustments:

**EIS Recommendations:**

1. To avoid precluding efficient future urban growth, only include properties 1 mile or more from existing UGAs in Alternative 4.

2. To make Alternative 4 consistent with its stated vision of recognize existing legal lots, only include properties which were segregated before 1994 in the Alternative. Segregation information is readily available from assessor data and can be easily incorporated into the mapping.

3. Ensure that the EIS analyze the full range of Alternative 4 impacts to public services, as well as the following as required by law:
   a) Impacts to adjacent cities - WAC 197-11-060(4)(b)
   b) Long as well as short term impacts - WAC 197-11-060(4)(c)
   c) Consideration of similar impacts from other current projects also calling for rural intensification, such as the proposed Rural Industrial Land Bank, and proposed removal of limits on the number of employees in rural home occupations. - WAC 197-11-060 (3)(b)

**Growth Forecasts and Assumptions**

The cities continue to support Board’s overall objectives stated throughout this process of emphasizing jobs over housing growth, and of keeping cities “whole” by not forcing unrequested reductions or expansions of Urban Growth Areas (UGAs) beyond the site specific UGA changes the cities have proposed. We support the new modest adjustment to the original growth forecasts and allocations proposed by staff, provided that they continue to support these objectives, as we understand they are intended to do.

However, we oppose more fundamental changes to the assumptions, such as requests to increase the countywide population forecasts to match the past 50-year trend, or to significantly increase the assumed amount of residential lands needed for infrastructure. These or other changes that increase residential land supplies beyond the current proposal are not
technically warranted, would undermine the jobs priorities you have set, and would impose unwanted UGA changes on the cities. Please refer to our November 2014 correspondence for documentation. Overall, we believe the updated assumptions proposed provide sufficient amounts of land for local jurisdictions to fully accommodate growth.

Assumptions Recommendations:

1) Adjust growth forecasts and allocations as necessary to maintain consistency with city proposals for expanding/maintaining UGAs
2) Avoid larger changes in assumptions which undermine jobs goals or force unrequested UGA reductions or expansions.

We again appreciate the opportunity for input, and the inclusive process that you and your staff have led. The cities do have concerns about the process in which Alternative 4 has been developed in recent weeks. Some of this may be a result of the difficulties in expanding what had been a concise Comprehensive Plan update process focused on jobs and a handful of site specific UGA changes, and then grafting onto it widespread density changes throughout the rural area. As noted in Board discussion at the March 11 worksession, there is no requirement that rural changes be completed by June 2016, as there is for the urban changes. As the process moves forward, we respectfully request you consider options for decoupling the two processes.

Sincerely,

[Signatures]

City of Battle Ground
City of Camas
City of La Center
City of Ridgefield
City of Vancouver
City of Washougal
City of Woodland
It is my opinion, and shared with a growing number of concerned citizens, that this "Alternative 4", currently being considered, is the creation of an inexperienced policy analyst (a member of the Councilors' staff), at the direction of a County Councillor; and it came to be only as a result of Councilors' relationship with Clark County Citizens United, a special interest group. It needs to be noted that CCCU alleges representation of "8,000" (sometimes 8,000) rural landowners in Clark County, although absolutely no documentation exists for this number to be verified.

CCCU does not represent all rural landowners but is receiving special treatment. This was unethically, and perhaps illegally, reinforced by that fact that CCCU was the only special interest group invited to the work session held on March 11, 2015, where CCCU was supposed to be representing rural land-owners. This action in itself flies in the face of a goal of the Growth Management Act, "Citizen participation and coordination. Encourage the involvement of citizens in the planning process and ensure coordination between communities and jurisdictions to reconcile conflicts" (Goal #11).

Other community groups, such as the Clark/Cowlitz Farm Bureau, Friends of Clark County, Friends of East Fork, Clark County Food System Council or any number of rural neighborhood associations - of which none were invited to the table at a particular, well-attended and very public work session (March 11) - have not received the attention or the ear of the majority of the current County Councilors, and, in fact, conversations have been denied. conversations, for example, regarding TDR's. TDR's have been suggested and encouraged by no fewer than three community groups for the last 20 years. Absolutely no consideration has been given to this program.

This is but one issue surrounding the development of Alternative 4 as an update to the Comprehensive Growth Plan. There are numerous violations that would be created by the acceptance of this alternative: suburban sprawl, critical depletion of ground and surface water available in rural areas, loss of productive ag land, potential infrastructure failures, increase in property taxes - and more.

It is obvious that all continuing efforts to pursue Alternative 4 is an investment of taxpayer money on something that should never come to be, and, at worst, will result in sizeable lawsuits. This is an irresponsible or even unethical use of tax money.

Regards,
Ann Foster,
Organizer, Salmon Creek Farmers' Markets
VP, North Salmon Creek Neighborhood Association
14011 NW 27th Avenue, Vancouver, WA 98685
Here, below, are citizen comments on the 2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan Update for Clark County, submitted by Byron and Nita Countryman on April 8, 2015.

We are owners of tax lot 205450000 (21 acres), east of Hockinson, a parcel of the original 160 acre Ahola Homestead. Current zoning on this forest land — since the 1994 ruling -- is for a 40-acre minimum lot size.

Seven Ahola siblings and grand-children now own the homestead property comprising ELEVEN tax lots, only one of which is over 40 acres. The one lot that is more than 40 acres is co-owned by three sibling sisters; the co-ownership of this lot (49 acres) is just a stop-gap measure — caused by the current restrictions which prevent the three sisters from legally dividing their owned acreages into three individual lots.

We siblings also wish to have the legal option to sell or gift some acreages to our children or grandchildren. A reduction from the 40 acre minimum to a 10 or 20 acre minimum lot size would not allow this.

Our recommendation: For the Forest areas immediately east of Hockinson, zoning as a 5 acre minimum makes more sense. Perhaps, a 10 or 20-acre minimum Forest zoning is practical in commercial forest areas of North Clark County. However, a 20 or 40 acre parcel is rare in the Hockinson area—as has been already noted by Clark County planners. We feel the Growth Management Plan should consider each parcel by neighborhood density when zoning for Forest Reserve. Many lots surrounding the Ahola homestead are currently in 5 acre size—or less. In fact, the predominant parcel size of properties surrounding the Ahola homestead quarter section had been 5 acres before the GMA zoning changes of 1994.

A 5 acre minimum lot size would be the best — and most equitable — option for the family-owned forest properties east of Hockinson.

Sincerely,

Byron (“Rusty”) and Nita (Ahola) Countryman

e-mail:

nita.countryman@gmail.com

U.S. Mail address:

Byron and Nita Countryman
215 NE Ahola Drive
Brush Prairie, WA 98606
These comments are related to the open house I attended at Hockinson High School on April 1, 2015. I previously submitted comments on the three alternatives presented at the October 2014 open houses on November 17, 2014, so will focus these comments on new information presented at the April 1 open house.

I appreciated the overview provided by Oliver on the alternatives. He said the council needs to decide which alternatives to study in the environmental review. I am concerned about the reduction in minimum lot sizes proposed in Alternative 4. It would encourage subdivision and development of property outside the established urban growth boundaries on resource and rural lands. This is counter to the intent and goals of the Growth Management Act and looks like spot zoning. I am sure Alternative 4 would be appealed if any of it ends up in the preferred alternative and would not be likely to be upheld by the Growth Management Board. Therefore, I do not think it is a good use of County staff and resources (my tax dollars) to study Alternative 4 and then have to defend it during appeal. I am also concerned that Alternative 4 will require a full environmental impact study rather than the supplemental EIS, resulting in more time and money spent on the comprehensive plan update. It would be better to use this comprehensive plan to encourage farming in Clark County rather than encouraging development where it does not belong.

Councilor Madore said the reduction in size of parcels proposed in both Alternative 2 and Alternative 4 is being driven by land owners’ desire to subdivide their land. This does not seem to me to be adequate justification for changes proposed in Alternative 2 and Alternative 4, considering the negative environmental and other impacts it would have. The current zoning has been in place since the first comprehensive plan in 1994. The landowners who purchased property since then are aware of the restrictions on their property. I expect few of them are original landowners. Just because a nearby property was subdivided before the 1994 comprehensive plan doesn’t justify subdividing more property. What is left of the larger rural, agriculture, and forest resource land parcels need to be preserved, not subdivided.

After the open house, I drove north about a mile to the 40-acre ranch where my mother raised horses in the 1970’s and 1980’s. I was dismayed to see how much development has occurred around it since the last time I drove by, with many large parcels split into small acreage. I’m certain the only reason that my mother’s ranch hasn’t been subdivided are the requirements of the Growth Management Act to preserve resource and rural lands. I think it is important for our quality of life that what is left of rural, agriculture, and forest resource lands continue to be preserved as determined by previous comprehensive plans. We also need to keep growth inside urban growth areas where it is less expensive to provide infrastructure and other services, reducing the burden on taxpayers. Therefore, I strongly oppose the reduced parcel sizes in Alternative 2 and Alternative 4.

Karen Wood
14910 NE 46th St
Vancouver, WA 98682
O’Donnell, Mary Beth

From: Bianca Benson <bianca@friendsofclarkcounty.org>

Sent: Wednesday, April 08, 2015 8:53 PM

To: Cnty 2016 Comp Plan

Subject: Alt 4 comments for the record

Attachments: Bianca Benson Alt 4 comments for record.pdf

For your consideration.

Sincerely,

Bianca Benson
Executive Director
Friends of Clark County
503.701.9203
visit our website
What’s wrong with Alternative 4?

Alternative 4 flies in the face of state law, the Growth Management Act, by knowingly creating conditions that:
✓ Support suburban sprawl and diminish the size and productivity of agricultural lands, creating over 15,000 new rural lots
✓ Sets the stage for the associated infrastructure failures, negative environmental impacts on air and water quality and wildlife protection
✓ Creates real risk to the depletion of ground and surface water supplies

Alternative 4 also creates credible financial risks to taxpayers in the form of:
✓ Increases in property taxes to all property owners and especially to some rural landowners
✓ Property value increases due to zoning so even if citizens don’t divide and develop their land, taxes will still increase
✓ More pressure on rural schools and public services, furthering tax increases
✓ Costs to defend against lawsuits re non-compliance with GMA process, rules and regulations

Tell Clark County Councilors you DO NOT want Alternative 4 considered in the Comprehensive Growth Plan Update.

What’s BEST for Clark County Taxpayers?

Alternative 1 is the best choice:
✓ Already plans for 7000 new lots according to population assumptions adopted by the county
✓ Stays out of legal entanglements, which keep taxes down, emergency services reliable and our water supply protected

Please fill out this sheet and let the County Counselors know YOU SUPPORT ALTERNATIVE 1

Community Planning Comp Plan Comments
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver WA 98666

Name: Bianca Benson
Email: bianca@friendsofclarkcounty.org

Address: 2211 NW Coyote Ridge Rd La Center, WA 98629

Comments: I wrote this form myself but would also like to add a personal note. My household runs out of water almost daily in the summer months. Neighbors of mine go weeks without water. This will become exceptionally common with over development of our rural lands. Not only will we not be able to water our food crops and animals but all the folks who paid over $500K for their dream home on 5 acres will also be out of water. I understand all of your terms will be expired by then but does it not bother you that by your simple act of office you will render homes worthless?
Water Transmission to Serve Clark Public Utilities, Battle Ground, and Ridgefield Demands

Legend
- Intake
- Wells
- Virga

Watermains
- 10"
- 12"
- 16" (Default line)
- 24"
- 30"
- 36"
- 42"

Water Service Boundary
- Battle Ground
- Camas
- Ridgefield
- Vancouver
- Washougal

City Boundary
- Battle Ground
- Camas
- La Center
- Ridgefield
- Vancouver
- Washougal
- Yacolt
- Clark County

Urban Growth Boundary
- Battle Ground
- Camas
- La Center
- Ridgefield
- Vancouver
- Washougal
- Yacolt

Build-out 2060
44.5 Miles of Transmission
$107,509,000 w/Supply
In 2013 Dollars
$2,559,740 / 1,000 GPM
Please find attached my comments regarding Alt 4 of the Comprehensive Growth Plan Update.
What’s wrong with Alternative 4?

Alternative 4 flies in the face of state law, the Growth Management Act, by knowingly creating conditions that:

- Support suburban sprawl and diminish the size and productivity of agricultural lands, creating over 15,000 new rural lots
- Sets the stage for the associated infrastructure failures, negative environmental impacts on air and water quality and wildlife protection
- Creates real risk to the depletion of ground and surface water supplies

Alternative 4 also creates credible financial risks to taxpayers in the form of:

- Increases in property taxes to all property owners and especially to some rural landowners
- Property value increases due to zoning so even if citizens don’t divide and develop their land, taxes will still increase
- More pressure on rural schools and public services, furthering tax increases
- Costs to defend against lawsuits re non-compliance with GMA process, rules and regulations

What’s BEST for Clark County Taxpayers?

Alternative 1 is the best choice:

- Already plans for 7000 new lots according to population assumptions adopted by the county
- Stays out of legal entanglements, which keep taxes down, emergency services reliable and our water supply protected

Please fill out this sheet and let the County Counselors know YOU SUPPORT ALTERNATIVE 1

Community Planning or Scan & email: comp.plan@clark.wa.gov
Comp Plan Comments
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver WA 98666

Name: Loren Sickle Email: lksickles@gmail.com
Address: 3013-B NE 103rd Dr Vancouver WA 98662

In addition to the points outlined above I have serious concerns the manner that ALT 4 was brought forward. I believe it should be scrapped or at the least set aside, for the purposes of the current comprehensive growth plan update.
April 6, 2015

Att: Clark County Community Planning

Re: Comprehensive Growth Plan Update

To whom it may concern,

This is a follow up letter to our original in which we wrote in favor of 10 acre ag zones, but after more research and consideration have changed our view to the following:

We believe 5 acre lot size or smaller is the perfect fit to Ag. Zoning. Five acre zoning will maintain rural character which doesn’t always happen with cluster developments. We are strongly requesting 5 acre zoning for our 80 acres located on 259th St. Just one minute north of Battle Ground and just west of Battle Ground Lake. We are on PUD water and in fact, we have a PUD reservoir tank and pump station located on our property. Our tax parcel numbers are: 986003678; 986027184; 226268000; 986027183. Our address is 16104 N.E. 25th St. Battle Ground, WA 98604.

Most of our neighbors are on lots of 5 acres or less, and the neighbors to the west (Chester and Emily Sarkinen) also strongly favor 5 acre or less zoning.

Respectfully,

Dave and Valerie Larwick

Date: 4-6-15
It is my opinion, and shared with a growing number of concerned citizens, that this "Alternative 4", currently being considered, is the creation of an inexperienced policy analyst (a member of the Councilors' staff), at the direction of a County Councilor, and it came to be only as a result of Councilors' relationship with Clark County Citizens United, a special interest group. It needs to be noted that CCCU alleges representation of "6,000" (sometimes 8,000) rural landowners in Clark County, although absolutely no documentation exists for this number to be verified.

CCCU does not represent all rural landowners but is receiving special treatment. This was unethically, and perhaps illegally, reinforced by that fact that CCCU was the only special interest group invited to the work session held on March 11, 2015, where CCCU was supposed to be representing rural land-owners. This action in itself flies in the face of a goal of the Growth Management Act, "Citizen participation and coordination. Encourage the involvement of citizens in the planning process and ensure coordination between communities and jurisdictions to reconcile conflicts" (Goal #1).

Other community groups, such as the Clark/Cowlitz Farm Bureau, Friends of Clark County, Friends of East Fork, Clark County Food System Council or any number of rural neighborhood associations - of which none were invited to the table at a particular, well-attended and very public work session (March 11) - have not received the attention or the ear of the majority of the current County Councilors, and, in fact, conversations have been denied .... conversations, for example, regarding TDR's. TDR's have been suggested and encouraged by no fewer than three community groups for the last 20 years. Absolutely no consideration has been given to this program.

This is but one issue surrounding the development of Alternative 4 as an update to the Comprehensive Growth Plan. There are numerous violations that would be created by the acceptance of this alternative: suburban sprawl, critical depletion of ground and surface water available in rural areas, loss of productive ag land, potential infrastructure failures, increase in property taxes - and more.

It is obvious that all continuing efforts to pursue Alternative 4 is an investment of taxpayer money on something that should never come to be, and, at worst, will result in sizeable lawsuits. This is an irresponsible or even unethical use of tax money.

Regards,
Ann Foster,
Organizer, Salmon Creek Farmers' Markets
VP, North Salmon Creek Neighborhood Association
14011 NW 27th Avenue, Vancouver, WA 98685
Att: Clark County Community Planning

Re: Comprehensive Growth Plan Update

To whom it may concern,

We own 40 acres just North of Battle Ground on 259th Street (acct. #226267000). We have owned this property since 1961. We would prefer our Ag-20 zoning be reduced to no greater than 5 acre zoning, and would prefer less. Many of our adjacent neighbors are living on 2 ½ and 5 acre lots, and we all have access to PUD water. The other large parcel to our East would also prefer 5 acre zoning or less.

We thank you for your hard and dedicated work on this matter. Please be fair to the larger land owners and allow them to receive zoning which is reflective of their neighbors.

Sincerely yours,

Chester and Emily Sarkinen

Date: 6-15

15506 NE 259TH ST
BATTLE GROUND WA, 98604
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM
March/April 2015

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Neal Blomquist

Address: 16311 N.E. 250th St. Battle Ground, WA 98604

Open house location: ☐ March 25, Ridgefield High School, 2724 South Hillhurst Road, Ridgefield  ☑ April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson

Comment:

I like councilor Madoves plan for future land use planning because it will open or make available more parcels of land for folks that want to live in the country.

Note: The more parcels that become available, the more moderating or downward push will be on prices.

Thanks

Neal Blomquist
Ph. 697-3034

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address:________________________

Other ways to comment:

Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

E-mail your comment to us:
comp.plan@clark.wa.gov

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOCC Hearing.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT RIDGEFIELD HIGH SCHOOL, 2630 SOUTH HILLHURST ROAD, RIDGEFIELD, WA. 98642

RECEIVED APR - 6 2015

CCCW WOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR COMMENTS REGARDING
CHANGES PROPOSED IN ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED
CHANGES TO THESE AREAS THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING
LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

✓ 1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.

✓ 2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC. RURAL ZONES
   TO REFLECT SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS

✓ 3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES
   TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.

✓ 4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES
   TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE AND FAMILY OWNED WOODLOTS

✓ 5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/ URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS
   THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS

✓ 6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS
   TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND RETURN THIS FORM TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. OR CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS

SIGNATURE

ADDRESS

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

OTHER COMMENTS

HELP THE YOUNG BOYS BUY

LAND. WE CAN BUY 80 ACRES AT ONCE.
WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT RIDGEFIELD HIGH SCHOOL, 2630 SOUTH HILLHURST ROAD, RIDGEFIELD, WA. 98642

CCCU WOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR COMMENTS REGARDING CHANGES PROPOSED IN ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES TO THESE AREAS THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

X 1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.

X 2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC RURAL ZONES TO REFLECT SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS

X 3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.

X 4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE AND FAMILY OWNED WOODLOTS

X 5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/ URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS

X 6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND RETURN THIS FORM TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. OR CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS

SIGNATURE:__________________________________________

ADDRESS: P.O. Box 372, Battle Ground, WA 98604

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

OTHER COMMENTS______________________________________
Here is my option to the new anti growth plan.  
Face book comments.  

Garry Jay Goodwin  
April 3 at 2:52pm -

Here we go again ! I went to the anti growth management meeting the other night and the county is asking to get sued if they adopt the alternative # 4.  
From what I understand if sued it might stop all building until resolved which could take years.  
I was on the Growth management planning board in 1993 and we were told that we would get brought into growth in 5 years 10 max. Were they being truth full or telling lies to get us to approve the plan? I think it was lies.  
' was in 2 1/2 acre zone with a lot of 3/4 to 1 acres lots already created before 1992.  
we were down zoned to UR 10 acre zone at that time to keep us from doing anything to our land until the city wants to come there.  
I live a little north of costco off andreson road at 6614 NE 139th street.  
They just put a stop light down the street but we now will be zoned 5 acre minimums so people can drive by us to go another 30 minuets or more to be able to split there 80 acre parcels to 20s and some 5s.  
I did contact the city about my property and was told they didn't want it to be in the city because they would have to bring sewer there, water is already there and they wouldn't get re elected because they would have to raise fees to the people to do that.  
My 401 K is my land and i wish the county officials would have told me in 1993 that i wouldn't to get to do any development to my land in my life time for the better of man kind.  
Maybe some of you could donate your 401 K for the better of man kind. Do i here any volunteers? lol It has been 22 years now since they told me 5 to 10 years.  
I was 40 then now i am going to be 62 in August.  
Laws are some times made with out calculating what affect it has on people.  
I am on the land because i had junk cars in the city and the city enacted the junk ordnance law and took me to court because i had a 1969 390 big bad green javelin,a couple 1969 amc amxs one 390 4 speed car and a 1970 torino Gt grabber green shaker hood cobra jet car and a 1969 1/2 sc rambler and a 1963 1/2 mercury super marauder 425 hp 427 4 speed 2 door ht  
s-55 red on red one of 11 made and a couple others.  
They took me to court and i hired Mike Wynn and got a probation agreement that the prosecutor forgot to record so they had a warrant out for my arrest for 5 months.
I got to pay mike again to go back to court to find this out. I decided to move to the country were i have several large trees but can't burn and have to haul the stuff 12 miles away to the city. WHAT A JOKE BUT ITS ON ME!

Like · Comment · Share

Ken Gaston, Don Kussman and Beau Weidman like this.
1 share
To: Clark County Planning Group

CC: Clark County Commissioners

Date: April 6, 2015

RE: Request for FR10 zoning for Prop ID 248067000

After careful review of the proposed zoning changes, I respectfully request an FR10 zoning for my property (248067000) instead of the FR20 proposed. As shown on the Alternative4_FR_Zoning.pdf map, this would be a fair and equitable zoning:

One can see that almost all of the private land parcels in the area are smaller than 10 acres. In fact, in a nine square mile area centered on my property, I counted more than 130 parcels of less than 10 acres, and only 16 parcels greater than 10 acres (before rezoning). And this not surprising—this property is about the same distance as the town of Yacolt from NE Lucia Falls Road.

This property is a family tree farm, and the 10 acre zoning will give my family more options in the future, especially if one or more my children would like to live on the property someday. This could be the deciding factor to keep the property in the family.

Thank you all for your work on this Comprehensive Growth Management Plan and I hope you respond favorably to my request. But if a FR10 zoning is not possible, please implement the FR20 zoning. If you have any questions, please contact me.

Best regards,
Steve Nylund / Manager
SIN+ LLC (Steve and Julie Nylund family tree farm)
19712 NE 174th Street,
Brush Prairie, WA 98606
360-896-4161, Cell 360-635-8086
Following comments were submitted online:

Parcel No:

Subject: Comprehensive Plan

Comments:
I request that the County adopt Alternative 1 or 2. Along with hundreds of county citizens, I worked for several years to study the various growth management options that would protect land for local farms, industrial growth, optimize and reduce the cost of needed infrastructure (schools, water, sewer, roads, law enforcement, fire protection, etc.). I urge you to make no change or minimal change with Alternatives 1 or 2. I live in unincorporated Clark County. Thank you.

Submitted by:
Deborah Nelson

Email: stayed@comcast.net

Address:
4905 NE 47 Ave
Vancouver, WA
April 3, 2015

Clark County Community Planning
Oliver Orjiako
1300 Franklin Street 3rd Floor
Vancouver WA 98666

Re: Gustafson DEIS Comment
Our File No. 51516-73506

Dear Oliver:

This comment to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement is to address the site specific property request and the conversion of natural resource lands to urban use. The parcel number is APN 200537000 which is known as "Gustafson." A map is also attached for reference as Exhibit A. We believe it is important to address the specific factors related to these properties. While GMA encourages the conservation of agricultural lands, nothing in the act specifically prohibits the conversion of these lands to more intensive uses, especially when "agricultural lands" are not suitable for commercial agricultural use.

In the leading Washington State Supreme Court decision, Lewis County v. Western Washington Growth Management Hearings Board, 157 Wash. 2d 488, 139 P.3d 1096 (2006), (Exhibit B) the Court decided what agriculture land is and what factors a County may consider in converting such land to urban use, holding that:

"Agricultural land is land: (a) not already characterized by urban growth, (b) that is primarily devoted to the commercial production of agricultural products enumerated in RCW 36.70A.030(2), including land in areas used or capable of being used for production based on land characteristics, and (c) that has long-term commercial significance for agricultural production, as indicated by soil, growing capacity, productivity, and whether it is near population areas or vulnerable to more intense uses. We further hold that counties may consider the development-related factors enumerated in WAC 365-190-050(1) in determining which lands have long term commercial significance."

1 Goal 8 – Natural Resource Industries: Maintain and enhance natural resource based industries including productive timber, agricultural, and fisheries industries. Encourage the conservation of productive agricultural lands, and discourage incompatible uses. RCW 36.70A.020.
Gustafson is currently designated Agriculture (AG). We believe that under the Lewis County case, conversion of these lands to urban use is warranted after the consideration of definition of agricultural lands and the WAC 365-190-050(1) development factors.

**Gustafson is Characterized by Urban Growth**

We believe that this property is characterized by urban growth under the definitions given to us by GMA and the Courts. The property is near several urban subdivisions including the Fieldstone Estates, Falcon’s Nest and Dunning subdivisions. Of course it is also bounded by urban areas on the west, northwest and south, at the fast growing edge of North Orchards, and to the east is the Hockinson Meadows Community Park.

During the appeals of the 2007 Clark County plan the Division II Court of Appeals gave a hint at additional guidance as to what it means to be characterized by urban growth. In that case the Court examined two properties listed as VA and VA-2 located just north of 179th Street and west of 50th Avenue in the Vancouver Urban Growth Area (UGA). The Court stated that GMA defines "[c]haraacterized by urban growth as referring to land having urban growth located on it, or to land located in relationship to an area with urban growth on it as to be appropriate for urban growth.\(^2\) The Court went on to state that the first prong of the Lewis County test "requires an assessment of the overall context of the land's relationship to the surrounding land - not just the land itself.\(^3\) [Emphasis added].

Given the fact that these parcels are encroached upon by urban development immediately to the south (Urban Oaks), down the NE 152nd corridor, and throughout Orchards which has now expanded up to North Orchards, these parcels are already characterized by urban growth. Additional factual information follows below in examination under the WAC Factors for demonstrating the land's urban character.

**Gustafson is Not Devoted Primarily to Commercial Production of Agricultural Products**

Gustafson does not provide a significant farm income, and there are no dwellings on the site. Commercial farming has changed dramatically in the County in recent decades, and numerous dairies which used to dot the landscape of Clark County closed. Shifts in the regional economy, increased environmental protection of wetlands, waterways and habitat, and the move towards larger scale farms have pushed most commercial agricultural operations east of the Cascades where less environmental constraints are present and where land is more conducive to commercial scale operations.

\(^2\) Clark County et al v. Western Washington Growth Management Hearings Board et al. 161 Wn. App. 204 (2011). The Court cited RCW 36.70A.030(18) [Emphasis Added]. The Definition is now cited as RCW 36.70A.030(19). See Exhibit C.

\(^3\) Id.
The County urban growth area expanded to the south and west property boundaries in 2007. The popularity of North Orchards generated market interest, and the property has been held for investment purposes since 2009.

More specifically, Gustafson is not devoted primarily to commercial scale production of the products listed in RCW 36.70A, which are horticultural, viticultural, floricultural, dairy, apiary, vegetable, or animal products, or of berries, grain, hay, straw, turf, seed, Christmas trees, or livestock. Gustafson lacks a well and irrigation water rights, which precludes commercial scale agriculture.

The bulk of Gustafson is mown annually, and there are no livestock, poultry or other animal husbandry activities. These actions are consistent with responsible weed and vegetation control, but do not rise to the level of commercial scale agriculture. For example, they do not generate sufficient income to qualify for the current agricultural use property classification. That classification requires an income of "relevant monetary profit" for this 20 acre property. By comparison, if it was 19 acres, the minimum income would be $200 per acre or $3800 for the entire parcel. Because the agricultural income generated by leasing the land to a local farmer has been substantially less, the parcel does not qualify and will be removed from the program.

The property lacks sufficient water rights to grow commercial scale vegetables or row crops.

Gustafson Does Not Have Long-Term Commercial Significance for Agricultural Production

The soil composition, capacity, and productivity of Gustafson do not support long-term commercial production. This is particularly true in light of the ten economic factors for evaluating whether land has "long-term commercial significance." In an earlier day, in the absence of development pressures and regulatory restrictions, Gustafson was part of a larger agricultural operation. Today, water-intensive facilities can possibly support long-term commercial production in the face of encroaching development and enhanced regulation.

The Soils

The subject property is about 60 percent MIA, McBee silt loam, with a 40 percent DoB, Dollar loam in the western portion of the property. MIA soils are poorly drained and not conducive to farming. The cost to install agricultural drainage is prohibitive, as is the problem of disposing surplus water. The property has historically been used for pasture land. Pasture land is not productive farming in Clark County, because it does not produce income to qualify for the current agricultural use property tax benefit.

As for parcels containing the MIA and DoB soils, WAC 365-190-050 directs counties and cities to use the land-capability classification system of the United States Department of Agricultural Soil Conservation Service (now the Natural Resources Conservation Service). This system divides soil types into eight "capability classes" based on their ability to produce common cultivated crops and pasture plants without deterioration over a long period of time. MIA is rated 6, and DoB is rated 3. Thus 60% of the soils on the Gustafson are rated class IV or higher. Class 6 soils "have severe
limitations that make them generally unsuitable for cultivation and that restrict their use mainly to pasture, rangeland, forestland or wildlife habitat." (http://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/App/WebSoilSurvey.aspx)

And 100 percent of the soils are rated class III or higher. Class III soils "have severe limitations that reduce the choice of plants or require special conservation practices, or both." In sum, the soils are not conducive to commercial agricultural use.

**The Development-Related Factors**

(a) **The availability of public facilities.**

Clark Regional Wastewater District already invested in this area with a pump station and transmission line right across 152nd. This is also demonstrated by the proliferation of nearby urban developments. The south and west boundary of Gustafson is the existing urban area boundary. A county park is adjacent to the east. All necessary public and private utilities are available along NE 152nd and can be extended into the Property.

Tax status. The income from leasing the land for small scale farming does not satisfy the requirement for the current agricultural use designation, so the Gustafson parcels are being removed from the current use agriculture designation.

(b) **The availability of public services.**

Clark PUD provides water and electricity. Clark Regional Wastewater District provides public sewer. Given the fact that they are already adjacent to these properties and the fact that the area is already characterized by urban growth it would be cost effective to accommodate growth in this area.¹

(c) **Relationship or proximity to urban growth areas.**

Gustafson is adjacent to the County urban growth area on the south and west sides, and the east boundary is the County park. The Property overlooks dozens of houses in the Dunning Meadows and Urban Oaks development just south. NE 152nd connects the property directly with the urban area to the south.

(d) **Predominant parcel size.**

Gustafson is 20 acres. Immediately south is the Urban Oaks property, also 20 acres, which is zoned and planned for single family lots. Southeast is the Nehalem 2 single family subdivision with 2 acre lots. East is the regional County park. North is the Silver

¹36.70A.030(19).
Buckle Equestrian Center. Northwest is urban land and the Fieldstone Estates single family subdivision. West and southwest is the urban designated Dempsey property currently designated for Business Park use and which is being planned for a K-8 school and single family development. The increasing residential density around Gustafson leads to more conflicts between residential interests and farming interests. This makes long-term commercial farming unsustainable. It is not equitable to allow increasing residential density around farming areas while requiring farm owners to forever keep the land in an uneconomic agricultural use.

(c) Land use settlement patterns and their compatibility with agricultural practices.

Numerous plats have been approved by the Clark County in the immediate vicinity, as the urban area borders Gustafson on two sides. Urban uses are not compatible with commercial farming because of odor, transportation needs, and other impacts.\(^5\)

(f) Intensity of nearby land uses.

Gustafson is right on NE 152nd, and adjacent to the urban area on two sides. These two factors and the popularity of North Orchards cause the intensity of nearby land uses to grow steadily. There are no commercial scale agricultural uses, such as dairy farms or container nurseries, in the immediate vicinity.

(g) History of land development permits issued nearby.

North Orchards is growing rapidly. The urban growth area which abuts Gustafson is zoned for single family residential and business park uses. Hundreds of single family lots have been approved or are in process for approval, most notably Fieldstone Estates with 60 lots and Dunning Meadows with 113 lots and Urban Oaks that are plainly visible from the Property. Innumerable other subdivisions in North Orchards have been developed in recent years.

(h) Land values under alternative uses.

Because of the proximity of these parcels to adjacent single family residential zone, the land value is set by these land uses.

Alternatively, the land has minimal value for agricultural use on a rental basis, and no value for a purchaser of agricultural land.

\(^5\)Id.
(i) Proximity of markets.

The market for grass hay grown on the property is limited to local hobby farms markets. There are no grain elevators or other commercial scale agricultural buyers or commodity storage facilities in the vicinity.

Conclusion

We believe that the conversion of these properties to urban use is consistent with the Supreme Court holding in the Lewis County case, the Clark County case, and by the criteria identified in the WAC. We thank you for the opportunity to comment on Gustafson and would be happy to provide further information upon request. We intend to present a more detailed analysis of each parcel during the Board of County Councilors’ hearings on the matter, so that should they choose to include these parcels in the 2016 UGA update, those specific findings may be adopted. If you have any questions, comments or concerns please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

JORDAN RAMIS PC

James D. Howsley
Admitted in Washington and Oregon
james.howsley@jordanramis.com
WA Direct Dial (360) 567-3913
OR Direct Dial (503) 598-5562
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used or capable of being used for production based on land characteristics; and (3) that has long-term commercial significance for agricultural production, as indicated by soil, growing capacity, productivity, and whether the land is near population areas or vulnerable to more intense uses. Counties may consider the development-related factors enumerated in WAC 365-190-050 (1) in determining which lands have long-term commercial significance.

[10] Counties - Land Use Controls - Growth Management Act - Agricultural Land - Designation - Factors - Agriculture Industry Needs. Although counties are not specifically authorized by statute to weigh the needs of the agriculture industry above all other considerations in designating and conserving agricultural lands, the Growth Management Act (chapter 36.70A RCW) does not prohibit such an approach. Inasmuch as the Growth Management Act does not dictate how much weight to assign each factor in determining which farmland have long-term commercial significance, and where RWC 36.70A.030 (10) includes the possibility of more intense uses among factors to consider, it is not "clearly erroneous" for a county to weigh the agriculture industry's anticipated land needs above all else. If the farm industry cannot use land for agricultural production due to economic, irrigation, or other constraints, the possibility of more intense uses of the land is heightened. RWC 36.70A.030 (10) permits such considerations in designating agricultural lands.

[11] Counties - Land Use Controls - Growth Management Act - Agricultural Land - Designation - Factors - "Nonfarm" Economic Needs of Farmers. Serves the "nonfarm" economic needs of farmers is not a logical or permissible consideration in designating agricultural lands under the Growth Management Act (chapter 36.70A RCW). The "nonfarm" economic needs of farmers is a goal. Thus, it is not a characteristic of farmland to be evaluated in determining whether such land has long-term commercial significance. A farm’s presumed need for "nonfarm" income does not necessarily relate to soil, productivity, or growing capacity under RWC 36.70A.030 (10), or to proximity to population areas or the possibility of more intense uses of land.

[12] Counties - Land Use Controls - Growth Management Act - Agricultural Land - Designation - Nonagricultural Uses - Blanket Exclusions - Validity. In designating agricultural lands under the Growth Management Act (chapter 36.70A RCW), a county may not exclude a specified number of acres on every farm for nonfarm uses without regard to soil, productivity, or other specified factors in each farm area. Counties may choose how best to conserve designated agricultural lands.

so long as their methods are designed to conserve agricultural lands and encourage the agricultural community.

[14] Counties - Land Use Controls - Growth Management Act - Agricultural Land - Nonagricultural Uses - Validity - Test. Under the Growth Management Act (chapter 36.70A RCW), a county’s agricultural land conservation regulations that allow specific nonfarm uses of farm land may be invalidated if they are not fashioned in such a way as to ensure that they do not negatively impact resource lands and activities and do not substantially interfere with the Growth Management Act goal of maintaining and enhancing the agricultural industry.

[15] Counties - Land Use Controls - Growth Management Act - Agricultural Land - Nonagricultural Uses - Residential Development - Zoning Code Protections - Sufficiency. A county’s agricultural land conservation regulations may be invalidated under RWC 36.70A.030 if they fail to regulate farm housing to conserve agricultural prime soils, fail to prevent residential densities inconsistent with agriculture, and allow clustered residential subdivisions that are not designed either to ensure conservation of agricultural lands or to
encourage the agricultural economy. These deficiencies are not mitigated by a zoning code provision requiring that such nonfarm uses not detract from the overall productivity of the resource activity; such a provision provides insufficient protection to conserve agricultural lands and encourage the agricultural economy as required by RCW 36.70A.090.

[16] Counties - Land Use Controls - Growth Management Act - Agricultural Land - Nonagricultural Use - Innovative Zoning Techniques - Validity - Test. A zoning technique that allows nonfarm uses on designated agricultural lands constitutes a permissible "innovative zoning technique" within the meaning of RCW 36.70A.177 of the Growth Management Act only so long as it does not undermine the act's mandate to conserve agricultural lands for the maintenance and enhancement of the agricultural industry after properly designing agricultural lands, a county may not then undermine the act's agricultural conservation mandate by adopting "innovative" amendments that allow the conversion of prime agricultural soils to an unrelated use.

[17] Counties - Land Use Controls - Growth Management Act - Agricultural Land - Nonagricultural Uses - Innovative Zoning Techniques - Validity - Question of Law or Fact. Whether a provision in a county's zoning code that allows nonfarm uses of designated agricultural lands constitutes a permissible "innovative zoning technique" within the meaning of RCW 36.70A.177 of the Growth Management Act is a question of law.

J.M. JOHNSON, SANDERS, and CHAMBERS, JJ., dissent in part by separate opinion.
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Nature of Action: A county sought judicial review of a growth management hearings board decision (1) that the county's designations of agricultural land in its growth management plan did not comply with the Growth Management Act (chapter 36.70A, RCW) and (2) that county ordinances (a) allowing nonfarm uses within designated agricultural lands, (b) excluding "farm centers" and farm homes from agricultural lands, and (c) requiring "sufficient irrigation capability" for designation as Class A farmland were invalid. The county also sought review of a separate hearings board order requiring that potential agricultural resource lands in rural zones be preserved from incompatible development until a compliant approach is utilized by the county so that such lands will be available for assessment under a compliant approach.

Superior Court: The Superior Court for Lewis County, No. 04-2-00477-1, H. John Hall, J., on February 23, 2004, entered a judgment affirming the board's decision.

Supreme Court: Holding that the hearings board applied the wrong definition of "agricultural land" in assessing the county's compliance with the Growth Management Act, but holding that the hearings board properly invalidated the county's ordinances which allowed nonfarm uses within designated agricultural lands and which excluded "farm centers" and farm homes from those lands, the court affirms the judgment in part, reverses it in part, and remands the case to the hearings board for further proceedings.

Deanna Zieske, pro se.

Alexander W. Mackie (of Perkins Cole, L.L.P.); and Jeremy R. Randolph, Prosecuting Attorney, and Douglas E. Jensen, Deputy, for appellant.

Lewis H. Zieske, Jr., for respondents.

Timothy E. Allen and Tim Trehimovich on behalf of Futurewise, amicus curiae.
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Robert M. McKenna, Attorney General, Maureen A. Hart, Senior Assistant, and Alan D. Cospey, Assistant, on behalf of the Washington Attorney General, amicus curiae.

¶1 ALEXANDER, C.J. - After falling four times to satisfy the Western Washington Growth Management Hearings Board (Board) that it properly designated agricultural lands for conservation under the Growth Management Act (GMA), chapter 36.70A, RCW, Lewis County now asks us to reverse the latest Board orders rebuffing its efforts. We conclude that the Board incorrectly defined agricultural land in reviewing Lewis County's 2003 ordinances. Accordingly, we reverse the Board's conclusion that the county violated the GMA by focusing on the farm industry's projected needs, rather than on soil and land characteristics, in designating agricultural lands for conservation. We also remand the case to the Board to determine whether the county's designations of agricultural land comply with the GMA, using the correct definition of agricultural land. ¶2 We conclude, however, that the Board did not err by invalidating the ordinances that: (a) allowed nonfarm uses within designated agricultural lands, and (b) excluded "farm centers" and farm homes from those uses. Therefore, we partially affirm the Board's orders.

¶2 Lewis County has long struggled to meet GMA requirements to designate and conserve agricultural lands. In June 2000, March 2001, and July 2002, the Board found the county's efforts noncompliant.
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ing the ordinances that: (a) allowed nonfarm uses within designated agricultural lands, and (b) excluded "farm centers" and farm homes from those sites. Therefore, we partially affirm the Board's orders.
¶3 In response to the Board’s September 8, 2003, deadline to achieve GMA compliance, the county staff prepared a report explaining how it identified agricultural lands to be conserved. The 2003 staff report said that of the 1,117 farms existing in Lewis County as of the 1997 census, only 179 farms had gross sales of $25,000 or more, and only 161 of them were larger than 180 acres. The report also said that of about 150,000 acres eligible for agricultural designation based on soil type, about 50,000 had no recent agricultural activity. The report described a decline in dairies and field crops, an absence of “significant clusters” of organic farms, and a poultry industry constrained by a lack of water rights. Clerk’s Papers (CP) at 242. The report also said no land conservation was needed for the hay and Christmas tree industries because they do not depend on soil, and “[g]rass hay in particular is a marginal operation, in that in good years the return is often barely enough to pay taxes on the property.” Id. at 254. Finally, the staff report said most Lewis County farms are not economically self-sufficient and


therefore need “non farm income” for survival. Id. To address that need, the report recommended allowing each farm to have a “farm center” of up to five acres where rural commercial and industrial uses would be allowed. Id. at 255.

¶4 The Lewis County Planning Commission held public hearings and approved the staff report almost entirely. It recommended that the Lewis County Commission designate 54,600 acres of agricultural land, “appropriate in location and amount to reasonably conserve the land-based needs of the commercial agriculture industry for the foreseeable future.” CP at 283. On September 8, 2003, the Lewis County Commission adopted by ordinance the planning commission findings and most of its recommendations, along with maps designating an agricultural zone of about 54,400 acres. And while prohibiting certain nonfarm land uses, the commission allowed others— including residential subdivisions, home-based businesses and telecommunication facilities—to be located in agricultural lands as long as they met certain conditions. CP at 13,787 of “Class A” farmlands, characterized by prime farm soils, over 40,000 acres of “Class B” farmlands, and “[f]armlands of local importance.” Id. at 670. The commission removed some lands from designation because they: (1) had “already been divided,” (2) “lost irrigation rights,” or (3) were “isolated and in areas where land development and potential changes create the potential for conflict and . . . significant change.” Id. at 283. The latter included lands near Interstate 5 where the county wants to attract “major industry.” Id.

¶5 The county’s designation of 54,400 acres of agricultural lands, as compared with 66,000 acres receiving special agricultural tax status and 283,000 acres of land with prime farm soils in Lewis County, was controversial, in
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January 2004, the Board held a hearing to review citizen petitions challenging the county’s 2003 actions and to determine GMA compliance. CP at 381. The citizen petitioners, using soil and aerial maps, claimed to identify 140,645 acres that were currently or recently used for agriculture and that should have been conserved. In February 2004, the Board issued a 49-page order concluding that Lewis County still failed to comply with the GMA. The Board reasoned as follows:

The GMA defers the requirements for designating natural resource lands based on the characteristics of the lands. Instead of basing its designation decisions on the characteristics of agricultural land, Lewis County focused its decision-making on its assessment of the needs of the local agricultural industry . . . . Historically, in Lewis County as well as in other counties, the agricultural industry has changed as the market for agricultural products changed. Agricultural economists are not able to predict which products will be in demand next year, let alone for the foreseeable future. The legislature, therefore, did not tie the designation of agricultural lands to economic conditions which shift unpredictably but to the characteristics of the land. The moving concern underlying the GMA’s requirement for designation and conservation of agricultural lands is to preserve lands capable of being used for agriculture because once gone, the capacity of those lands to produce food is likely gone forever.

CP at 634. The Board invalidated the ordinances and maps that (a) designated the agricultural lands to be conserved, (b) excluded “farm centers” and farm homes from designated agricultural lands, (c) allowed nonagricultural uses on the designated lands, and (d) required “sufficient irrigation capability” for designation as Class A farmland. CP at 674, 675. In a May 2004 order on reconsideration, the Board said that “until the County utilizes a compliant approach . . . potential agricultural resource lands in the


rural zones must be preserved from incompatible development so that they will be available for assessment under a compliant approach.” CP at 684.

¶6 Lewis County appealed both 2004 orders to the Lewis County Superior Court. On December 23, 2004, the superior court affirmed the Board’s orders, agreeing with the Board that “the . . . needs of the industry” argument is clearly erroneous and that “the definition of long-term significance refers to the growing capacity and productivity of the soil.” Id. at 10. We granted review.

II

(1, 2)¶7 The Growth Management Hearings Board is charged with adjudicating GMA compliance and invalidating noncompliant plans and development regulations. RCW 36.70A.280 . . . . 302. The Board “shall find compliance” unless it determines that a county action “is clearly erroneous in
view of the entire record before the board and in light of the goals and requirements of the GMA. RCW 36.70A.230 (3). To find an action “clearly erroneous,” the Board must have a “firm and definite conviction that a mistake has been committed.” Dept of Ecology v. Pub. Util Dist No. 1 of Jefferson County, 151 Wn.2d 172, 201, 849 P.2d 646 (1993). On appeal, we review the Board’s decision, not the superior court decision affirming it. King County v. Cent. Puget Sound Growth Mgmt. Hearings Bd., 142 Wn.2d 543, 553, 14 P.3d 133 (2000) (hereinafter referred to as Soccer Fields ). "We apply the standards of RCW 34.05 directly to the record before the agency, sitting in the same position as the superior court." Id. (quoting City of Redmond v. Cent. Puget Sound Growth Mgmt. Hearings Bd., 138 Wn.2d 38, 45, 959 P.2d 1091 (1998)).
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[3][¶] The legislature intends for the Board "to grant deference to counties and cities in how they plan for growth, consistent with the requirements and goals of the GMA. RCW 36.70A.3201. But while the Board must defer to Lewis County’s choices that are consistent with the GMA, the Board itself is entitled to deference in determining what the GMA requires. This court gives “substantial weight” to the Board’s interpretation of the GMA. Soccer Fields, 142 Wn.2d at 553.-7]

[4-7][¶] Under the Administrative Procedure Act (APA), chapter 34.05 RCW, a court shall grant relief from an agency’s adjudicative order if it fails to meet any of the standards delineated in RCW 34.05.570 (3). Here, Lewis County asserts that the Board erroneously applied the law, warranting relief under RCW 34.05.570 (3)(c), engaged in an unlawful decision-making process. RCW 34.05.570(3)(c). The burden of demonstrating that the Board erroneously applied the law or failed to follow prescribed procedure is on the party asserting error. Soccer Fields, 142 Wn.2d at 553. Our review of issues of law under RCW 34.05.570 (3)(c) is de novo. Thurston County v. Coop Point Ass’n, 148 Wn.2d 1, 8, 57 P.3d 1165 (2002). “On mixed questions of law and fact, we determine the law independently, then apply it to the facts as found by the agency.” Id. (citing Helvet v. Employment Sec. Dept., 83 Wn. App. 140, 145, 946 P.2d 1282 (1997), review denied, 137 Wn.2d 1038 (1999)).

III ¶10 Under the GMA, Lewis County must designate "agricultural lands that are not already characterized by

[7][¶] The dissent wrongly summarizes the Board’s role as merely this: “to ensure that the proper legislative bodies under the GMA are making the decisions mandated;” as if any decisions will do. Dissent at 514. Actually, the Board is empowered to determine whether county decisions comply with GMA requirements, to remand noncompliant ordinances to counties, and even to invalid in part or all of a comprehensive plan or development regulation until it is brought into compliance. RCW 36.70A.300 (9), 302(1). In other words, the Board is more than a deskbound stenographer telling counties what decisions are due.
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urban growth and that have long-term significance for the commercial production of food or other agricultural products.” RCW 36.70A.170 (1)(a). In addition, the county must adopt development regulations “to assure the conservation of those agricultural lands designated under RCW 36.70A.170. RCW 36.70A.050 (1).” The parties in this case offer contrary definitions of the lands subject to these requirements. As a threshold matter, then, we must identify the correct definition of “agricultural lands” under the GMA.

¶11 Lewis County designated agricultural lands based on its own definition: “those lands necessary to support the current and future needs of the agricultural industry in Lewis County, based upon the nature and future of the industry as an economic activity and not on the mere presence of good soils.” CP at 418. The Board called the county’s definition clearly erroneous, saying, “We note that throughout the GMA and the court decisions constituting it the focus is on the nature of the land, not on the nature of the agricultural industry that is using the land at any given time.” Id. at 640.

The Board also said, “[t]he GMA calls for designation of agricultural lands based on characteristics of the land” that affect long-term production capability. Id. But to be guided strictly by the physical nature of the land would stifle economic development in counties like Lewis, which have a significant amount of potentially good farmland, much of which is unproductive. For reasons set forth below, we conclude that the Board’s and county’s definitions of agricultural land are both incorrect.

¶12 The GMA defines agricultural land as “land primarily devoted to the commercial production of horticultural, viticultural, floricultural, dairy, apiary, vegetable, or animal products or of berries, grain, hay, straw, turf, seed, Christmas trees . . . or livestock, and that has long-term commercial significance for agricultural production.” RCW 36-8.

¶8 Lewis County became subject to GMA planning mandates in July 1993 and first designated agricultural lands in 1998. Until 1998, the county had no zoning laws at all.
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.70A.050(2). Thus, the legislature established that agricultural lands are those which (1) are “primarily devoted to” commercial agricultural production and (2) have “long-term commercial significance” for such production. RCW 36.70A.050 (2). We now turn to what these terms mean.

¶13 This court previously addressed the meaning of the term “primarily devoted to” in City of Redmond v. Central Puget Sound Growth Management Hearings Board, 138 Wn.2d 38, 959 P.2d 1091 (1998) (hereinafter referred to as Bentroya I), a case in which landowners challenged designation of their land as agricultural. We said there that land is primarily “devoted to” commercial agricultural production “if it is in an area where the land is actually used or capable of being used for agricultural production,” and that a landowner’s intended use of land is not conclusive. Id. at 53.

¶14 In the present case, the Board relied partly on the aforementioned language in concluding that Lewis County improperly excluded from
designated those lands that are “capable of being used” for farm production. 
CP at 637. But Benroya I dealt only with whether land is "primarily devoted to" 
"farming under RCW 36.70A.030". Benroya I, 135 Wn.2d at 49. The other question in 
designating agricultural land, neglected by the Board in this case, is whether land also 
has "long-term commercial significance" for farm production.

The GMA says that long-term commercial significance “includes the growing capacity, 
productivity, and soil composition of the land for long-term commercial production, in 
consideration with the land's proximity to population areas, and the possibility of more 
intense uses of the land.” RCW 36.70A.030 (10) (emphasis added). Thus, coun

The issue in Benroya I was whether a landowner must intend for the land to be “devoted to” agriculture to be subject to designation. We said, “While the land use on the 
particular parcel and the owner’s intended use for the land may be considered along with other factors in the determination of whether a parcel is in an area primarily devoted 
to commercial agricultural production, neither current use nor landowner intent of a particular parcel is conclusive for purposes of this element of the statutory definition.” Benroya I, 
135 Wn.2d at 59.
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ties must do more than simply catalogue lands that are physically suited to farming. They must consider development prospects (the "possibility of more 
intense uses") in determining if land has the enduring commercial quality needed to fit the agricultural land definition.

While this court has not previously interpreted RCW 36.70A.030 (10), we approve of the approach used by the Court of Appeals in Manke 
Board decision to invalidate its designation of forest lands, subject to the same GMA conservation requirements as agricultural lands. In holding that 
the Board erred, the court relied largely on WAC 365-190-050, the Washington Department of Community, Trade and Economic Development 
regulation designed to guide counties in determining which agricultural and forest lands have “long-term commercial significance.” That regulation 
says that counties shall also consider the combined effects of proximity to population areas and the possibility of more intense uses of the land as indicated by:

(a) The availability of public facilities;
(b) Tax status;
(c) The availability of public services;
(d) Relationship or proximity to urban growth areas;
(e) Predominant parcel size;
(f) Land use settlement patterns and their compatibility with agricultural practices;
(g) Intensity of nearby land uses;
(h) History of land development permits issued nearby;
(i) Land values under alternative uses; and
(j) Proximity of markets.

The decision refers to WAC 365-190-060 but cites language identical to the current WAC 365-190-060.
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WAC 365-190-050 (1). The court in Manke determined that the Board misapplied the GMA, and that the county could limit forest land 
designations to parcels of at least 5,000 acres that have a forest tax classification because the guidelines allow consideration of “predominant parcel size” and “tax status” in determining long-term significance. See Manke, 91 Wn. App. at 807-08.

In sum, based on the plain language of the GMA and its interpretation in Benroya I, we hold that agricultural land is land: (a) not already 
characterized by urban growth (b) that is primarily devoted to the commercial production of agricultural products enumerated in RCW 36.70A.030 (2), 
including land in areas used or capable of being used for production based on land characteristics, and (c) that has long-term commercial significance 
for agricultural production, as indicated by soil, growing capacity, productivity, and whether it is near population areas or vulnerable to more intense 
uses. We further hold that counties may consider the development-related factors enumerated in WAC 365-190-050 (1) in determining which lands 
have long-term commercial significance. We, therefore, remand this case for the Board to apply the correct definition of agricultural land in 
determining whether Lewis County’s 2003 ordinances complied with RCW 36.70A.170 (1).

The respondent citizens in this case argue that “nowhere in the GMA or in the implementing WACs is there authority to limit agricultural 
resource lands designations using an industry needs assessment.” Br. of Resp’ts

Interestingly, while the state of Washington’s amicus brief argues that the “structure” of WAC 365-190-050 supports the primacy of soil characteristics, it does not mention the extensive and devoted to these development-related considerations that have nothing to do with soil. State’s Amicus Curiae Br. at 10 Besides, the regulation’s structure merely 
removes the order in which the underlying statute, RCW 36.70A.030 (10), lists the factors to consider in determining long-term commercial significance. Whether the statute nor the
at 10. While it is true that no statute specifically authorizes counties to weigh industry needs above all other considerations in designating and conserving agricultural land, this does not mean the GMA prohibits such an approach. As noted above, the GMA's stated intent is to recognize the "broad . . . discretion" of counties to make choices within its confines. RCW 36.70A.3201. Because the GMA does not dictate how much weight to assign each factor in determining which farmlands have long-term commercial significance, and because RCW 36.70A.030 (10) includes the possibility of more intense uses among factors to consider, it need not "clearly erroneous" for Lewis County to give the industry's anticipated land needs above all else. If the farm industry cannot use land for agricultural production due to economic, irrigation, or other constraints, the possibility of more intense uses of the land is heightened. RCW 36.70A.030(10) permits such considerations in designating agricultural lands. Indeed, Manke involved some of the same considerations cited in the Lewis County staff report, undersized parcels and possible conflicts with nearby development. Therefore, the Board erred in concluding that Lewis County violated the GMA by designating agricultural lands based on the local farm industry's anticipated needs.

§19 However, we do not decide whether Lewis County, in focusing on the needs of the local agriculture industry, went beyond the considerations permitted by WAC 365-190-050 and RCW 36.70A.030 in designating agricultural lands. Unfortunately, Lewis County's briefs do not explain the extent to which the county applied the specified factors.

157 Wn. 2d 488

And while Lewis County Ordinance 1179C does spell out in detail how the county considered WAC 365-190-050 factors in mapping agricultural lands, the record does not indicate whether the county used permissible criteria in other decisions not explicitly tied to the WAC factors. For example, in not designating Christmas tree farms as agricultural land because they do not depend on a particular soil type, the county could have been considering the soil composition factor listed in RCW 36.70A.030 (10). But in light of the Christmas tree industry's relatively robust $19.8 million in annual sales, it is not apparent why Lewis County would "consider" soil in this way, excluding productive tree farms from designated agricultural lands simply because they don't need the types of prime soil that other farm sectors need. Thus, upon remand, when the Board reviews whether Lewis County properly designated agricultural lands, the inquiry should include whether the county's decisions were "clearly erroneous" in light of the considerations outlined in RCW 36.70A.030 or WAC 365-190-050.

V

11, 12At20 While most of the county's designation decisions at least possibly could have been based on per

6For example, the county said it considered growing capacity and productivity by requiring agricultural land to have certain soil types, as well as sufficient irrigation capability "to grow the primary agricultural crops produced in Lewis County." CP at 378. The county considered predominate parcel size by requiring agricultural land to be at least 30 acres (for economic viability), or to meet the United States Department of Agriculture definition of "commercial" agriculture. The county considered availability of public facilities and services by requiring agricultural lands to be located outside areas where urban-level services are "conducive to the conversion" of farmland. Id. at 379.
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missible criteria. We note one exception. In excluding "farm centers" and farm homes from designated agricultural lands, the county sought to serve the farmer's nonfarm economic needs. Opening Br. at 30. Serving the farmer's "nonfarm" economic needs is not a logical or permissible consideration in designating agricultural lands under the GMA. That is because it is a goal in and of itself, not a characteristic of farmland to be evaluated in determining whether such land has long-term commercial significance. A farmer's presumed need for "nonfarm" income does not necessarily relate to soil, productivity, or growing capacity under RCW 36.70A.030 (10), nor to proximity to population areas or the possibility of more intense uses of land. It has to do only with the farmer's bottom line. And while we share Lewis County's concern for the struggles farmers often face, we note that the GMA is not intended to trap anyone in economic failure, as evidenced by the mandate to conserve only those farmlands with long-term commercial significance. The problem with the county's approach is that any farmer could convert any five acres of farmland to more profitable uses, even if such conversion would remove perfectly viable fields from production. Thus it was clearly erroneous for Lewis County to exclude from designated agricultural lands up to five acres on every farm, without regard to soil, productivity, or other specified factors in each farm area.

Accordingly, we affirm the Board's invalidation of the blanket exclusion of five-acre farm

6For example, in finding that farms need gross sales of $25,000 or more for potential long-term significance, the county could have been considering "productivity" of the land or the "possibility of more intensive uses" pursuant to RCW 36.70A.030 (10). It is not necessarily error to assume that farms with meager income are likely to succumb to development pressure. Similarly, in finding that farms smaller than 180 acres may not be cost effective, the county could have been considering productivity, the practicability of more intensive uses, or "predominant parcel size."

6While the county's briefs discuss this issue in the context of zoning choices, the Board correctly treated it as a designation issue. The Board found that excluding farm homes and farm centers from designated agricultural land was "clearly erroneous" because it "creates isolated pockets of inconvertible zoning in farmlands" and makes adjacent lands vulnerable to redezignation CP at 649, 678.
centers and farm homes from designated agricultural lands.

VI

[19] Having discussed whether Lewis County properly designated lands under RCW 36.70A.170, we now turn to the RCW 36.70A.080 duty to conserve designated lands. The GMA says in relevant part: "Each county... shall adopt development regulations... to assure the conservation of agricultural... lands designated under RCW 36.70A.170." RCW 36.70A.080(1).

A county... may use a variety of innovative zoning techniques in areas designated as agricultural lands... The... techniques should be designed to conserve agricultural lands and encourage the agricultural economy. A county... should encourage nonagricultural uses to be limited to lands with poor soils or otherwise not suitable for agricultural purposes.

RCW 36.70A.177(1) (emphasis added).

[They techniques a county... may consider include...

(a) Agricultural zoning, which limits the density of development and restricts or prohibits nonfarm uses of agricultural land...

(b) Cluster zoning...

(c) Large lot zoning...

RCW 36.70A.177(2). Thus, counties may choose how best to conserve designated lands as long as their methods are "designed to conserve agricultural lands and encourage the agricultural economy." RCW 36.70A.177(1).

[14, 15] Lewis County contends that the Board ignored RCW 36.70A.177 and mandated that all agricultural land be zoned for agriculture only, thereby imposing a "per se prohibition" on all nonagricultural uses there. Opening Br. at 33. But as the respondent citizens correctly noted, the Board orders contain no such prohibition. Br. of Resp't at 24. Rather, the Board concluded that the nonfarm uses allowed within farmlands, including mining, residential subdivisions, telecommunication towers and public facilities: (a) "are not limited in ways that would ensure that they do not impact resource lands and activities negatively," and (b) "substantially interfered with achieving the GMA goal of maintaining and enhancing the agricultural industry." CP at 676. Furthermore, the Board found that the zoning failed to conserve agricultural land as required by RCW 36.70A.080. For example, the Board found that: (a) "[t]he failure to regulate farm housing to conserve agricultural prime soils and to prevent residential densities inconsistent with agriculture fails to conserve agricultural lands," (b) "[c]lustered residential subdivisions as currently allowed in the 13,767 acres of Class A Farmlands are not designed to ensure conservation of agricultural lands and encourage the agricultural economy," and (c) "the requirement that these uses not detract from the overall productivity of the resource activity is not sufficient protection." CP at 672. That is different from requiring a particular form of zoning or flatly prohibiting all nonfarm uses. In sum, Lewis County has not been stripped of the ability to use innovative zoning techniques pursuant to RCW 36.70A.177, as it contends. Rather, in invalidating the Lewis County ordinance allowing nonfarm uses of agricultural lands, the Board was simply making sure that the
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county's zoning methods are actually "designed to conserve agricultural lands and encourage the agricultural economy" as required by RCW 36.70A.177(1).[17]

[16] The county also argued that the Board failed to heed this court's decision in King County v. Central Puget Sound Growth Management Hearings Board, 142 Wn.2d 642, 14 P.3d 133 (2000), which involved whether soccer fields could be located on agricultural lands. Opening Br. at 31-32. The county contends that the Soccer Fields test is whether a nonagricultural use "unreasonably" prevents agricultural land "from being used for its intended purpose," or "defeas[es]" the county's ability to maintain and enhance the farm industry. Opening Br. at 32. That is not the test. This court said, "In order to constitute an innovative zoning technique consistent with the overall meaning of the Act, a development regulation must satisfy the Act's mandate to conserve agricultural lands for the maintenance and enhancement of the agricultural industry. Soccer Fields, 142 Wn.2d at 660. "After properly designating agricultural lands... the County may not then undermine the Act's agricultural conservation mandate by adopting 'innovative' amendments that allow the conversion of entire parcels of prime agricultural soils to an unrelated use." Id. at 591. The court concluded just the soccer field zoning was noncompliant because it "would result in a long-term removal" of agricultural land from agricultural production, possibly never returning to agricultural use. Id. at 592. Thus, a zoning technique that allows nonfarm uses on designated agricultural lands satisfies the Soccer Fields test if it does not undermine the GMA mandate to conserve

<17> The dissent appears to misperceive the scope of that RCW 36.70A.177 requirement for zoning methods to be "designed to conserve agricultural lands and encourage the
agricultural economy." That is simply the standard that a county must meet if it uses an innovative zoning technique to conserve agricultural lands. Conclusively, the dissent asserts that it is also"the standard we use when reviewing a board's determination of noncompliance and invalidity regarding nonresource uses." Dissent at 516. But the standard of review for Board determinations of noncompliance, as already noted, is drawn from the APA. Rather than apply the APA standard of review, the dissent simply offers bare assertions, i.e., "The uses that the Board found noncompliant are actually consistent with the GMA" to justify its conclusion that the Board erred. Dissent at 516.
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agricultural lands for the maintenance and enhancement of the farm industry.

[17][24] Applying the Soccer Fields test to this case, the question is whether Lewis County's ordinance allowing residential subdivisions and other nonfarm uses within designated agricultural lands undermined the GMA conservation requirement. This is a question of law, and we give "substantial weight" to the Board's interpretation of the GMA. Id. at 563. In concluding that Lewis County's permitting of nonfarm uses could "impact resource lands and activities negatively," and therefore substantially interferes with maintaining and enhancing the farm industry, the Board essentially interpreted the GMA to prohibit negative impacts on agricultural lands and activities, CP at 576. That is consistent with the RCW 36.70A.090 directive to conserve designated agricultural lands, the RCW 36.70A.200(8) goal of maintaining and enhancing the agricultural industry, and the Soccer Fields holding that innovative zoning may not undermine conservation. Therefore, the Board did not err in holding that the nonfarm uses of agricultural lands failed to comply with the GMA requirement to conserve designated agricultural lands.

VII

¶25 In conclusion, as explained above, we reverse the Board's decision that Lewis County may not designate agricultural lands based on the local farm industry's projected land needs. 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.

¶26 We also remand the case for the Board to apply the correct definition of agricultural land, taking into account whether the county used permissible criteria. However, we affirm the Board's invalidation of the exclusion of farm homes and farm centers from designated agricultural lands because "serving the farmer's nonfarm economic needs" is
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not a permissible consideration. We also affirm the Board's invalidation of nonfarm uses within agricultural lands.

C JOHNSON, MADSEN, BRIDGE, OWENS, and FAIRHURST, JJ., concur.

¶27 J.M. Johnson, J. (dissenting/concurring) - The legislature recognized the authority and wide discretion of county governments to adopt county comprehensive plans according to local growth patterns, resources, and needs. RCW 36.70A.010; 902; Manke Lumber Co. v. Diehl, 91 Wn. App. 753, 795, 928 P.2d 1173 (1996). This is the necessary starting point when reviewing any Growth Management Act (GMA), chapter 36.70A RCW, case involving review of local legislative planning decisions by one of the Growth Management Hearings Boards (GMA Boards).

¶28 The majority adequately recognizes this deference owed to county legislative bodies and the resulting standards of review. However, the majority disregards this principle when it upholds the GMA Board's decision to overturn Lewis County's (County) determination that farm centers and farm homes and certain other nonresource related uses are appropriate and allowable on agricultural and forest lands in the county. Therefore, I concur in part and dissent in part.

I. THE GROWTH MANAGEMENT ACT AND THE ROLE OF THE GMA BOARDS

¶29 Prior to reviewing these GMA Board decisions, it is necessary to provide a brief overview of the GMA, the creation of the three GMA Boards, the requirements for GMA Board membership, and the GMA Boards' limited role

Because we decide this case on statutory grounds we do not reach the procedural issues raised by Lewis County.

A separate concern, of constitutional dimension, is not presented today, whether these are genuine unelected boards, appointed by the governor, may overrule county legislators and micromanage land use plans for counties.
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to ensure compliance with GMA, while giving local legislative bodies discretion to address local needs.

¶30 In 1991 the Washington State legislature passed the GMA to help preserve Washington's environmental quality and to balance the inevitable growth with the quality of life concerns for the benefit of Washington residents. See LAWS OF 1990, 1st Ex. Sess., ch. 17, codified at ch. 36.70A RCW. The GMA recognizes 13 planning goals, which are not ranked in priority, are not meant to be exclusive, and are permitted to be given varying degrees of emphasis by local legislative bodies. RCW 36.70A.020; VAC 265-195-070 (1).

¶31 The GMA was to be a "bottom-up" approach, allowing local cities and counties the authority to make decisions based on their local needs in order to harmonize and balance the 13 statewide planning goals.

¶32 GMA was not intended to be a top-down approach with state agencies (or GMA Boards) dictating requirements to local entities. Thus, in accordance with the legislative language of the act, we have held that the GMA does not prescribe a single approach to growth management. RCW 36.70A.3201; Viking Props. v. Holm, 155 Wn.2d 112, 125-26, 118 P.3d 322 (2005) (

the ultimate burden and responsibility for planning, harmonizing the planning goals of the GMA, and implementing a county's or city's future
RCW 36.70A.020 lists the goals as:
1. Urban growth
2. Reduce sprawl
3. Transportation
4. Housing
5. Economic development
6. Property rights
7. Permits
8. Natural resource industries
9. Open space and recreation
10. Environment
11. Citizen participation and coordination
12. Public facilities and services
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Thus, the GMA is implemented exclusively by city and county governments and is to be construed to allow local governments to accommodate local needs. Viking Props., 156 Wn.2d at 125-26.

Rather than have GMA disputes proceed directly to superior court, the legislature created three regional GMA Boards to resolve land disputes under the GMA - Western Washington Growth Management Board, Eastern Washington Growth Management Board, and Central Puget Sound Growth Management Board. RCW 36.70A.250. In this case we are dealing with the Western Washington Growth Management Board (Board).

The role of GMA Boards is quasi-judicial and each may interpret for counties and cities the requirements of the GMA to ensure compliance with the GMA’s 13 goals. GMA Boards are the first level to resolve conflicting interpretations in order to resolve land disputes quickly and efficiently. GMA Boards are empowered to “hear and determine” allegations that a city, county, or state agency has not complied with the goals and requirements of the GMA and related provisions of the Shoreline Management Act of 1971 and the State Environmental Policy Act. RCW 36.70A.260.

GMA Boards review petitions for review regarding (1) designation of resource lands and critical areas, (2) regulations to conserve and protect critical areas, (3) designation of urban growth boundaries, and (4) comprehensive plans, development regulations, and shoreline master plans. Each board may also review the 20-year growth management plans, determine issues of standing, and has the task of making adjustments to growth management planning projects while considering statewide implications. RCW 36.70A.260.
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However, the role of GMA Boards is very limited. The legislature requires each GMA Board “to grant deference to counties and cities in how they plan for growth, consistent with the requirements and goals of the GMA. RCW 36.70A.3201.” While we give weight to each GMA Board’s decisions, deference is required to county planning actions if consistent with the goals and requirements of the GMA. State v. Bradshaw, 152 Wn.2d 528, 536, 98 P.3d 1190 (2004), cert. denied, 544 U.S. 922 (2006). Moreover, if a GMA Board fails to give deference to a county planning decision that complies with the GMA, the GMA Board’s ruling is not entitled to deference from this court. Quadrant Corp. v. State Growth Mgmt. Hearings Bd., 154 Wn.2d 224, 238, 110 P.3d 1132 (2006).

Some GMA Boards have recognized their very limited authority: that they are not allowed to reach constitutional or equitable issues nor are they empowered to resolve disputes related to impact fees (RCW 82.02.020). See e.g., Alberg v. King County, No. 95-3-0041, Cent. Puget Sound Growth Mgmt. H'gs Bd. Final Dec. & Order 1106 (Wash. Sept. 13, 1995) (GMA Board can't reach constitutional or equitable issues); Master Builders Ass'n of Pierce County v. City of Barney Lake, No 05-3-0046, Cent. Puget Sound Growth Mgmt. H'gs Bd. Final Order (Wash. Jan. 12, 2006) (GMA Board does not have jurisdiction to decide issues related to impact fees imposed under chapter 82.02 RCW.).

While “substantial weight” is afforded to a GMA Board's interpretation of the GMA, they are not judicial or legislative officers. The board members are not elected, but are appointed by the sitting governor for six-year terms (without legislative confirmation). In order to be eligible to participate on a GMA Board, the GMA simply requires of members (1) that at least one attorney and one former local elected official serve on each board, (2) that each board member reside within the region for which the GMA Board has jurisdiction and is qualified by “experience or training
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in matters pertaining to land use planning," and (3) that no more than two members may reside in the same county nor be from the same political party. RCW 36.70A.260.

§40 In summary, in order to effectuate the true legislative intent of the GMA, local legislative bodies must be free to address local needs and concerns. Each GMA Board's limited quasi-judicial role is to ensure that the proper legislative bodies under the GMA are making the decisions mandated.

II. AGRICULTURAL LAND AND FARM CENTERS AND FARM HOMES

§41 The majority properly ascertains the definition of agricultural land from the plain language of the GMA and our prior case law. See majority at 498-500 (citing City of Redmond v. Cent. Puget Sound Growth Mgmt. Hearings Bd., 136 Wn.2d 36, 959 P.2d 1081 (1998)). However, the majority and I differ as to the appropriate remedy. The majority would amend the issue to the Board and instruct them to apply the definition. Majority at 522. This will further protract and delay while not allowing the appropriate local government to govern.24*

§42 I also would remand to the Board (as remand is procedurally necessary) but would instruct the Board to remand to Lewis County to allow the county and its legislative body to correct the designations of land given this new definition. Lewis County must be allowed to alter its plans, if it so desires.

§43 The majority summarily affirms the Board's finding of noncompliance pertaining to farm homes and farm centers. See majority at 505-06. Specifically, the Board found that the provisions allowing farm centers and farm homes failed to comply with the GMA requirements for designation.

24*Notably, Lewis County has apparently been under constant review of the Board since 2000 as the Board found Lewis County noncompliant in 2000, 2001, and 2002. Pursuant to RCW 36.70A.130(4)(d) the Board is to review Lewis County's comprehensive plan every seven years. Thus, by the time this opinion issues, Lewis County will be on the cusp of yet another review and they have not fully completed this review.
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of agricultural resource lands. Clerk's Papers (CP) at 31. I disagree. The farm centers and farm homes that Lewis County allowed are compatible with agricultural lands under the requirements of the GMA.

§44 Lewis County allowed specific farm homes and farm centers to be excluded from the designation of long-term agricultural lands (and thus allowed in those areas):

Long-term commercially significant designations do not include (a) the "farm home" (a house currently on designated lands as the date of designation and a contiguous 5 acres, to be segregated by boundary line adjustment for separate financing purposes; and (2) "farm centers," being those lands existing at the time of designation, marked by impervious (gravel or paved) surfaces, including buildings and sheds and storage areas not to exceed 5 acres, which shall be available for rural commercial and industrial uses under guidelines established as a conditional use. (Non-farm development on the farm center shall not be effective until the County completes the terms of the special use permit.)

Lewis County Ordinance 1179E, CP at 418 (emphasis added). These farm homes and farm centers were areas that had preexisting nonagricultural uses. Id. In adopting the above ordinance, Lewis County reasoned that "[i]n the family home on the farm is not farmed and is often used for numerous activities that provide economic return to the farm family other than farm agriculture," CP at 255. Regarding farm centers, such as roadside stands for sale of farm products, Lewis County reasoned that "[f]arms in Lewis County have areas developed by paved or gravel level areas, barns, sheds, storage facilities, equipment and machine storage and maintenance areas . . . [such areas support the farm activity, but are not cropped, tilled, or generally used for soil-based agriculture, nor are they likely to in the future." CP at 255. Moreover, the farm centers were to be "centered around the existing barn and shed facilities." CP at 255.

§45 The purpose of farm homes and farm centers was to ensure the long-term survival of agricultural land by allow
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ing farmers to supplement their income. "[M]ost farms are not economically self-sufficient . . . on farm non farm income' and the ability of the farm to provide non-farm economic opportunities are both essential to the survival of long-term agriculture in Lewis County." CP at 254-55; 863. This income is a substantial component of financial viability for farms in Lewis County.

§46 Such farm centers were often already developed on lands in which the soil was not used for agriculture. A farm house and contiguous land was limited to five acres. Lewis County's Opening Br. at 30. Thus, these farm centers and farm homes have a minimal effect on agricultural land. Lewis County notes that

The designation of the farm home and the farm center from long-term commercially significant lands will not have a major impact on the conservation and protection of long-term commercially significant agricultural lands because

a. Such lands are commonly not in production; and

b. The land removed from the total designation is estimated to be approximately 2,000 acres, still leaving ample reserve for current agricultural production and future growth.

CP at 255-56. Moreover, home occupations and small commercial activities have previously coexisted with and supported farms and there is no evidence that such coexistence harmed the long-term commercial significance of agricultural land. See CP at 857.
§47 The majority states that "[p]reserving the farmer's . . . economic needs is not a . . . permissible consideration under the GMA." Majority at 0. This is illogical and would lead to fewer farms. As a legal conclusion, it is wrong; the GMA does not prohibit consideration of farmers' economic needs.

§48 The majority reads RCW 36.70A.030 (10) as an exclusive list of what "long-term commercial significance" means. Majority at 501. However, the plain language of the statute shows that the list is not exclusive: "[l]ong-term commercial significance includes the growing capacity, pro

Aug. 2006 Lewis County v. W. Wash, Growth Mgmt. Hearings Bd. 517
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ductivity, and soil composition of the land for long-term commercial production." RCW 36.70A.030 (10) (emphasis added). Thus, counties may consider other factors in determining whether land has "long-term commercial significance," including the farmers' economic needs. Moreover, as the planning commission recognized, "most farms are not economically self sufficient, and that 'on farm non farm income' and the ability of the farm to provide non farm economic opportunities are both essential to the survival of long-term agriculture in Lewis County." CP at 254-55. Allowing farm centers actually furthers the goals of the GMA because farmers will continue to farm because they are able to ensure a profit by supplementing their income through sales, etc.

§49 Farm centers and farm homes are compatible with the requirements of the GMA and may be necessary to perpetuate farms, as the Lewis County elected officials decided after extended and public consideration.

III. NONRESOURCE USES

§50 The GMA directs counties to do management and planning but allow county government broad discretion to decide what is best for each county. This discretion is especially important when considering nonresource uses on forest and agricultural land.

§51 RCW 36.70A.060, the development regulations for natural resource lands and critical areas, uses mandatory language and thus imposes a requirement. RCW 36.70A.060(1) provides:

Each county . . . shall adopt development regulations on or before September 1, 1991, to assure the conservation of agricultural, forest, and mineral resource lands designated under RCW 36.70A.170. Regulations adopted under this subsection may not prohibit uses legally existing on any parcel prior to their adoption and shall remain in effect until the county or city adopts development regulations pursuant to RCW 36.70A.040. Such regulations shall assure that the use of lands adjacent to

Aug. 2006 Lewis County v. W. Wash, Growth Mgmt. Hearings Bd. 518
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agricultural, forest, or mineral resource lands shall not interfere with the continued use, in the accustomed manner and in accordance with best management practices, of these designated lands for the production of food, agricultural products, or timber, or for the extraction of minerals.

(Emphasis added.)

§52 This court interpreted this statute in the "Soccer Fields" case stating: "The County is to conserve agricultural land in order to maintain and enhance the agricultural industry and to discourage incompatible uses." King County v. Cent. Puget Sound Growth Mgmt. Hearings Bd., 142 Winn. 2d 543, 557, 14 P.3d 133 (2000) (emphasis omitted) (hereinafter Soccer Fields).

§53 RCW 36.70A.177 (1), allowing innovative zoning techniques, uses discretionary language, which indicates a recommendation not a requirement:

A county or a city may use a variety of innovative zoning techniques in areas designated as agricultural lands of long-term commercial significance under RCW 36.70A.170. The innovative zoning techniques should be designed to conserve agricultural lands and encourage the agricultural economy. A county or city should encourage nonagricultural uses to be limited to lands with poor soils or otherwise not suitable for agricultural purposes.

(Emphasis added.) The explicit purpose of this statute is to allow counties to apply creative alternatives that conserve agricultural lands and maintain and enhance the agricultural industry. Soccer Fields, 142 Winn. 2d at 561.

§54 The majority reads these two statutes together to mean that "counties may choose how best to conserve designated lands as long as their methods are 'designed to conserve agricultural lands and encourage the agricultural economy.'" Majority at 507 (quoting RCW 36.7A.177 (1)). Thus, Lewis County has discretion in its land designations, but should aim to conserve agricultural lands and encourage the agricultural economy. This is the standard we use when reviewing a board's determination of noncompliance and invalidity regarding nonresource uses.

Aug. 2006 Lewis County v. W. Wash, Growth Mgmt. Hearings Bd. 519
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§55 The majority states:

[The] Board essentially interpreted the GMA to prohibit negative impacts on agricultural lands and activities. CP at 676. That is consistent with the RCW 36.70A.020 directive to conserve designated agricultural lands, the RCW 36.70A.020(8) goal of maintaining and enhancing the agricultural industry, and the Soccer Fields holding that innovative zoning may not undermine conservation.

Majority at 509. However, the Board did not specify any negative impact Lewis County's nonresource uses had on agricultural land. Thus, the Board failed to adequately consider the uses and did not support its findings with evidence. The Board decision did not further the goal of maintaining and enhancing the agricultural industry and may actually undermine farm survival. As discussed above, the many small farms composing "agricultural industry" often need supplemental income to survive. Finally, the Soccer Fields case is easily distinguished. In that case, entire parcels of agricultural land were being converted to long-term and nonagricultural uses of recreational fields. Here only a small and specified portion of some agricultural land parcels are being used in each instance (cumulatively little).

§56 The uses that the Board found noncompliant are actually consistent with the GMA when given proper consideration (as Lewis County did here)
A. Lewis County Code (LCC) 17.30.470(2)(c) and (d): Forest Land Incidental Uses

¶57 LCC 17.30.470 allows incidental uses on forest land, which may provide supplementary income, "without detracting from the overall productivity of the forestry activity." (Emphasis added) The uses must not "adversely affect the overall productivity of the forest nor affect more than five percent of the prime soils..." on any forest resource lands; the use must be "secondary to the principal activity.

<15%The entitled language of the quote provides "$15 percent as provided below in LCC 17.30.490(3)b." Attach. II (Lewis County's Am. Open Br.) at 178 (Attach. II). A notation next to the quote provides "error - see strike out at 17.30.490(3)d." 17.30.490(3)(d) strikes out the words "$15 percent or less." Attach. II at 180 The County states that the 15 percent clause was erroneously left in the subsection and should have been struck out. We assume that the County means what it says and has corrected this error.
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of forestry; and the use must be "sited to avoid prime lands where feasible and otherwise to minimize impact on forest lands of long-term commercial significance." LCC 17.30.470(1); Attach. III (Lewis County's Am. Open Br.) at 178-79 (Attach. III).

¶58 The Board declared several subsections of LCC 17.30.470 as noncompliant and invalid: (2)(c), allowing telecommunication facilities as an incidental activity, and (2)(d), allowing the "erection, construction, alteration, and maintenance of gas, electric, water, or communication and public utility facilities." Attach. III at 176; CP at 46. The Board reasoned that the restrictions on the incidental uses did not fulfill the GMA requirement that natural resource lands be conserved and incompatible uses be discouraged. CP at 46.

¶59 Lewis County had reasoned that these incidental uses are necessary because the county's residential corridors are surrounded by forest lands and any cross county public utility will necessarily cross either forest or agricultural lands. CP at 886. Moreover, most of the prominent hills in the county are located in forest land, thus any desire to run communication lines or towers on tall hills will require that they be located in forest lands. CP at 886.

¶60 Considering the protective limits Lewis County placed on the minimally intrusive incidental uses, as well as the necessity of those uses and their importance to the agricultural economy, the uses meet the GMA's directive to conserve agricultural lands and encourage the agricultural economy. The uses comply with the GMA and are well within Lewis County's discretion under the GMA.

B. LCC 17.30.480: Essential Public Facilities (forest land)

¶61 LCC 17.30.480 provides:

    Essential public or regulated facilities, such as roads, bridges, pipelines, utility facilities, schools, shops, prisons, and
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airports are facilities, which by their nature are commonly located outside of urban areas and may need large areas of accessible land. Such areas are allowed where:<1d>(1)<1d>

(1) Identified in the comprehensive plan of a public agency or regulated utility.

(2) The potential impact on forestry lands and steps to minimize impacts to commercial forestry are specifically considered in the siting process.

In deciding that this section was both noncompliant and invalid, the Board admitted that:

There are essential public facilities such as roads, bridges, pipelines and utility lines that must, of necessity, be located in resource lands. Clearly, the County must take into account the need for the construction of such facilities in resource lands. However, the County must also assure that the construction of these essential public facilities in forest resource lands does not interfere with the use of the resource.

CP at 47 Lewis County notes that one-third of the county is in designated forest lands. CP at 671. Thus, essential public facilities including roads, bridges, pipelines, and utility lines must be located in resource lands.

¶62 This section of Lewis County's code is compliant and valid because the County has appropriately balanced the requirement for essential public facilities with conservation of forest land. The evidence supporting this appropriate balance includes the admitted fact that forest land encompasses a large percentage of Lewis County, and the requirement of section 480 that uses must be identified in the comprehensive plan. The impact of each use on the forest land is considered and minimized in the siting process. The legislature required the counties to receive deference in making such decisions.

C. LCC 17.30.490(3)(b) and (g): Maximum Density and Minimum Lot Area (forest land)

¶63 LCC 17.30.490(3) provides:

    Subdivision as an Incidental Use. A residential subdivision of land for sale or lease within primary or local forest lands,
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whether lots are over or under five acres in size, may be approved under the following circumstances.

(a) The total density, including existing dwellings, is not greater than one unit per 60 acres, for forest land of long-term commercial importance, and that one unit per 20 acres for forest lands of local importance.
(b) The units are clustered on lot sizes consistent with Lewis County board of health rules for wells and septic.

(c) Adequate water and provisions for septic are in fact present.

(d) The project affects none of the prime soils on the contiguous holdings at the time of the adoption of this chapter, including all roads and accessory uses to serve the development; however, that prime lands previously converted to non-forestry uses are not considered prime forest lands for purposes of this section.

(e) The plat shall set aside the balance of the parcel in a designated forest tract.

(f) The plat shall contain the covenants in LCC 17.30.540.

(g) Any subdivision shall meet the cluster subdivision requirements of LCC 17.115.030(10).

---

26. LCC 17.115.030(10) provides:

CLUSTER SUBDIVISIONS greater than six units.

(a) Special conditions.

(i) Must be on properties 60 acres and larger.

(ii) No more than 24 cluster subdivision units in any 1/2-mile radius, except where separated by a visual geographic barrier.

(iii) The hearing examiner shall examine the existing and proposed development within a one-mile radius of the perimeter of the proposed site to protect rural character and shall:

(A) Determine the nature of existing development and availability of adequate facilities.

(B) Determine the likelihood of probable future cluster development.

(C) Determine the cumulative effect of such existing and probable future development.

(iv) The hearing examiner shall make written findings that the area in which the cluster is located is within the population targets of Table 4.3, p. 4-63 of the Lewis County comprehensive plan.

(v) The hearing examiner shall identify necessary conditions, including caps or specific limitations to assure that urban development defined in RCW 36.70A.020 (17) as prohibited outside urban growth areas by RCW 36.70A.110 does not occur, and that the rural character identified in the comprehensive plan and RCW 36.70A.030 (18) and RCW 36.70A.070 (50a) is protected, and to achieve the specific requirements of RCW 36.70A.070 (50c).

---
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§84 The Board found subsections (b) and (g) noncompliant and invalid. CP at 48. The Board stated that "[l]imitations on clustering are needed to ensure that residential subdivisions will not interfere with forestry activities." CP at 48. However, the section contains many limitations designed to protect forest activities - no prime soils may be affected, water provisions must be in place, and clustering restrictions contained in LCC 17.115.030(10). These limitations are sufficient to fulfill the GMA requirement of conserving forest land. Thus, the challenged sections are compliant and valid.

D. LCC 17.30.510: Water Supply

(1) When residential dwellings, other structures, or any other use intended to be supplied with water from off-site sources, an easement and right running with the land shall be recorded from the property owners supplying the water prior to final plat approval, building permit issuance, or regulated use approval.

(2) Due to the potential to interfere or disrupt forest practices on forest lands, new residential or recreational public water supplies shall comply with state standards and shall not be located within 100 feet of classified forest lands without an easement from the adjacent or abutting forest land property owner.

§85 The Board found LCC 17.30.510 to be in violation of the GMA, RCW 36.70A.110 (4), 36.70A.080(7), and 36.70A.040. CP at 48. The Board based its conclusion on chapter 36.70A, RCW claiming the provision "runs afoul of the GMA prohibition against providing urban governmental services outside of urban growth areas." CP at 48. The Board stated

---
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The extension of water systems (whether owned privately or publicly) to natural resource lands for residential purposes clearly violates the GMA by encouraging intense levels of development in resource lands and encouraging nonresource-related uses of those lands.

CP at 48.

§86 The Board's conclusion ignores the GMA's balancing of the 13 planning goals and fails to implement the GMA's clear mandate that cities and counties are to make planning decisions - not boards.
¶87 To properly apply chapter 36.70A RCW, we must be guided by legislative intent as expressed in the language of the GMA. Cannon v. Dept of Licensing, 147 Wash. 2d 41, 87, 50 P.3d 627 (2002); Rosner v. City of Bellevue, 116 Wash. 2d 542, 347, 804 P.2d 24 (1991). All of the GMA provisions must be considered in their relation to one another, and if possible, harmonized to ensure proper construction of each provision. City of Seattle v. Fontenelle, 128 Wash. 2d 492, 948, 909 P.2d 1294 (1996).

¶88 The Board's decision implies that extension of water systems to natural resource lands for residential purposes may never occur. This is not consistent with the GMA. There are 13 planning goals that must be balanced and harmonized with others. This balancing and harmonizing is within the discretion of the cities and counties. See Manke Lumber, 113 Wash. App. at 626-27. The protection of natural resources and critical areas is just one of the 13 planning goals under the GMA. The other planning goals require, inter alia, cities and counties to balance economic development needs, private property needs, and environmental needs. The blanket ban on extension of water systems to natural resource lands renders RCW 36.70A.110 (4), 36.70A.040, and 36.70A.060 inconsistent with the GMA's harmonizing approach and inconsistent with the discretion given to local cities and counties to balance those goals.
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E. LCC 17.30.620(3) and (4); Primary Uses

¶69 LCC 17.30.620(3) and (4) allowed several "primary uses" on agricultural land including:

(3) One single family dwelling unit or mobile home per lot, parcel, or tract, and the following farm housing:

(a) Farm employee housing; or

(b) Farm housing for immediate family members.

(4) Active mineral resource activities, including mining, processing, storage, and sales.

LCC 17.30.620(3), (4). The Board held these uses noncompliant and invalid. CP at 38-39.

¶70 Regarding section (3), housing, the Board inconsistently acknowledged that "farm worker housing and housing for immediate family members... may well be a resource-related use." CP at 38. The record here supports the necessity to encourage young members of families to stay on the farm. CP at 877. Further, farm worker housing is a resource related use that maintains and enhances the agricultural industry. Section (3) is an allowable use under the GMA.

¶71 Regarding section (4), mining, the Board held that the provision does not comply with the GMA to the extent mining activities are allowed without restriction in agricultural resource lands. CP at 37. The Board noted that mining activities are nonagricultural uses with great potential to impact agricultural activities and the lands themselves. CP at 38.

¶72 Lewis County argued that mining (presumably sand and gravel) is allowed to provide on-farm nonfarm income. CP at 877.

¶73 The Board erroneously held that allowing any such mining in agricultural areas would not comply with the GMA. It is likely that mining (as further defined) could be allowed in an agricultural area with the appropriate restrictions. However, such use may be better included in the incidental use section discussed directly below.
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F. LCC 17.30.640(2)(b) (c) and (e)

¶74 LCC 17.30.640, incidental uses, provides for "[u]ses which may provide supplementary income without detracting from the overall productivity of the farming activity." (Emphasis added.) The Board found subsections (2)(b), (c), and (e) noncompliant. CP at 42. LCC 17.30.640(2) (Ord. 11708, 2000) provides:

(2) Uses Allowed as Incidental Activities.

(2)(a) (b) Telecommunication facilities;

(c) Public and semipublic buildings, structures, and uses including, but not limited to, fire stations, utility substations, pump stations, wells, and transmission lines;

(e) Home based business subject to the same size requirements, development conditions, and procedures and processes as home based businesses authorized under LCC 17.42.40.

¶75 Subsection (1) qualifies these allowed uses by stating that such uses "will not adversely affect the overall productivity of the farm nor affect any of the prime soils on any farm." LCC 17.30.640(1)(a). The code itself states that uses may not detract from the overall farming activity and that such uses will not affect any of the prime soils. Lewis County has properly qualified the nonfarm incidental uses in its code. Thus, the County requirements for a nonfarm use assure the conservation of agricultural lands as required by RCW 36.70A.060.

G. LCC 17.30.660; Essential Public Facilities (agricultural land)

¶76 This section is similar to the requirements in LCC 17.30.480, discussed above. LCC 17.30.660 provides:

Essential public or regulated facilities, such as roads, bridges, pipelines, utility facilities, schools, shops, prisons, and airports, are facilities.
which by their nature are commonly located outside of urban areas and may need large areas of accessible land. Such areas are allowed
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(1) Identified in the comprehensive plan of a public agency or regulated utility.

(2) The potential impact on farmed lands and steps to minimize impacts to commercial agriculture are specifically considered in the siting

The Board concluded that this section was noncompliant and invalid. CP at 43. Regarding roads, bridges, pipelines, and utility lines, the Board found
noncompliance because there were no restrictions ensuring minimal interference with agricultural activity. CP at 43. However, the Board overlooked
the restrictions which are written into the statute; the public facilities must be identified in the comprehensive plan and the impact on the lands must be
considered and minimized when determining the location of such facilities.

§77 Regarding schools, shops, prisons, and airports, the Board found noncompliance because the uses interfere with agricultural uses and do not

need to be placed on agricultural land. CP at 43. It is appropriate that Lewis County consider the need for such facilities on agricultural land. An
example of such a need would be allowing some schools to be sited in agricultural areas to shorten student commutes.

H. LCC 17.30.860(1): Maximum Density and Minimum Lot Area (agricultural land)

§78 This section is similar to the requirements in LCC 17.30.490(5), discussed above. LCC 17.30.860(1) provides:

The minimum lot area for any new subdivision, short subdivision, large lot subdivision or exempt segregation of property shall be as follows, except for parcels to be used for uses and activities provided under LCC 17.30.810 through 17.30.650:

(1) Development Standards - Division of Land for Sale or Lease. The minimum lot area for subdivision of commercial farmland shall be 20

acres; provided, however, that a residential subdivision of land for sale or lease, whether lots are over or under five acres in size, may be

approved under the following circumstances:

(a) The total density of residential development on the entire contiguous ownership, including existing dwellings, is not more than one unit per

20 acres.
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(b) The units are clustered on lot sizes consistent with Lewis County board of health rules for wells and septic.

(c) Adequate water and provisions [for] septic capacity are in fact present.

(d) The project affects none of the prime soils on the contiguous holdings at the time of the adoption of the ordinance codified in this chapter, including all roads and accessory uses to serve the development; provided, however, that prime lands previously converted to non-crop related agricultural uses, including residential, farm and shop buildings and associated yards, parking and staging areas, drives and roads, are not considered prime farmland for purposes of this section.

(e) The plat shall set aside the balance of the prime farm lands in a designated agricultural tract.

(f) The plat shall contain the covenants and protections in LCC 17.30.880.

(g) Any subdivision shall meet the cluster subdivision requirements of LCC 17.115.030(10).

§79 The Board found subsections (b) and (g) noncompliant and invalid. CP at 56. The Board expressed concern that clustering would not conserve

agricultural lands and encourage the agricultural economy. CP at 44. However, the section contains many limitations designed to protect agricultural

activities - no prime soils may be affected, water provisions must be in place, and clustering restrictions are contained in LCC 17.115.030(10). These

limitations are sufficient to fulfill the GMA's requirement of conserving agricultural land. Thus, the challenged sections are compliant and valid.

IV. CONCLUSION

§80 I concur with the majority's conclusion regarding the definition of agricultural land. However, the majority incorrectly Proceeds to allow the Board -

instead of the County - to decide that farm centers and farm homes are improper on agricultural land and that certain non-resource related uses are

improper on agricultural and forest lands.
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By remanding to the Board instead of through the Board to the County to apply the decision, the local control mandated by the legislature in the GMA -
is further frustrated. The proceedings and resulting delay imposes costs easily avoided by my recognition of the legislature's intent. Therefore, I

concur in part and dissent in part.

SANDERS and CHAMBERS, JJ., concur with J.M. Johnson, J.
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1 In 2004, Clark County (County) designated the 10 land parcels at issue in this case as agricultural lands of long-term commercial significance (ALLTCS). Despite identifying these parcels as having long-term commercial significance for the agricultural industry in the County, less than three years later, in 2007, the County removed the 10 parcels from ALLTCS status. Simultaneously with the designation, the County included the 19 parcels in its then existing urban growth areas (UGAs). Although the ALLTCS designation process and the redrawing of the UGA boundaries are separate processes, the County blended the processes to designate and incorporate the parcels into UGAs in a single proceeding.

2 John Karpinski, a private citizen and land owner in Clark County; the Clark County Natural Resources Council, a Washington nonprofit corporation; and Futurewise, a Washington nonprofit corporation (hereinafter collectively referred to as Karpinski), petitioned the Western Washington Growth Management Hearings Board (Growth Board) for review of the County's 2007 designation/UGA expansion decisions. Karpinski challenged the County's decision on the grounds that (1) the parcels still qualified as ALLTCS, (2) the County improperly considered economic factors in deciding to desinate the agricultural parcels, and (3) the County improperly included lands not characterized by urban growth in its UGAs. While review of the County's designations/UGA expansions was pending before the Growth Board, the cities of Camas and Ridgefield passed ordinances to annex all of the designated land in parcel CB and part of the designated land in parcels CA-1 and RB-2.

3 The Growth Board affirmed the County's decisions with regards to eight of the challenged parcels: BB, LA, LC, RB-1, RC, VC, VE, and WA. But the Growth Board found that the County committed clear error in its decisions regarding the other 11 challenged parcels: SC, CA-1, CB, LB-1, LB-2, LE, RB-2, VA, VA-2, VB, and WB. As to those 11 areas, the Growth Board deemed the areas noncompliant with the GMA and the County's actions invalid.
14 The County appealed the Growth Board’s decision to the Clark County Superior Court, assigning error only to the rulings on the 11 parcels that the Growth Board found noncompliant under the GMA; Karpinski did not cross-appeal. In reviewing the Growth Board’s rulings, the superior court affirmed in part, reversed in part, held some issues moot, and remanded to the Growth Board for further consideration.

15 Karpinski sought appellate review of the superior court’s decision. Although Karpinski invoked our jurisdiction, because we review the Growth Board’s decision, not the superior court decision affirming or reversing it, the burden to prove the propriety of the dedesignations is on the County. Lewis County v. W. Wash. Growth Mgmt. Hearings Bd., 157 Wash.2d 488, 497–500, 139 P.3d 1096 (2006); King County v. Cent. Puget Sound Growth Mgmt. Hearings Bd., 142 Wash.2d 548, 553, 14 P.3d 133 (2000) (hereinafter referred to as Soccer Fields). “We apply the standards of [the Administrative Procedures Act (APA), ch. 34.05 RCW] directly to the record before the agency, sitting in the same position as the superior court.” Soccer Fields, 142 Wash.2d at 553, 14 P.3d 133 (quoting City of Redmond v. Cent. Puget Sound Growth Mgmt. Hearings Bd., 136 Wash.2d 38, 45, 959 P.2d 1091 (1998)). Under the APA, we grant relief from an agency’s adjudicative order only if it fails to meet one of nine standards delineated in RCW 34.05.570(3).

“The burden of demonstrating the invalidity of [an] agency action[,] here the Growth Board’s decision[,] is on the party asserting the invalidity” of the action, here the County. RCW 34.05.570(1)(c).

16 During our preliminary review of this case, we posed several questions to all the parties relating to jurisdiction and seeking a clarification of the issues on appeal. In particular, we requested citation to authority for Cama’s and Ridgefield’s annexation of lands while the status of those lands (dedesignation and inclusion into their UGAs) was pending review. We also requested citation to the County’s and Growth Board’s authority to act on issues pending review before this court that would invariably alter the status quo and impact our analysis.

17 To review the issues that the parties have raised in this case, we must consider the timing and effective date of UGA boundary amendments, the effect of County and Growth Board actions on issues pending review before this court, and the proper standard for deesignating ALLTCS. In part one of this opinion, we address the jurisdictional questions and hold that the Growth Board had authority to enter findings for parcels CA-1, CB, and RB-2. In addition, we hold that the County had the authority to take legislative action and that the Growth Board had the authority to take agency action on issues pending before this court, but that these actions mooted issues related to parcels BC, CA-1, RB-2, and VB.

18 In the second part of this opinion, we evaluate whether the Growth Board committed a legal error and whether substantial evidence supports the Growth Board’s order with regard to six specific land areas: LB-1, LB-2, LE, VA, VA-2, and WB. We reject the County’s argument that the Growth Board is required to review the challenged planning decisions based only on portions of the record selected by the County and is precluded from reviewing the entire record. We affirm the Growth Board’s deesignations with regards to parcels LB-1, LB-2, and LE. But because the Growth Board committed an error of law with regards to parcels VA, VA-2, and WB, we remand to the Growth Board for further consideration of those parcels.

FACTS

19 In 2004, the County updated its GMA comprehensive plan. The next year, in 2005, the County began a review of its comprehensive plan culminating in the September 25, 2007 passage of Ordinance No. 2007-09-13 (Ordinance). The Ordinance made many revisions to the County’s comprehensive plan. Central to this appeal is the County’s deesignation of parcels of land from ALLTCS status and the simultaneous decision to add these lands to the UGA boundaries of the County’s cities. The County deesignated 19 land parcels, consisting of approximately 4,351 acres of land, and incorporated them into the UGAs of the Cities of Battle Ground, Camas, La Center, Ridgefield, Vancouver, and Washougal.

20 On November 16, 2007, Karpinski petitioned the Growth Board, challenging the County’s deesignation of the 19 parcels and their addition into the various UGAs. In general, Karpinski argued that the County erred in its decisions because (1) the parcels still qualified as ALLTCS under the test established in Lewis County, (2) the County violated the GMA by improperly considering economic factors when it is decided to deesignate the parcels, and (3) the County improperly included lands not characterized by urban growth into its UGAs.

21 On April 8, 2008, the Growth Board held a one-day hearing to consider Karpinski’s claim. Although the Growth Board heard hours of testimony and reviewed an administrative record consisting of more than 3,000 pages, it focused its analysis on one specific County staff-produced document titled “Issue Paper #7: Agricultural Lands.” Administrative Record (AR) at 2236. This document contains the County’s analysis of the statutory and regulatory factors for determining whether land qualifies as ALLTCS, a matrix containing information applying each of the factors to each of the 19 parcels, and maps highlighting the then current land use zoning designations of the 19 parcels.

22 In late April 2008, while the Growth Board deliberated and prepared its final order on the propriety of
the County's desegmentation/UGA expansion decisions for the 19 parcels, Camas and Ridgefield passed ordinances purporting to annex parts of some of the parcels then pending review before the Growth Board. By City Ordinance No. 991, Ridgefield purposed to annex part of parcel RB–2. By City Ordinance No. 2512, Camas purposed to annex part of parcel CA–1. And by City Ordinance No. 2511, Camas purposed to annex all of parcel CB. These annexed lands were included in Karpinski's petition for review to the Growth Board but the Growth Board had no notice of the cities' legislative annexation actions.

¶ 13 The Growth Board entered its final order on May 14, 2008, and an amended final order on June 3, 2008. The Growth Board’s order affirmed the County's decisions on 8 of the challenged parcels, but it found clear error in its decisions on the other 11 challenged parcels. Accordingly, the Growth Board found the County's actions noncompliant with the GMA and invalidated the Ordinance with regard to the following 11 parcels: Battle Ground parcel BC; Camas parcel CA–2 and CB; La Center parcels LB–1, LB–6, and LB; Ridgefield parcel RB–2; Vancouver parcels VA, VA–2, and VB; and Washougal parcel WB.

¶ 14 On June 11, 2008, the County petitioned the Clark County Superior Court, under the APA, to review the Growth Board's decision. The County challenged only the Growth Board's 11 findings of noncompliance related to the County's desegmentation decisions. Karpinski did not file a cross appeal.

¶ 15 On February 26, 2009, Karpinski and GM Camas LLC, which has interests only in parcel CA–1, stipulated that because of Camas's enactment of City Ordinance No. 2512, purporting to annex part of parcel CA–1, that GM Camas LLC prevailed on this part of Karpinski's appeal. The superior court entered the stipulation and reversed the Growth Board's decision of noncompliance for parcel CA–1.23

¶ 16 On June 12, 2009, the superior court (1) reversed the Growth Board's decision that the County improperly desegmented from ALTCIS status parcels CB, LB–1, LB–6, LE, VA, VA–2, and WB; (2) affirmed the Growth Board's decision that the County improperly desegmented from ALTCIS status parcels PB and VB; (3) acknowledged its previous reversal of the Growth Board's decisions with regard to parcel CA–1 based on the parties' prior stipulation; (4) found issues related to parcel RB–2 moot; and (5) remanded the case to the Growth Board for further consideration. Karpinski timely appealed. The County filed a cross appeal that it later abandoned.

¶ 17 After the parties appealed to this court, the Growth Board and the County continued to pass ordinances and enter orders related to lands whose legal status was pending review before this court. These legislative and agency actions concerned land within parcels that were purportedly annexed (i.e., parcels CA–1, CB, and RB–2) and parcels where the superior court had affirmed the Growth Board's findings (i.e., parcels BC and VB). First, the Growth Board issued an order stating that it lacked jurisdiction over the purportedly annexed parts of parcels CA–1, CB, and RB–2, mistakenly believing that it lost jurisdiction when these lands were annexed prior to its final decision. The Growth Board refused to rescind its noncompliance findings for the purportedly annexed lands in these three parcels, but it “excused [the County] under these unique circumstances from taking legislative action to achieve compliance with the GMA” because the County now lacked authority over the purportedly annexed lands. AR at 3594. Next, the County passed an ordinance redesignating parcels BC, VB, and the portions of parcels CA–1 and RB–2 that were not purportedly annexed, as ALTCIS. Last, after the redesignation of these lands, the Growth Board entered findings of GMA compliance for parcels BC, VB, and the unannexed portions of parcels CA–1 and RB–2.

ANALYSIS

I.

¶ 18 Initially, we address two threshold matters relating to jurisdiction that affect the scope of our review. First, we must answer this question—when is a county's planning decision that is appealed to the Growth Board final such that city governments can rely and take action on it? Specifically, in this case, when, if ever, did parcels CA–1, CB, and RB–2 become incorporated into the Camas and Ridgefield UGAs such that they were subject to annexation? Second, we must evaluate what effect a county's legislative action changing the designation of land has on our jurisdiction to resolve issues in a pending appeal involving that land. We hold that because a County's challenged land designation determination is not final, city governments cannot rely on county planning decisions that are the subject of a pending appeal and any such actions do not divest the reviewing body of jurisdiction. We also hold that in some circumstances, a County's legislative actions during a pending appeal may moot issues on review.

City Governments May Not Rely on County GMA Planning Decisions That Are Pending Review

¶ 19 On June 1, 2010, we requested citation to the authority for Camas's and Ridgefield's annexation ordinances regarding parcel CB and parts of parcel CA–1 and RB–2. Under RCW 35.15.005, "[n]o city or town located in a county in which urban growth areas have been designated under RCW 35.70A.110 may annex territory beyond an urban growth area." Because the propriety of the County's decision to include this land in a UGA had been timely challenged and was pending review before this court, we questioned
what authority allowed the cities to purportedly annex land not yet determined to be properly within their UGAs.

120 In a consolidated response, the parties first objected, arguing that the validity of the annexations is not properly before this court because no party raised it. But issues related to the annexations directly impact our ability to resolve pending issues on parcels CA-1, CB, and RB-2 raised in this appeal. And jurisdictional questions are, as always, a threshold issue for a reviewing court.

121 Because we sit in the same position as the superior court, we review issues related to the challenged portions of the Growth Board's decision appealed to the superior court. See Soccer Fields, 142 Wash.2d at 553, 14 P.3d 133. Here, the County's original appeal challenged each of the Growth Board's decisions related to 11 different parcels, including challenges to parcels CA-1, CB, and RB-2. But in its opening brief to this court, the County argues that issues related to parcels CA-1, CB, and RB-2 are moot because the cities' annexation of the lands deprived the Growth Board and reviewing courts of jurisdiction. Moreover, the County argues on appeal that the Growth Board committed an error of law because it entered decisions evaluating the County's actions with regard to these lands without jurisdiction to do so.

122 From these arguments, the question pending before us with regard to parcels CA-1, CB, and RB-2 is whether the Growth Board had jurisdiction to enter findings and conclusions on these three parcels. Implicit is a question of the legitimacy of the annexations, as evidenced by arguments that any determinations made by the Growth Board or this court would be pointless because the County has no authority over annexed lands. To evaluate whether any issue on these three parcels is moot or whether the Growth Board committed an error of law, as the County contends, we must first determine what effect, if any, the annexations had on the Growth Board's jurisdiction to determine GMA compliance for parcels CA-1, CB, and RB-2.

123 When addressing the merits of our jurisdictional questions, the parties argue in their consolidated response that statutory authority allows city and county governments to take action on issues that are under review by the Growth Board. Specifically, the parties cite RCW 36.70A.300(4), .320(1), and former RCW 36.70A.320(1) (1997) for support. RCW 36.70A.320(1) states that "comprehensive plans and development regulations, and amendments thereto, adopted under this chapter are presumed valid upon adoption." RCW 36.70A.300(4) states that, "unless the Growth Board makes a determination of invalidity, a finding of noncompliance and an order of remand shall not affect the validity of comprehensive plans and development regulations during the period of remand." The parties also cite to statutory language that a Growth Board "determination of invalidity is prospective in effect and does not extinguish rights that vested under state or local law before receipt of the [Growth Board's] order by the city or county." Former RCW 36.70A.320(2) (emphasis added). The parties contend that these cited statutes allow cities to take legislative actions, including annexing land, in reliance on a county's decisions until the Growth Board determines that the county's planning decisions are noncompliant or invalid under the GMA.

124 The parties' arguments are unpersuasive. For the reasons we explain below, challenged County legislative actions pending review are not final and no party may act in reliance on them. In this case, the city of ordinances purporting to annex land in parcels CA-1, CB, and RB-2 did not deprive the Growth Board of jurisdiction over the challenge to the County's actions. Accordingly, here the Growth Board did not err by entering findings and conclusions related to parcels CA-1, CB, and RB-2 in its final order after Camas and Ridgefield purported to annex parts of these parcels.

125 We review statutory construction de novo. Wanatchee Sportsmen Ass'n v. Chelan County, 141 Wash.2d 169, 175, 4 P.3d 123 (2000). When the plain language of a statute is unambiguous, we construe the provision as written. Bravo v. Dolan Cos., 125 Wash.2d 745, 752, 888 P.2d 147 (1995). But, in undertaking a plain language analysis, we avoid a reading that results in "unlikely, absurd, or strained consequences" because we presume that the legislature did not intend an absurd result. Cannon v. Dept of Licensing, 147 Wash.2d 41, 57, 50 P.3d 627 (2002). We evaluate the plain meaning of a statutory provision from the ordinary meaning of the language used in the statute, as well as from the context of the statute in which that provision is found and the statutory scheme as a whole. Wash. Pub. Ports Ass'n v. Dept of Revenue, 146 Wash.2d 697, 645, 66 P.3d 462 (2003).

126 The parties misinterpret RCW 36.70A.320(1). This statute addresses the burdens, presumptions, and standards that govern the review of a county action by the Growth Board. The purpose of the Growth Board's review is to determine the legitimacy of a county's actions that have been timely challenged. Although RCW 36.70A.320(1) creates a presumption of validity of the county's actions that must be applied by the Growth Board during its review, the statute does not create a presumption of validity such that other entities can act in reliance on challenged land use decisions before the Growth Board and/or appellate court terminates its review. A presumption of validity on review is just that—a rebuttable presumption that the County's decision is correct; but the County's timely challenged actions are not
effective until review of the relevant issues is terminated.

¶ 27 The parties' reliance on RCW 36.70A.300(4) is also misplaced. This subsection of the statute addresses only the effect of Growth Board decisions "during the period of remand." RCW 36.70A.300(4) (emphasis added). During the Growth Board's initial review of the County's decisions, nothing has been remanded to the County for its further consideration. Accordingly, this statute does not apply.

¶ 28 Likewise, former RCW 36.70A.302(2) does not support the parties' argument. This statute states that Growth Board decisions are prospective in effect and do not "extinguish rights that vested under state or local law before receipt of the [Growth] Board's order by the city or county." Former RCW 36.70A.302(2) (emphasis added). Here, the parties' rights to annex the lands purportedly added to their UGA did not yet vest under state law. County decisions related to the GMA that are timely challenged and pending review before the Growth Board and/or an appellate court are not final and cannot be relied on until either (1) the Growth Board's final order is not appealed or (2) the county's decisions are affirmed and a final order or mandate opinion is filed by a court sitting in its appellate capacity.

¶ 29 Under the parties' interpretation of RCW 36.70A.300(4), 320(1), and former RCW 36.70A.302(2), the GMA would be unenforceable. The parties' interpretation would allow a county to incorporate any land into a UGA regardless of whether it satisfies the GMA's requirements; draw out the appeal at the Growth Board level until a city could pass an ordinance annexing the property; and then moot out any challenges by citing the county's lack of authority over the lands or argue, as it did here, that the annexation deprived the Growth Board of jurisdiction to review its decision to include the property in the UGA. The legislature did not intend to permit counties to evade review of their GMA planning decisions in this manner, and the GMA's statutory scheme does not allow them to do so.

¶ 30 Accordingly, we hold that Camas's and Ridgefield's annexations did not deprive the Growth Board of jurisdiction to review the validity of the County's actions designating parcels CA-1, CB, and RB-2 and including them in the cities' UGA. We address this issue only in relation to the County's challenge to the Growth Board's jurisdiction, and ours, to review its designations/UGA decisions. We hold only that the Camas and Ridgefield annexation ordinances did not deprive the Growth Board or this court of jurisdiction over the appeal of parcels CA-1, CB, and RB-2 in this case. We reject the County's argument that the Growth Board lacked authority to enter noncompliance findings related to parcels CA-1, CB, and RB-2 and that it committed an error of law when entering its findings on these parcels. Accordingly, we hold that the Growth Board had authority to enter findings regarding these parcels.

¶ 31 Finally, in its amicus curiae brief, Camas argues that it is a necessary party to the consideration of any questions involving the validity of the annexations and that it was never properly joined to these proceedings. CR 19. A necessary party is one that "claims an interest relating to the subject of the action" and whose absence from the case may "impar [im] or impede his ability to protect that interest." CR 19(a)(2). We are not insensitive to the cities' concerns and limit our holding only to the Growth Board's authority to enter findings regarding the validity of the County's decisions relating to these parcels.

The Impact of County Actions On Issues Pending Review

¶ 32 Also on June 1, 2010, we asked the parties to address whether the County could enact ordinances and whether the Growth Board could enter orders on matters pending appeal in this court. According to the parties' consolidated response, the County apparently decided to accept the superior court's decision affirming the Growth Board's decisions with regard to parcels BC and VB. While this case was pending review before this court, the County passed an ordinance removing parcels BC and VB from UGAs and redesignating them as A1LTCs. In the same ordinance, the County also removed from UGAs those parts of parcels CA-1 and RB-2 that were not included in the cities' annexation ordinances and redesignated them as A1LTCs.

¶ 33 Although a superior court lacks authority to enter an order that modifies the judgment or decision appealed without permission from this court, RAP 7.2(e), this limitation does not apply to or prohibit a legislative body from taking a valid legislative action. Here, the County withdrew its prior efforts to incorporate parcels BC, VB, and parts of CA-1 and RB-2 into UGAs and returned these lands to their original A1LTC designation status. Although the County's original designations decisions regarding these lands were subject to our review via Karpinski's appeal from the superior court's decision, the County has the burden to prove that the Growth Board acted under the APA. RCW 34.05.450(1)(a). By the nature of its legislative action, the County effectively conceded that the Growth Board did not err in its decisions related to these lands. And because the Growth Board subsequently removed its noncompliance findings with regard to these lands, there is no longer any error presented for our review or any remedy for us to provide. Accordingly, any issues related to parcels BC, VB, and the parts of parcels CA-1 and RB-2 that were redesignated A1LTCs are now moot.

Properity of Appellate Review of the County's GMA Decisions Affirmed By The Growth Board But Not Appealed
In our June 1, 2010 order relating to jurisdiction, we also asked the parties to clarify whether the notice of appeal included the propriety of the Growth Board's decision approving the County's designation of eight parcels (i.e., parcels BB, LA, LC, RB-1, RC, VC, VB, and WA) from AILTC status. The Growth Board ruled that the County's decisions on these eight parcels were compliant with the GMA and Karpinski did not cross-appeal these decisions to the superior court. Although the Growth Board addressed all 19 parcels in a single decision, the parties agree that the notice of appeal did not include any issues related to the Growth Board's decisions affirming the eight aforementioned parcels. Accordingly, we do not address any issues related to parcels BB, LA, LC, RB-1, RC, VC, VB, and WA.

II.

We next address the land specific arguments related to parcels LB-1, LB-2, LE, VA, VA-2, and WB. The Growth Board determined that the County's decisions desegregating these parcels from AILTC status and incorporating them into UGAs were noncompliant with the GMA. We affirm the Growth Board's decisions for parcels LB-1, LB-2, and LE, but remand to the Growth Board for further consideration on parcels VA, VA-2, and WB.

Standard of Review and Burden of Proof in GMA Cases

The GMA provides counties with broad discretion to develop comprehensive plans. Soccer Fields, 142 Wash.2d at 561, 14 P.3d 133. A county's discretion, however, "is bounded by the goals and requirements of the GMA." Soccer Fields, 142 Wash.2d at 561, 14 P.3d 133. The GMA's goals include encouraging development in areas already characterized by urban development; reducing sprawl; encouraging economic development; maintaining and enhancing natural resource-based industries, such as the agricultural industry; conserving agricultural lands; and retaining open spaces including increasing access to natural resource lands. RCW 36.70A.300(1); (2), (3), (8), (9).

The Growth Board is charged with determining whether county decisions comply with GMA requirements. Former RCW 36.70A.380 (2003); RCW 36.70A.320 (3); Lewis County, 157 Wash.2d at 497, 139 P.3d 1096. In carrying out its duties, the Growth Board can either (1) remand noncompliant decisions and ordinances to the county so it can bring them into compliance with the GMA or (2) invalidate part or all of the county's noncompliant comprehensive plan and/or development regulations. RCW 36.70A.320 (3); former RCW 36.70A.300 (1) (1997); Lewis County, 157 Wash.2d at 498 n.7, 139 P.3d 1096.

The legislature specifically intended the Growth Board "to grant deference to counties and cities in how they plan for growth, consistent with the requirements and goals of the GMA." Lewis County, 157 Wash.2d at 496, 139 P.3d 1096 (quoting former RCW 36.70A.320 (1997)). Accordingly, at the Growth Board's level of review, a county's comprehensive plan and/or regulations are "presumed valid upon adoption." RCW 36.70A.320 (1). This statutory deference requires that the Growth Board "shall find compliance" unless it determines that a county action "is clearly erroneous in view of the entire record before the [Growth] Board and in light of the [GMA's] goals and requirements." Lewis County, 157 Wash.2d at 497, 139 P.3d 1096 (quoting RCW 36.70A.320 (3)); see also RCW 36.70A.330 (2) (stating that a challenger has the burden to demonstrate that a county's action is not GMA-compliant). A county's action is "clearly erroneous" if the Growth Board has a "firm and definite conviction that a mistake has been committed." Thurston County v. W. Wash. Growth Mgmt. Hearings Bd., 164 Wash.2d 329, 340-41, 190 P.3d 38 (2008) (internal quotation marks omitted) (quoting Lewis County, 157 Wash.2d at 497, 139 P.3d 1096).

The APA governs judicial review of board actions, including the Growth Board's. Thurston County, 164 Wash.2d at 341, 190 P.3d 38; see also RCW 36.70A.300 (5). "The burden of demonstrating the invalidity of [an] agency action is on the party asserting invalidity," here the County and the other interveners. RCW 34.05.770 (1)(a) (emphasis added); Thurston County, 164 Wash.2d at 341, 190 P.3d 38. On appeal, we sit in the same position as the superior court and apply the APA review standards directly to the record before the agency. Soccer Fields, 142 Wash.2d at 553, 14 P.3d 133 (quoting Redmond, 136 Wash.2d at 45, 959 P.2d 1091). In addition, like the Growth Board, we defer to the County's planning action unless the action is "clearly erroneous." Brinnon Grp. v. Jefferson County, 159 Wash.App. 446, 446, 253 P.3d 769 (2011); see RCW 36.70A.330 (2); former RCW 36.70A.3201; Quadrant Corp. v. Cent. Growth Mgmt. Hearings Bd., 154 Wash.2d 234, 238, 110 P.3d 1138 (2005).

Under the APA, we grant relief from an agency's order after an adjudicative proceeding if we determine, in relevant part, that

(d) [The agency has erroneously interpreted or applied the law; or]

(e) The order is not supported by evidence that is substantial when viewed in light of the whole record before the court, which includes the agency record for judicial review, supplemented by any additional evidence received by the court under this chapter.
RCW 34.05.770(3) 18


The GMA Definition and History of the Term "Agricultural Lands of Long-Term Commercial Significance" (ALLCOS)

142 By September 1, 1991, certain counties were required to designate "agricultural lands that are not already characterised by urban growth and that have long-term significance for the commercial production of food or other agricultural products." Lewis County, 157 Wash.2d at 498–99, 139 P.3d 1096 (quoting RCW 36.70A.170(1)(a)). Additionally, counties were mandated to develop regulations "to assure the conservation of" designated agricultural lands. Lewis County, 157 Wash.2d at 499, 139 P.3d 1096 (quoting RCW 36.70A.060(1)(b)). The purpose was clear: to curtail sprawl, to preserve critical resource lands, and to ensure the continued viability of local food production.

143 Our Supreme Court summarized the working definition of "agricultural land" under the GMA as land: (a) not already characterised by urban growth (b) that is primarily devoted to the commercial production of agricultural produce enumerated in RCW 36.70A.050(3), including land in areas used or capable of being used for production based on land characteristics, and (c) that has long-term commercial significance for agricultural production, as indicated by soil, growing capacity, productivity, and whether it is near population areas or vulnerable to more intense uses. We further hold that counties may consider the development-related factors enumerated in [former] WAC 365–190–050(1) [(1991)] in determining which lands have long-term commercial significance.

Lewis County, 157 Wash.2d at 502, 139 P.3d 1096.19

144 Despite our Supreme Court's permissive language suggesting that counties "may consider the development-related factors enumerated in [former] WAC 365–190–050(1)," Lewis County, 157 Wash.2d at 502, 139 P.3d 1096 (emphasis added), when addressing the third prong of the Lewis County test to determine if land has long-term significance for agricultural production, the regulation actually requires counties to consider the 10 factors:

(1) In classifying agricultural lands of long-term significance for the production of food or other agricultural products, counties and cities shall use the land-capability classification system of the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Soil Conservation Service as defined in Agriculture Handbook No. 510. These eight classes are incorporated by the [USDA] into map units described in published soil surveys. These categories incorporate consideration of the growing capacity, productivity and soil composition of the land. Counties and cities shall also consider the combined effects of proximity to population areas and the possibility of more intense uses of the land as indicated by:

(a) The availability of public facilities;

(b) Tax status;

(c) The availability of public services;

(d) Relationship or proximity to urban growth areas;

(e) Predominant parcel size;

(f) Land use settlement patterns and their compatibility with agricultural practices;

(g) Intensity of nearby land uses;

(h) History of land development permits issued nearby;

(i) Land values under alternative uses; and

(j) Proximity of markets.

Former WAC 365–190–050 (emphasis added). 20 The GMA and WAC do not prioritize these 10 factors.
and a county has discretion regarding their application. Lewis County, 157 Wash.2d at 569, 115 P.3d 196. Additionally, our Supreme Court has suggested that counties cannot consider additional other factors to the detriment of the GMA’s stated goals and requirements. See Lewis County, 157 Wash.2d at 566 n. 16, 115 P.3d 196 (“Although, counties may consider factors besides those specifically enumerated in RCW 36.70A.030(10) in evaluating whether agricultural land has long-term commercial significance, that is not what happened here. Rather, Lewis County simply decided to serve its own goal instead of meeting the GMA’s specific land designation requirements.”).

¶ 45 The Growth Board previously gave deference to the County’s 2004 designation of these lands as ALLTCS. See Bldg. Assoc. of Clark Cnty., No. 04-2-00386, 2005 WL 3392258. We evaluate whether a designation of agricultural land was clearly erroneous by determining whether the property in question continues to meet the GMA’s definition of “agricultural land” as defined in Lewis County v. Lewis County. See Yakima County v. E. Wash. Growth Mgmt. Hearings Bd., 146 Wash.App. 679, 688–89, 199 P.3d 12 (2008). The County’s contention that the Growth Board is required to give its 2004 designtion deference over its 2006 designation is unpersuasive. The County designated these parcels as ALLTCS in its 2004 comprehensive plan that it intended to follow for 20 years. Absent a showing that this designtion was both erroneous in 2004 and improperly confirmed by the Growth Board, or that a substantial change in the land occurred since the ALLTCS designation, the prior designation should remain. Without such deference to the original designation, there is no land use plan, merely a series of quixotic regulations. Moreover, under such ever-changing regulations, the GMA goal of planning, maintaining, and conserving agricultural lands could never be achieved. See RCW 36.70A.020(5); Soccer Fields, 142 Wash.2d at 558, 14 P.3d 133.

The Growth Board’s Required Deference to the County

¶ 46 As another preliminary matter, the County argues that the Growth Board committed an error of law by failing to defer to the County’s current land characterizations to the derogation of its prior long-term land designations. Specifically, the County asserts that the Growth Board substituted its own judgment based on its improper independent evaluation of the evidence rather than deferring to the County’s decisions, as required by RCW 36.70A.320(1) and former RCW 36.70A.3201. The County contends that the Growth Board exceeded its authority by reevaluating all the evidence in the record to determine whether the County committed a clear error. We disagree.

¶ 47 The Growth Board’s function is to determine whether the County complied with the GMA. Former RCW 36.70A.280; RCW 36.70A.320(3); Lewis County, 157 Wash.2d at 497, 139 P.3d 1096. In order to determine compliance, the Growth Board must review the County’s actions and decide whether they are “clearly erroneous in view of the entire record before the board and in light of the goals and requirements” of the GMA. RCW 36.70A.320(3) (emphasis added). The County has not persuaded us that the Growth Board committed an error of law by exceeding its authority in review of the County’s designtion decisions. RCW 94.04.570(1)(a).

¶ 48 In order for the Growth Board to review Karpinski’s challenge to the County’s designtion decisions, it had to review all of the evidence in the record, review the statutory and regulatory factors in the Lewis County test, and determine whether the County erred in 2007 when applying the test to the parcel. To fulfill its statutory obligation of determining whether a county committed clear error, a Growth Board must review the evidence but not reweigh it. Once the Growth Board determines that the County committed a clear error, it owes no deference to the County’s decisions, which rest on the identified error, and acts in accord with its statutory duty when entering findings of noncompliance and/or invalidity. RCW 36.70A.300, 302, 320(3). Accordingly, insofar as the County argues that the Growth Board committed a legal error by reviewing the evidence rather than just the portion of the record that the County put forth as supporting its decisions, the County’s claim fails.

¶ 49 Moreover, the County’s argument that the Growth Board is compelled to consider only the portion of the evidentiary record highlighted by the County and is precluded from considering the entire evidentiary record is inconsistent with the concept of appellate review. If the Growth Board were required to automatically accept a county’s land characterization without the context of the entire record, there is, in effect, no full review of the county’s decisions. When engaging in a statutory construction analysis, we avoid a construction that results in “unlikely, absurd, or strained consequences” because we presume that the legislative body did not intend absurd results. Cannon, 147 Wash.2d at 57, 50 P.3d 657. Under the County’s argument, the Growth Board can consider only a county’s final decisions and/or evidence that a county puts forward as supporting its decision, and the Growth Board must reject any contradictory evidence and/or not examine the reasons underlying a county’s decisions. But the Growth Board has both the duty and the authority to review a county’s reasons supporting its decisions to determine if whether a county followed the GMA and whether a county’s decisions are consistent with the GMA’s goals and objectives. See RCW 36.70A.320(3). Otherwise a county could simply ignore overwhelming evidence that contradicts its preferred planning option and articulate a decision that, on its face, appears consistent with the GMA but lacks evidentiary support.
150 In addition, the County's argument would render meaningless the plain language of the Growth Board's mandate to determine GMA compliance "in view of the entire record before the Board." RCW 36.70A.540(3) (emphasis added). We interpret and construe statutes so as to give effect to all statutory language and not render any part meaningless or superfluous. Whittier County v. City of Bellingham, 128 Wash.2d 521, 546, 929 P.2d 1205 (1996). Under the County's interpretation, a county would have unfettered discretion and authority to make planning decisions that facially comply with the GMA but are based on policies inconsistent with the GMA. The County's interpretation is inconsistent with a proper application of the rules of statutory construction and would effectively eviscerate the duties the legislature requires the Growth Board to perform.

151 In addition, the County's argument misstates the Growth Board's standard of review by conflating it with the appellate court's standard of review. The County asserts that if substantial evidence supports its decisions, the Growth Board must find that the County complied with the GMA. Rasp's MacDonald Living Trust, 86 Wash.2d at 7 (quoting Tension Growth Board v. City of Bellingham, 128 Wash.2d 521, 546, 929 P.2d 1205 (1996)). But a Board's finding of clear error is not grounded in whether substantial evidence supports the County's decisions; the correct standard is whether, after having reviewed the entire record in light of the goals and purposes of the GMA, the Growth Board has a "firm and definite conviction that a mistake has been committed." Soccer Fields, 142 Wash.2d at 153, 15 P.3d 1533 (quoting Dep't of Ecology v. Pub. Util. Dist. No. 1, 121 Wash.2d 179, 201, 849 P.2d 456 (1993), aff'd, 151 Wash.2d 700, 114 S.Ct. 1900, 128 L.Ed.2d 715 (1994)). The Growth Board could find both that substantial evidence supports the County's decisions and that the County's decisions contradict the goals and purposes of the GMA such that the Growth Board has a firm and definite conviction that the County made a mistake.

152 Accordingly, the County's claim that the Growth Board committed an error of law when it did not defer to the County's 2007 decisions—which were inconsistent with the County's 2004 decisions to which the Growth Board had previously deferred—rests on a misinterpretation of statutes. The GMA does not preclude the Growth Board from reviewing the entire record when making a determination of GMA compliance. And the correct standard for the Growth Board to apply is whether it has a firm and definite conviction that the County made a mistake. We turn now to a review of the individual parcels and whether the Growth Board committed an error of law when finding the County made clear errors in its planning decisions.

La Center Parcels LB-1, LB-2, LE 22

153 Next, we address the County's argument that the Growth Board erred in finding that parcels LB-1, LB-2, and LE did not comply with the GMA because the Growth Board (1) failed to consider evidence supporting La Center's position and (2) failed to enter findings of fact that showed it considered fully all the Lewis County factors. Our review of the record shows that the Growth Board considered all the Lewis County factors and correctly determined that the County committed a clear error in deciding to designate these lands. The County ignored overwhelming evidence showing that these parcels were ALLTCS in 2004 and remained so in 2007. Substantial evidence supports each part of the Growth Board's application of the Lewis County analysis, as well as the ultimate GMA noncompliance finding. The Growth Board properly determined that the County erred in 2007 when it desigated parcels LB-1, LB-2, and LE from ALLTCS status and incorporated them into the La Center UGA.

154 First, we reiterate that the County designated La Center parcels LB-1, LB-2, and LE as ALLTCS in 2004. The record supports the Growth Board's determination that ALLTCS remained the correct designation for the property in 2007. The challenged La Center parcels meet the definition of ALLTCS based on the County's own Lewis County matrix information. The evidence that the County considered in its matrix overwhelmingly indicates that these parcels remain ALLTCS and that, in designtating them, the County incorrectly ignored the vast majority of the evidence in favor of its desire to further economic development for the City of La Center.

155 Specifically, the matrix indicates that parcels LB-1, LB-2, and LE all (1) lack water and sewer lines in their borders; (2) are not adjacent to the then existing boundary of the La Center UGA; (3) are described as having mostly rural land uses such as open fields, forested land, and rural residential; (4) are next to land characterized by rural land uses; and (5) lack any urban development permits in their vicinity. In addition, parcel LB-1 is described as containing 56.58 percent prime agriculture soils with 83.99 percent of the parcel's land currently in an agricultural/farm use program. Parcels LB-2 and LE have 60 percent and 78.69 percent prime agricultural soils, respectively, although these parcels currently have only 21 percent and 0 percent of the land currently in an agricultural/farm use program. Based on the overwhelming evidence that these parcels are still ALLTCS, the Growth Board correctly identified that the County committed clear error when desesignating parcels LB-1, LB-2, and LE from ALLTCS status.

156 Because the Lewis County test has three prongs that must be satisfied for land to be desesignated
as ALLICS, we briefly evaluate each in reviewing whether the Growth Board correctly concluded that the County erred when it dedesignated these parcels. Yakima County, 146 Wash.App. at 688-89, 192 P.3d 12. Put differently, just because the County may have committed clear error in its application of one proviso of the test does not mean that the County's overall dedesignation decision for a particular parcel was clear error because the County may have correctly determined that the land failed a different prong of the test.

157 The first Lewis County prong requires a determination of whether the land is characterized by "urban growth." 157 Wash.2d at 502, 139 P.3d 1096. The Growth Board's finding of fact 43 states in part, "Areas LB-1, LB-2, and LE while near the La Center's UGA are not areas of the UGA characterized by urban growth." CP at 339. The County concedes that it has never challenged this finding of fact. Unchallenged findings are verities on appeal. Manke, 113 Wash.App. at 628, 53 P.3d 1011.

158 Moreover, even if we were to review it, substantial evidence supports finding of fact 43. The GMA defines "urban growth" as "typically requir[ing] urban governmental services." Former RCW 36.70A.030(18) (2009). "Urban governmental services" include a variety of "public services and public facilities." Former RCW 36.70A.030(20) (2009) (listing examples of "urban governmental services," including storm and sanitary sewers, water, street cleaning, fire and police protection, public transit, and other public utilities). The GMA also defines "urban growth" as "land having urban growth located on it, or to land located in relationship to an area with urban growth on it as to be appropriate for urban growth." Former RCW 36.70A.030(18).

159 All the evidence in the County's matrix belies a conclusion that parcels LB-1, LB-2, and LE are characterized by urban growth. The second column of the County's matrix, which addresses the first Lewis County test prong, notes only the size of the parcel and that there are no sewer or water lines in the parcel. And, elsewhere in the matrix, the County describes each of these parcels as containing mostly "open fields, forested land, and rural residential" land uses, that there are no urban development permits within the vicinity of these parcels, and that the parcels are not adjacent to any existing UGAs. AR at 2242-43. Accordingly, substantial evidence supports a finding that parcels LB-1, LB-2, and LE do not contain urban growth and are not near lands containing urban growth. The Growth Board correctly concluded that the County committed clear error when assessing the urban growth characteristics of these parcels because the evidence does not support it.

160 The second Lewis County prong requires a determination of the commercial productivity of the land or the land's capability of being commercially productive. 157 Wash.2d at 502, 139 P.3d 1096. This factor requires an assessment of whether "the land is actually used or capable of being used for agricultural production." Redmond, 136 Wash.2d at 53, 959 P.2d 1091. Further, "neither current use nor landowner intent of a particular parcel is conclusive for purposes of this element." Redmond, 136 Wash.2d at 53, 959 P.2d 1091. The Growth Board's finding of fact 43 states in part, "All areas, LB-1, LB-2, and LE, are capable of being farmed." CP at 339. The County did not challenge finding of fact 43 and, therefore, it is a verity on appeal. Manke, 113 Wash.App. at 628, 53 P.3d 1011. Moreover, on appeal, the County concedes that "there is substantial evidence in the record that these areas have soils suitable for agriculture." Resp't La Center Br. at 4. Accordingly, substantial evidence supports that parcel LB-1, LB-2, and LE are lands that are able to be farmed. The Growth Board correctly concluded that the County committed clear error when it evaluated the farming capabilities of these parcels.

161 The final Lewis County prong requires a determination of the "long-term commercial significance" for agricultural production of the parcels. 157 Wash.2d at 502, 139 P.3d 1096. This prong requires considering soil composition, proximity to population areas, the possibility of more intense uses of the land, and the 10 factors in former WAC 365-190-050(1). See RCW 36.70A.030(4)(C). The Growth Board's finding of fact 43 states in part, "All areas, LB-1, LB-2, and LE, are capable of being farmed." CP at 339. The County did not challenge finding of fact 43 and, therefore, the County's decision is a verity on appeal. Manke, 113 Wash.App. at 628, 53 P.3d 1011. Moreover, on appeal, the County concedes that "the County's decision was proper.

162 Although the County is correct that the Growth Board did not enter specific findings of fact related to each of the WAC factors, the record shows that the Growth Board adequately considered all aspects of the third Lewis County test prong. In its final decision, the Growth Board outlined the various arguments the parties presented regarding the WAC factors, evidencing that the Growth Board did not overlook disputes about any of them. In the analysis section of its final order, the Growth Board mentioned "other WAC factors" but stated that "the [County's] reason for de-designating these areas is that they border Interstate-5 ([1-3]) therefore present[ing] a unique economic development opportunity for La Center. The [County's] desire to further economic development can not outweigh its duty to designate and conserve agricultural lands." CP at 328. The County's clearly stated reasons for redesignating these parcels were beliefs that (1) the parcels had a "special value" (AR at 24080) that provided more economic benefit to La Center as developed land than it would as agricultural land and (2) the lands would help "diversify the La Center economy." AR at 15.
Although neither the GMA nor WAC prioritizes the WAC factors, the Growth Board correctly determined that the County committed clear error because it focused almost exclusively on diversifying La Center's economy and other economic considerations while ignoring the other WAC factors and local agricultural needs. Our Supreme Court previously suggested that economic considerations cannot be outcome determinative because “presumably, in the case of agricultural land, it will always be financially more lucrative to develop such land for uses more intense than agriculture.” Redmond, 136 Wash.2d at 537, 962 P.2d 1091.

Moreover, the County's overly heavy reliance on economic factors when deciding whether land has long-term agricultural commercial significance runs afoul of several of the GMA's planning goals—namely, the County's duty to “designate and conserve agricultural lands.” Soccer Fields, 136 Wash.2d at 558, 14 P.3d 153 (analyzing the GMAV "Natural resources industries" planning goal—RCW 36.70A.005(8)). In addition, the County's emphasis on economic factors violates RCW 36.70A.005(5), which requires counties to “[e]ncourage economic development within the capacities of the state's natural resources, public services, and public facilities.” (Emphasis added.) The Growth Board correctly concluded that the County committed clear error in its analysis of the Lewis County test's third prong when the County appeared to overly ignore the goals of the GMA by focusing on economic factors.

In addition, we note that the economic factors on which the County relied when making its decisions were speculative in nature. At the time, part of parcel LB-2 was subject to a pending request for federal trust status by the recently federally-recognized Cowitz Indian Tribe. The County believed that the tribe could be taken into trust and that the tribe would then build a casino on the land, which, in turn, would destroy the agricultural nature of the surrounding land. The County believed that because the land would soon be developed by the tribe anyway, development should be allowed on other agricultural lands in and around parcel LB-2 and the I-5 area. At the time of the County's decision, the possible approval of the pending trust application and the possible building of a casino were too attenuated to support the County's position. Allowing the County to begin developing the land in 2007 based on the Cowitz Tribe's speculative development plans, which could take years to overcome multiple legal hurdles, could have resulted in the inappropriate conversion of agricultural land pursuant to the GMA if the Cowitz Tribe's speculative development plans fell through. Perhaps in the future, the circumstances of the land will have changed such that the land in and around parcel LB-2 no longer qualifies as ALLTCS under the Lewis County test. But when the County made its decision under the then existing circumstances as we understand them, and in light of the deference to the 2004 ALLTCS land designations, the parcels continued to meet the requirements of the Lewis County test.

Moreover, to the extent that the County believes that the "only logical place" for economic growth of the city is an expansion of the UGA to the I-5 corridor, their belief lacks support in the law. AR at 2370. Under the GMA, the "logical place" for expansion and growth is to build higher within the UGA, not to expand it. See RCW 36.70A.005(2) (stating that a goal of the GMA is to "reduce the inappropriate conversion of undeveloped land into sprawling, low-density development") (emphasis omitted).

We also reject the County's position that the Growth Board erred by focusing on the La Center parcels' soil type and relationship to the existing La Center UGA. The Growth Board's decision cited a variety of reasons supporting its finding that the County committed clear error. Of particular noteworthiness, the Growth Board emphasized a lack of urban growth on the parcels themselves as well as the surrounding lands. Only part of the Growth Board's analysis included soil characteristics and proximity to the existing La Center UGA.

In addition, the case law the County relies on does not support its assertion that the Growth Board incorrectly determined that these parcels are not adjacent to areas characterized by urban growth. The County citing City of Arlington v. Central Puget Sound Growth Management Hearings Board, 164 Wash.2d 756, 219 P.3d 1079 (2009), argues that because the parcels are adjacent to the I-5 highway, they are adjacent to areas characterized by urban growth. But in Arlington, our Supreme Court held that an area called "Island Crossing" could be incorporated into a UGA for two separate reasons: (1) the land's proximity to an I-5 interchange allowed the land to be properly considered as proximate to urban growth, and (2) the Island Crossing land had an adjacent border to the existing Arlington UGA. 164 Wash.2d at 790-91, 219 P.3d 1079 (emphasis added). Here, the parcels have no adjacent borders with the former La Center UGA boundary and, although they are near I-5, the parcels themselves and surrounding lands completely lack any urban growth. The Arlington test is not satisfied by mere proximity to the I-5 corridor and does not support the County's claim.

Accordingly, having correctly concluded that the County committed clear error in its analysis of the Lewis County test, the Growth Board did not commit an error of law by failing to defer to the County's desigation decisions for parcels LB-1, LB-2, and LE. In addition, based on its review of the totality of all the evidence before it, substantial evidence supports the Growth Board's conclusion that parcels LB-1, LB-2, and LE meet all three prongs of the Lewis County test and are ALLTCS. We discern no error and affirm the Growth Board's decision that the evidence does not support the County's desigation of
The County argues that the Growth Board erred when entering finding of fact 32, stating that parcels VA and VA–2 are not near the UGA but are not near areas characterized by urban growth or adjacent to areas characterized by urban growth. In effect, the County argues that the Growth Board erred when reviewing the County's assessment of the first Lewis County prong. We agree and remand to the Growth Board for reconsideration of its decision on parcels VA and VA–2.

The GMA defines "characterized by urban growth" as referring to "land having urban growth located on it, or to land located in relationship to an area with urban growth on it as to be appropriate for urban growth." Former RCW 36.70A.090(18) (emphasis added). "Urban growth" is defined in part as "growth that makes intensive use of land for the location of buildings, structures, and impermeable surfaces to such a degree as to be incompatible with the primary use of land for the production of food, other agricultural products, or fiber" and that "[w]hen allowed to spread over wide areas, urban growth typically requires urban governmental services." Former RCW 36.70A.090(18). "Urban governmental services" are "public services and public facilities, including storm and sanitary sewer systems, domestic water systems, street cleaning services, fire and police protection services, public transit services, and other public utilities associated with urban areas and normally not associated with rural areas." Former RCW 36.70A.090(20).

Under the first prong of the Lewis County test, the statutory definition of "urban growth" requires an assessment of the overall context of the land's relationship to the surrounding land—not just an evaluation of the land itself. See former RCW 36.70A.090(18); Lewis County, 157 Wash.2d at 502, 139 P.3d 1096. Parcels VA and VA–2 lie within a small area of land that is quickly being encroached on by two separate UGAs—the Vancouver UGA and the Battleground UGA. These parcels' relative proximity to all the development occurring in both UGAs, but particularly the Vancouver UGA, belies the Growth Board's conclusion that the VA and VA–2 parcels are not characterized by urban growth. It appears that the Growth Board's determination that the County committed clear error in the designation of these parcels was based on an error in the Growth Board's application of the statutory definition of "characterized by urban growth" in the first Lewis County prong. Accordingly, we remand to the Growth Board its decisions regarding parcels VA and VA–2 for further consideration.

For parcel WB, the County argues that substantial evidence does not support part of finding of fact 40 and that the Growth Board failed to properly apply the Lewis County test by not considering all the WAC factors. Substantial evidence supports the challenged portion of finding of fact 40. But the record does not show that the Growth Board considered all of the WAC factors. Accordingly, we remand to the Growth Board its decision on parcel WB for further consideration.

The County assigns error to finding of fact 40 inasmuch as the Growth Board stated, "[Area WB] is not adjacent to the UGA." A CP at 338. The County asserts that the Home parcel's "SW tip [a] adjacent to [a] UGA" rather than stating that parcel WB is not adjacent to the Washougal UGA. Resp't MacDonald Living Trust Suppl. Br. at 3. The County's matrix does not contain the asserted language and actually states that parcel WB is "not adjacent to [the] Washougal UGA." AR at 2247. Moreover, a review of the Washougal UGA map attached to the County's matrix reveals that parcel WB does not touch the former Washougal UGA boundary. Accordingly, substantial evidence supports the Growth Board's finding that parcel WB is not adjacent to the Washougal UGA.

Next, we review the third prong of the Lewis County test, the only prong that the County assigned error to, to determine whether the Growth Board adequately reviewed all the statutory and regulatory factors when making its noncompliance finding. Our review of the Growth Board's analysis of the WB parcel reveals that the Growth Board failed to make an adequate record of its consideration of most of the WAC factors. The Growth Board's analysis and finding of fact 40, the only formal finding specific to parcel WB, discusses soil characteristics, tax base expansion benefits, and adjacency of the parcel to the existing UGA. But the record does not show that the Growth Board considered all the WAC factors in its review such that it could have had a "firm and definite conviction" that the County made a mistake in its designation decision insofar as the County made its decision based on the third Lewis County test prong. Soccer Fields, 142 Wash.2d at 552, 14 P.3d 133. Accordingly, we remand the Growth Board's decision for parcel WB to the Growth Board for further consideration.

Conclusion

Our opinion resolves the issues in this case with three major holdings in addition to our evaluation of the parcel-specific analysis of the Growth Board's actions. First, county GMA planning decisions are not final when they have been appealed and have an unresolved legal status. Second, although a county's
legislative body and the Growth Board can take actions that affect issues currently pending for review in this court, its actions may moot issues pending review. And, third, we affirm the Growth Board's ability to review challenged county GMA planning decisions in light of all the evidence in the record. In accordance with this opinion, we remand to the Growth Board for further consideration on parcels VA, VA-2, and WB while affirming the Growth Board in all other challenged aspects.

FOOTNOTES

1. This opinion refers to the 19 parcels using the County's original planning designation names. The parcel names included the nearby urban growth area to which the County intended to add the parcel. The 19 parcels are City of Battle Ground parcels BB and BC; City of Camas parcels CA-1 and CB; City of La Center parcels LA, LB-1, LB-2, LC, and LE; City of Ridgefield parcels RB-1, RB-2, and RC; City of Vancouver parcels VA, VA-2, VB, VC, and VR; and City of Washougal parcels WA and WB.

2. Former RCW 36.70A.130(1), (g) (2006). We note that under former RCW 36.70A.130(1)(c), counties may simultaneously review comprehensive plan land use elements and UGA boundaries.

3. As of July 1, 2010, the three regional Growth Management Hearings Boards were consolidated into a single statewide board composed of seven appointed members who are then constituted into three-member panels to hear cases. Laws of 2010, ch. 211, §§ 4-5, 18.

4. This case involves multiple intervenors with interests in specific land areas. For ease to the reader, in this opinion we attribute almost all of the respondent parties' actions to the County. But we discuss and attribute actions to the intervening parties, as necessary, in clarifying footnotes.

5. Lewis County established "Soccer Fields" as a short form for 142 Wash.2d 543, 14 P.3d 133. Lewis County, 157 Wash.2d at 497, 139 P.3d 1096.

6. The parties asserted on appeal only that the Growth Board, and by extension this court, did not have the authority to review the County's decisions on these parcels because the County no longer had jurisdiction over them.

7. At oral argument, the County suggested that the 2004 comprehensive plan included in the record was never finalized. Our review of previous Growth Board decisions does not support this claim. Although there previously were challenges to parts of the 2004 comprehensive plan, the Growth Board ultimately found all the challenged portions compliant with the GMA. Bldg. Assoc. of Clark Cnty., et al., v. Clark County, et al., No. 64-8-00018, 2005 WL 3399968, at *52 (W. Wash. Growth Mgmt. H'gs Bd., Nov. 23, 2005).

8. Karpinski also challenged the County's environmental review and public participation processes. The Growth Board found that these processes contained no clearly erroneous errors. Karpinski did not cross-appeal these Growth Board determinations for review to the superior court and, thus, these issues are not part of this appeal.

9. Although the Growth Board's procedural history of this case lists the Growth Board's hearing date as April 1, 2008, the transcript of the hearing in the administrative record indicates that the hearing occurred on April 8, 2008.

10. Our review of the entire record reveals that the matrix is an accurate summation of the County's considerations and deliberations concerning the 19 parcels. The County's staff essentially read the matrix information for each parcel over the course of several County commissioner meetings. The commissioners made comments that were later included in the last column on the matrix under the heading "[Board of County Commissioners] Deliberation/Decision." AR at 2241-47.

11. The Growth Board's amended order did not substantively differ from its original order. The amended final order corrected "clerical and grammatical errors," deleted duplicative portions in the original order, and renumbered the Growth Board's findings. 2 Clerk's Papers (CP) at 263.

12. Technically, La Center filed the appeal to the superior court, noting that the Growth Board reversed the County on 10 different parcels—neglecting to include parcel BC in its list—and challenging only issues related to La Center parcels. The other parties in this appeal then joined La Center's appeal, and all the parties, including Karpinski, limited their arguments to the Growth Board's noncompliance/invalidity findings of the 11 reversed parcels.

13. The parties' stipulation and the superior court's order did not explicitly identify parcel CA-1 by name; instead, the stipulation and order referenced "the GM Camas property" and the reversal of the Growth Board "with respect to GM Camas, LLC." AR at 3277-78. In its June 12, 2009 order, the superior court identified the subject matter of the stipulation as parcel CA-1.
14. Although the County’s arguments do not relate to any of its assigned errors on appeal, RAP 1.2(a) permits liberal interpretation of the rules to promote justice and facilitate a decision on the merits. We exercise this discretion and consider the County’s argument as an allegation that the Growth Board committed an error of law pursuant to RCW 36.70A.330(1) of the APA when entering noncompliance findings for parcels CA-1, CB, and RE-2. In light of the arguments contained in the administrative record that were presented to the superior court and Growth Board regarding the jurisdictional effect of the annexations, and the County’s appellate arguments that issues for parcels CA-1, CB, and RE-2 are now moot, the nature of the challenge is clear in the briefing. See Daughtry v. Jet Aeration Co., 91 Wash.2d 704, 709–10, 590 P.2d 631 (1979) (Reviewing the merits of a challenge on appeal, despite a failure to strictly comply with RAP 10.3, where the nature of the challenge was “perfectly clear” and the challenged finding was set forth in the appellate brief.”); Hitchcock v. Dept. of Ret. Sys., 59 Wash.App. 67, 72 n. 3, 692 P.2d 845 (1984) (Reviewing the merits of a challenge to a finding on appeal, despite technical violations of RAP 10.3 where the nature of the challenge was clear and the challenge to the finding extensively discussed in the appellate briefing.), review denied, 109 Wash.2d 1029 (1985).

15. In our June 1, 2010 order relating to jurisdiction, we asked the parties about possible misrepresentations made to the superior court regarding the parcel CA-1 annexation. In light of our analysis of issues related to parcel CA-1, a discussion and resolution of any misrepresentations is unnecessary.

16. RAP 7.2(a) states in relevant part, “If [a] trial court determination will change a decision then being reviewed by the appellate court, the permission of the appellate court must be obtained prior to the formal entry of the trial court decision.”

17. RCW 36.70A.330 arguably requires the Growth Board to review a county’s progress toward achieving compliance and to enter an order removing its original findings of noncompliance despite any pending review by this court. After entering a finding of noncompliance and allowing the County time to come into compliance with the GMA, “the board shall set a hearing for the purpose of determining whether the state agency, county, or city is in compliance with the requirements of this chapter. The board shall issue any order necessary to make adjustments to the compliance schedule and set additional hearings as provided in subsection (g) of this section.” RCW 36.70A.330(4)-(g) (emphasis added). We note that this practice makes determining whether a Growth Board’s order is final for purposes of appeal under RAP 2.1(a)(1), as opposed to discretionary review under RAP 2.1(b)(3), problematic. In addition, to the extent that the ruling appealed is no longer the final ruling (in effect), an opinion from this court could turn out to be an advisory opinion in violation of TEA v. Trade Shows v. Collins, 144 Wash.2d 409, 416, 27 P.3d 1149 (2001), cert. denied, 535 U.S. 931, 122 S.Ct. 1304, 152 L.Ed.2d 215 (2002), and Commonwealth Ins. Co. of Am. v. Grey’s Harbor County, 100 Wash.App. 232, 245, 84 P.3d 304 (2004) (citing Wash. Beauty Coll., Inc. v. Huse, 195 Wash. 160, 164, 80 P.2d 403 (1938)).

18. On appeal, no party clearly identifies the portions of the APA that they rely on in their assignments of error. But RAP 1.2(a) permits liberal interpretation of the rules and allows appellate review despite technical violations where proper assignment of error is lacking but the nature of the challenge is clear and the challenged findings are set forth in the party’s brief. Green River Cent. Coll. Dist. 10 v. Higher Ed. Pers. Bd., 107 Wash.2d 497, 431, 730 P.2d 653 (1986). Here, it is quite clear from the briefing that the two issues on appeal are whether the Growth Board correctly interpreted and applied the GMA and whether substantial evidence supports various parts of the Growth Board’s final decision and order.

19. Our Supreme Court evaluated two statutes when developing the Lewis County definition of “agricultural land” RAP 36.70A.030(2), which reads: “Agricultural land” means land primarily devoted to the commercial production of horticultural, viticultural, floricultural, dairy, poultry, vegetable, or animal products or of berries, grain, hay, straw, turf, seed, Christmas trees not subject to the excise tax imposed by RCW 84.33.100 through 84.33.140, fish in upland hatcheries, or livestock, and that has long-term commercial significance for agricultural production. (Emphasis added) and RCW 36.70A.030(10), which reads: “Long-term commercial significance includes the growing capacity, productivity, and soil composition of the land for long-term commercial production, in consideration with the land’s proximity to population areas, and the feasibility of more intense uses of the land. As evidenced by this case, since Lewis County some counties and the Growth Board have used the term ALLTCS to describe lands rather than using the term “agricultural lands.” Because long-term commercial significance is part of the working definition of “agricultural lands,” “agricultural lands” and ALLTCS are synonymous terms.

20. Moreover, in this instance, the County incorporated the WAC factors in its comprehensive plan as the approach used to analyze whether lands qualify as ALLTCS.

21. We note that even though a county’s comprehensive plan amendments are presumed valid upon adoption, under RCW 36.70A.030(1), a county’s previous determinations and designations of land are still relevant to the analysis. A significant goal of the GMA is to identify, maintain, enhance, and conserve agricultural lands. See RCW 36.70A.020(8); Soccer Fields, 143 Wash.2d at 554, 14 P.3d 123. This goal
suggests there is relevance of a county's previous designation of land as ALLUC because otherwise there would be no way for a county to maintain and conserve these lands over time. But under the GMA it is unclear, and the legislature may want to consider and provide direction on, what weight a county should give to prior agricultural designations during subsequent comprehensive plan reviews. Based on the goals of maintaining and conserving agricultural lands, it appears the proper weight is deference to the original designation. See RCW 56.70A.020(8); Sunset Fields, 142 Wash.2d at 558, 14 P.3d 138; see Yakima County v. E. Wash. Growth Mgmt. Hearings Bd., 146 Wash.App. 679, 688–89, 152 P.3d 12 (2008).

22. In this section of the opinion, we attribute to the County all arguments presented by La Center and the County for ease to the reader.

23. Although the matrix indicates that parcel LB–1's eastern boundary was adjacent to the then existing La Center UGA, a map of the parcel attached to the matrix belies this characterization.

24. La Center indicated in a supplemental brief that it did not challenge finding of fact 45 in its appeal to the superior court or to this court. When the Growth Board filed its amended final decision deleting duplicative portions, the numbering of its factual findings changed. Finding of fact 45 in the May 14, 2008 final order became finding of fact 45 in the amended June 3, 2008 final order.

25. In its briefing, La Center argues that these parcels are characterized by urban growth because water is located two miles away and La Center's waste management plant has confirmed it has the capacity to serve these parcels. La Center provides no citations to the record to support this factual assertion. Though the County discussed sewer capacity during its preliminary discussions about the La Center parcels, the discussions appear to reference information contained outside the record. But because La Center did not challenge finding of fact 43, it is a verity and arguments about evidence conflicting with this finding are irrelevant.

26. It appears that the County relied on an individual County commissioner's belief in the difficulties in obtaining water rights or accessing water for farming on these parcels. We could not find anything in the record to support the commissioner's opinion that it would be hard to get water and/or water rights to these parcels. The County commissioner merely states this belief, which in and of itself does not constitute substantial evidence supporting the County's decision.

27. Also, La Center's mayor stated in a letter to the County commissioners, "[T]he City's objective in the current UGA expansion has been to urbanize the 1–5 Junction as part of the City's incorporated area in an effort to diversify the City's economic base." AR at 1807.

28. On January 12, 2011, La Center filed a motion requesting that we take judicial notice of the United States Department of the Interior's December 2010 decision to approve the Cowitz Tribe's fee-to-trust application of approximately 152 of the 245 acres in parcel LB–2. The Department of Interior's approval allows the tribe to establish a reservation and indicates the land is eligible for gaming under the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act, 25 U.S.C. §§ 2701–2721. But that La Center and the County three years ago accurately predicted the approval of the trust application does not change our analysis. We, and the Growth Board, must consider the evidence and circumstances of the land at the time of the County's decision to determine whether the County complied with the GMA when making its land use decisions. Otherwise, we believe the County have improperly developed the land and its speculative predilections have failed to come to fruition. Moreover, even though the Cowitz Tribe's federal trust request has now been approved, the possible building of a casino is still too attenuated to support the County's 2007 redesignation decision. Among other practical considerations, financing to build the infrastructure of the reservation, let alone the intended casino, is unknown. And the effects of the recent economic recession may very well bring about delay or abandonment of some or all of the tribe's development plans, even plans that are desirable and were created with good faith intentions to complete. The possibility of building a casino and the impact on the surrounding agricultural productivity of the land was too speculative in 2007 to support the County's decisions, and it remains speculative even under the present circumstances. And even if the sewer and projected infrastructure materializes, they might serve only the tribal trust lands.

29. In this section, we attribute all arguments presented by Renaissance Homes, which has interest in the VA parcel, and the County to the County for ease to the reader. Also, the parties acknowledge a scrivener's error in the administrative record on the Vancouver West Map attached to the County's matrix where parcel "VA–1" should be labeled "VA–2."

30. Because we remand on these grounds, we need not consider other arguments such as a challenge to finding of fact 53 regarding the adequacy of the Growth Board's evaluation of the WAC factors for the VA and VA–2 parcels.

31. In this section, we attribute to the County all arguments presented by MacDonald Living Trust and the County for ease to the reader. We note that the record is not clear whether MacDonald owns all of or
only a portion of parcel WB.

32. Because of the basis for our remand, we need not address arguments that parcel WB should be dedesignated and incorporated into the Washougal UGA to ensure that enough land is available for development to accommodate expected population growth.

QUINN-BRINTNALL, J.

We concur: ARMSTRONG, P.J., and HUNT, J.
Mary Beth:

For the record. You’ll likely get this from the Board’s office as well.

Gordy

Greetings,

Attached you will find Slow Food Southwest Washington’s comments on the proposed Alternative 4 of the Clark County Comprehensive Plan. I look forward to further discussing Slow Food Southwest Washington’s concerns around Alternative 4.

Thank you,

Warren Neth
Executive Director
Slow Food Southwest Washington
www.slowfoodswwa.com
cell: 360-771-1296
Slow Food*  
Southwest Washington

Board of Clark County Councilors,  
Clark County is a rapidly urbanizing county and part of an ever-expanding metropolitan area. Our natural resources, rural character, great schools and neighborly community are a few of the reasons, which make Clark County a highly desirable community to live in. Your stewardship of the Comprehensive Plan process is crucial to preserving that livability.

Slow Food Southwest Washington does not believe that ALT 4 should be considered in this round of GMA updates. The proposal opens developments into Clark County's rural areas without consideration of:

1. The smaller parcel sizes that ALT4 proposes will put increased market pressure on our remaining agricultural land, out pricing larger lots for 'commercially viable farms', as described in the 2007 “Analysis of the Agricultural Economic Trends and Conditions in Clark County, Washington” by Globalwise.

2. How will these new, smaller parcel size designations be used in the future? Developing these smaller parcel sizes, without creating zones where they will be used in the long-term, will open the smaller parcel sizes to be used during Annual Review process anywhere in the rural area. I do not believe the discretionary procedure of clustering similarly sized lots will provide adequate direction for future clustering of similar sized lots that you have proposed.

3. ALT4 directs development toward Rural areas, which does not honor the considerable investment made to direct development toward Cities, Rural Centers, and Urban Reserves that Clark County has already made.

**Slow Food Southwest Washington questions:**

**Rural Character** -  
How will the 1 acre parcelization of Clark County's forest and fields effect traffic and other lifestyle benefits of Clark County's rural character?

**Property taxes** - Has their been an assessment of how rural landowners taxes will raise as the new smaller zoned lots, as well as the houses and infrastructure they require as they develop?

**Capitol Improvements** - How does the BOCCC plan to pay for the new roads, utilities, sewer, fire districts, sheriff's presence and other Capitol Improvements as we open up 15,000 new parcels across our rural areas?

**Water** - Clark County's rural residents are dependent on wells that draw from an already stressed aquifer. Who will be monitoring the effect of new wells drilled and manage our
Slow Food*  
Southwest Washington  
water resources?

Process-
1. After the community had already given input during the first two years on ALT1, ALT2, ALT3, Council member Madore proposed ALT4, with minimal analysis and outreach to effected stakeholders.

2. At the March 11th, BOCCC Work Session Council member Madore continually insisted "No new parcels will be created". At the following Open House, Community Planning stated an estimated 15,000 new parcels would be created between ALT3 and 4.

3. The 2013 survey of AG20 and FR40 landowners called the Rural Census was not a scientific poll, vote or an actual census. The questions left ambiguity and were loaded. Removing AG20 and FR40 based on this survey is not good stewardship of the Comprehensive Planning process nor Clark County's agriculture or forest resource lands.

Slow Food Southwest Washington requests:
1. Consider zoning options that would provide flexibility to family's who might want to share their land, not a blanket zoning policy that opens Clark County's rural areas to subdivision.
2. Focus residential development to Cities, Rural Centers, and Urban Reserves.
3. Protect Clark County's last large acreage parcels of class 1 growing soils. Develop Agricultural Production District's, Transfer of Development Rights and Purchase of Development Rights as described in numerous reports developed by citizen led committees, such as Clark County Agriculture Preservation Strategies Report, Clark County Food System Council's "Conserving agricultural food production in Clark County", Slow Food Southwest Washington's "Grow Clark County" recommendations.
4. Consider the Grow Clark County recommendation to develop policy that conserves farmland and strengthens the farm economy. More info here: www.slowfoodswwa.com/growclarkcounty

I look forward to talking further about these issues.

Thank you,  
Warren Neth  
Executive Director  
Slow Food Southwest Washington  
360-771-1296  
warren@slowfoodswwa.com  
www.slowfoodswwa.com
O’Donnell, Mary Beth

From: NoReply@Clark.Wa.Gov
Sent: Friday, April 03, 2015 8:55 PM
To: Cnty 2016 Comp Plan
Subject: 2016 Comp Plan comments submitted

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Following comments were submitted online:

Parcel No:

Subject: biased staff

Comments:
During the 3/25, and 4/1 open houses, I witnessed a number of biased remarks coming from members of the county staff. "There shouldn't be any houses out there. That should all be trees." "This new plan addition is costing another $40,000 and delaying the project another 3 months." "Alternative 4 will never fly. It won't get the votes." At one point, a staff member prominently stood towards the center of the presentation area "preaching" the downfalls in alt. 4. He became argumentative with several citizens. The staff need to be educated on what is proper conduct to enable the process to have a non-biased, neutral atmosphere for a proper presentation. These open houses were far from neutral.

Submitted by:
susan rasmussen

Email: sprazz@outlook.com

Address:
27705 ne 14th ct.
ridgefield, wa
David Madore
April 3 at 11:18pm · Edited ·

Hockinson High School Open House – a great turnout:

- dozens of rural citizens showed up on Wednesday evening to ensure that their voices were heard as we decide on the future of their land. The high turnout was even greater than last week’s Open House at Ridgefield High School.

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 elected representatives of the people, our job is to listen and faithfully represent their interests in compliance with state law.

All but one of those citizens that shared their views with me, strongly supported Alternative 4 and wished that even more flexibility could be provided.

The Reflector published a front page story about the proposed plans: http://www.thereflector.com/
.../page_e0cf5a15-88c9-5983-a0f1-...
http://www.thereflector.com/.../page_de209027-59d8-57a5-bdcb-...

Fair newspaper stories include contrary views and the Reflector did a good job including quotes from a citizen who opposed Alternative 4 in favor of alternative 1, the “do nothing” alternative.

Ms. Reisbick implied that Alternative 4 was based on ignorance or contempt for the Growth Management Act. Nothing could be further from the truth.

The GMA rightfully requires our county to provide sufficient affordable, useful, and appropriately zoned land for our community to prosper for the next 20 years. The problems that resulted in the massive downzoning of 1994 were not due to the mandates of the GMA. Rather, the twenty years of stagnation imposed upon their rural community were due to a poor and inappropriate implementation of the GMA in Clark County.

We can do better, much better.

Ms. Reisbick errs by asserting that Alternative 4 is “like driving without a driver’s manual”. The truth is that Alternative 4 is like finally driving with our eyes open, recognizing the parcels that already exist, and providing a zoning map that is compatible with the real world. It is the clear understanding of the Growth Management Act that properly serves as the basis for Alternative 4.

That law is not intended as a curse, but as a blessing. When we get it right, our rural community can once again prosper and thrive.

Editor Ken Vance also contributed a well written editorial this week.
http://www.thereflector.com/.../article_729d1238-d800-11e4-92...

As a community, we are on track to plan a much brighter future for rural Clark County.

Thank God! Yea Clark County!
Like · Comment · Share

Lenora Johnston, Dina Stepanyuk, Dan Coursey and 12 others like this.

2 shares

View 5 more comments

Maureen Horn
A Patricia Smith
Like · Reply · April 4 at 1:56pm

A Patricia Smith Durell was there in the aisle seat before the lady with the long blond hair.
Like · Reply · 1 · April 4 at 2:05pm
The monthly City-County Coordination meeting is next Friday on April 10. This meeting we will debrief on the open houses held for the Comp Plan and also discuss the upcoming BOCC hearing on 4/14.

Since this is Spring Break week for Washington, we are trying to get a head count to verify that we have attendance for this meeting.

Please shoot an email back to me letting me know if we’ve got a majority for attendance?

Thank you!
From: Orjiako, Oliver  
Sent: Thursday, April 02, 2015 12:50 PM  
To: Euler, Gordon; Alvarez, Jose; Anderson, Colete; O'Donnell, Mary Beth  
Subject: FW: Input to Jeanne Stewart on Alternative 4 for the record  

For index. Thanks!

From: Orjiako, Oliver  
Sent: Thursday, April 02, 2015 12:49 PM  
To: 'Heather Tischbein'  
Subject: RE: Input to Jeanne Stewart on Alternative 4 for the record

Hello Heather:

Thank you for sharing your email to Councilor Stewart with me and your inquiry.

In response, Issue Paper 4 will discuss and present additional capacity for population and jobs not captured by the vacant land model reflecting an increase of 15,22 persons and 24,175 jobs. Issue Papers 5.0 and 5.1 are the same and relates to the environmental review process which will put into the record. These issue papers will be helpful to both legal and planning staff and difficult to do after the fact.

In order words, the purpose is to reflect recent information. The information comes from redevelopment (i.e. potential housing and jobs as a result of the waterfront redevelopment, etc.) and a detail information of events that have inspired since the Board of Councilors initially discussed the environmental impact review process on July 16, 2014. We are not proposing to change the previous decisions made on population and jobs projections for planning purposes. You never know the councilors may use the opportunity to open the door for a higher growth rate. I hope this is helpful.

From: Heather Tischbein [mailto:htischbein@wa-net.com]  
Sent: Thursday, April 02, 2015 11:21 AM  
To: Orjiako, Oliver  
Subject: Fw: Input to Jeanne Stewart on Alternative 4 for the record

Oliver,

It was good to talk to you again at last night's open house at Hockinson High School. Below is the email I sent to Councilor Stewart on Monday this week, as follow up to our meeting with her on March 26, 2015.

In regard to the consent agenda item (referenced below) approved this week revised population and employment allocations: What impact will revisions to these projections have on the public input processes and deadlines required by GMA rules and regulations?

Thank you for your attention to this question.

Most sincerely,

"Heather Tischbein
FROM CONSENT AGENDA for BOCC 3/31/15 HEARING:

5. Notice of Hearing approved setting Tuesday, April 14, 2015, 10:00 a.m., in the Commissioners’ Hearing Room, 1300 Franklin Street, 6th Floor, Vancouver, Washington, as the time and place to take public testimony and discuss the proposed alternatives for consideration in the environmental review required to update the county’s Comprehensive Growth Management plan. The council will also consider revised Population and Employment Allocation - Issue Paper 4.2 and SEPA Alternatives – Issue Paper 5.1.

APPROVED

----- Original Message -----  
From: Heather Tischbein  
To: Jeanne Stewart  
Cc: comp.plan@clark.wa.gov ; Euler, Gordon ; Jeff Swanson  
Sent: Monday, March 30, 2015 8:38 AM  
Subject: Input on Alternative 4 for the record

Dear Jeanne Stewart,

It was a pleasure to meet with you last Thursday, March 26. Thank you for your generosity in meeting with us for 90 minutes. I hope the meeting was of value to you in terms of serving your learning about the complexities and history of the land use decisions that have been made since the GMA became state law.

Have you been able to access all the historical documents we called to your attention? If not, please let me know and I’ll get on that immediately.

I want to reiterate in writing that I oppose the inclusion of Alternative 4 as an option for consideration in this round of GM updates. At the Ridgefield open house Wednesday, March 25, I witnessed a CCCU member in conversation with a small group of people seated in the bleachers in which she said that the creation of Alternative 4 was initiated by CCCU with the intention to undo what CCCU feels to be the individual property rights restrictions created by the GMA in the 1990s. The statements made by this woman were verified as being accurate in the one-on-one conversations I had that evening with staff of the county’s planning department.

It is my opinion that it is not good public policy to propose, and promote in the case of Councilor Madore, the adoption of land use policies based on the perspective and desires of one group of citizens, especially a group of citizens who publicly advocate their intention to undo, or do an end run around, the GMA in order to serve their own financial and family interests, literally at the expense of all the rest of us.

As we tried to convey in our meeting, there are two categories of objections to Alternative 4. First, the intent and goal of Alternative 4 fly in the face of state law, the GMA, by knowingly creating conditions that 1) support suburban sprawl and diminish the size and productivity of agricultural lands, and 2) set the stage for the associated infrastructure failures, negative environmental impacts on air and water quality and wildlife protection, and 3) create real risk to the depletion of ground and surface water supplies. Second, Alternative 4 creates credible financial risks to taxpayers in the form of 1) wasted planning staff time, 2) increases in property taxes to all property owners and especially to some rural landowners, and 3) costs to defend against lawsuits re non-compliance with GMA rules and regulations and breaches of the separation of executive and legislative authorities stipulated in the charter. In my opinion, pursuing Alternative 4 by including it in the EIS analysis is a failure of the council’s fiduciary responsibility to taxpayers and a failure of what I believe to be your moral responsibility as elected officials to make every sincere effort to understand, respect, and represent the diverse interests of all citizens, not just the interests of those who voted for you or whose personal values and belief systems align with your personal values and belief systems. Last time I checked, We were all in this together... with all our differences.

In the interest of trying to be of service to you, I’m sharing below a recent report issued by King County having to do with local foods. I am sending this along by way of showing why I take issue with the assertion by some that “agriculture is dead” in Clark County. This is not true, though there is compelling evidence that some have been trying, with some success, to kill it off through policy and budget decisions. If you read only page 5 of this report, copied in its entirety
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below, you will get a sense of what is also true in Clark County as a microcosm, or fractal, of what is happening in terms of the re-structuring of our food systems and land ownership and tenure patterns statewide and nationwide.

**Agriculture is not yet dead in Clark County** and We (as citizens in collaboration with our public servants) have a right and a responsibility to investigate what is actually happening within and to our agriculture and food systems and to deliberate together about what we, as diverse citizens, would like to see happen in our county to manifest and protect a shared, co-created vision of quality of life, and to not be subjected to a vision of quality of life dictated by just a few. The process of updating the GMA is an opportunity to breathe renewed life and vitality into the farming and food sector here and I stand for doing just that with rigor and determination, in order that our children and our children's children have a chance to live in healthy, vibrant, resilient and thriving communities of place in Clark County. As currently envisioned, Alternative 4 would pretty much take that option off the table by building out 20th century suburban sprawl. We're in the 21st century. Please take this bad idea off the table, now, so that we, as a community of diverse people, can effectively deal with our 21st century circumstances.

Most sincerely,

Heather Tischbein
1119 NW 131st Way
Apt. A
Vancouver, WA 98685


King County's Local Food Initiative

**MESSAGE FROM THE EXECUTIVE**

...places do food better than King County. Our culinary scene is world-renowned. We have vibrant urban areas within a tractor ride of farms growing delicious, healthy produce. Our residents can browse at more than 40 bustling farmers markets across the county. Nowhere is healthful living more valued. King County has the largest food market of any county in the Pacific Northwest, with close to $6 billion annually spent on food and beverage.

But that's where our food story begins to... wilt a bit. Only about two percent of that $6 billion is going back to King County's farms, whose survival is increasingly at risk due to development pressure, regulatory challenges, and fewer growers getting into farming. Our local food system was not built to withstand global threats such as climate change. What's more, many low-income communities in King County — where residents experience higher rates of obesity and diabetes — suffer from limited access to nutritious foods.

Last year I launched the Local Food Initiative to better connect local farms to consumers, increase access to healthy, affordable foods in underserved areas, support our farmers, and create a farm-to-plate pipeline that is more resilient to the effects of climate change. I asked more than 30 high-level stakeholders in our local food system — our "Kitchen Cabinet" — to take a hard look at these issues. With this report, they have recommended meaningful targets, strategies, and actions for the County and our partners to pursue.

In this report you will find my Top 20 priority actions for 2015-17. You will also learn about the Cabinet's process, the current state of our county's food system, and see additional Cabinet recommendations for how it can be enhanced over the long term.

I believe that, working together, we can achieve our vision for a stronger food system within
a decade.

Everyone can help in this process by working to become better “food citizens.” Be aware of what you’re consuming, where it is grown or produced, and whether others also have the opportunity to eat healthy, local food. Through wise food purchasing and consumption we can keep our farms productive, our food businesses thriving, and ensure that everyone has access to affordable, healthy food.

Thank you.
Dow Constantine
King County Executive
O'Donnell, Mary Beth

From: Derek Huegel <dh@wolfind.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 02, 2015 1:53 PM
To: Cnty 2016 Comp Plan
Subject: Parcel# 195547000 (Boundary Modification Request)

County Staff,
I am a firm believer in smaller lot sizes that match the surrounding lot sizes. I bought this parcel of six acres and built a home for my family. I would love the option to divide this into 5 or 6 one acre lots. Do to the funny L shape of me surrounding my neighbors of 1 acre lots, I feel this would be a good fit. Please consider changing me from the proposed R 5 to the R 1 in the new Alternative 4. If you have any questions, or would like more explanation, don't hesitate to reach out.

Thanks!

Derek Huegel
Wolf Industries, Inc.
C: 360.314.8037
O: 360.723.5307
Laurie,
I talked with you about transportation last night at Hockinson Hi.

I'm not familiar with the planning terms used in transportation planning so sorry if I used the wrong names for things. The area of my interest is from 50th Ave. on the west to 72nd Ave on the east and 119th street on the south to 139th on the north. Especially all the new subdivision that will connect to 124th street.

I think you said there was a circulation plan for this area that has not been approved. I have not been able to find this plan on the Clark County web site. Can you email the plan to me or email a link to the plan? Any information you can provide on the process and timing of getting the plan approved and the best method for me to submit comments on the plan would be appreciated.

Thank you,
Darrel VanCoevering
5406 NE 123rd Street
98686
O'Donnell, Mary Beth

From: Orjiako, Oliver
Sent: Thursday, April 02, 2015 12:22 PM
To: Euler, Gordon; Alvarez, Jose; Anderson, Colete; Albrecht, Gary; Hermsen, Matt; Kamp, Jacqueline; Lebowsky, Laurie; McCall, Marilee; O'Donnell, Mary Beth
Subject: FW: April 1, 2016 Hockinson Comprehensive Plan Open House Conversations - For the Public Record

A comment from Carol Levanen for whatever it is worth. Thanks.

Oliver

From: McCauley, Mark
Sent: Thursday, April 02, 2015 11:16 AM
To: Orjiako, Oliver
Subject: Fwd: April 1, 2016 Hockinson Comprehensive Plan Open House Conversations - For the Public Record

FYI

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Carol Levanen <cnldental@yahoo.com>
Date: April 2, 2015 at 10:35:14 AM PDT
To: "jeanne.stuart@clark.wa.gov" <jeanne.stuart@clark.wa.gov>, Tom Mielke <tom.mielke@clark.wa.gov>, David Madore <david.madore@clark.wa.gov>, "Mark McCauley" <mark.mccauley@clark.wa.gov>, Susan Rasmussen <sprazz@outlook.com>, Leah Higgins <leahwhomes@gmail.com>, Rick Dunning <ralan1953@gmail.com>, Rita Dietrich <billrita@pacifier.com>, Jerry Olson <wcorlsons@tds.net>, "Fred Pickering" <fredp@yacolt.com>, Jim Malinowski <j.malinowski@ieee.org>, "Frank White" <fiffarmer@yahoo.com>, Benjamin Moss <benjaminmoss@johnlscott.com>, Lonnie Moss <mossback44@gmail.com>, Melinda Zamora <mzamora1001@gmail.com>, Nick Redinger <nickredinger@hotmail.com>, Curt Massie <cmassicpe31@gmail.com>, Marcus Becker <marcushb35@msn.com>, Zachary Mclsaac <zmclsaac@ashbaughbeal.com>, Carol Levanen <cnldental@yahoo.com>, "Clark County Citizens United Inc." <cccunique@yahoo.com>
Subject: April 1, 2016 Hockinson Comprehensive Plan Open House Conversations - For the Public Record
Reply-To: Carol Levanen <cnldental@yahoo.com>

Dear Councilors,

Clark County Citizens United, Inc. was approached by attendees of the Hockinson Open House, on a continuous basis with requests for our handout in support of Alternative 4, and conversations over their concerns. All of them wanted smaller lot sizes in the rural areas. CCCU distributed 100 handouts. One landowner reported that they overheard a staff member tell someone that Alternative 4 will never pass because it doesn't have enough votes. When one planner was asked if he had an open mind regarding the proposal, he told the citizen that he was not interested in having a conversation with the man. Many of them commented that it was obvious that staff didn't support Alternative 4 and they were unable to get answers to their questions. Many commented that they were happy to see Councilors Madore and Stewart there to hear, first hand, what they had to say. The attendees were a composite of well mannered concerned citizens of the community, including landowners, business owners, and the building industry.
Realtor, Leah Higgins, invited many of the major builders to the Open House and a number of them attended. A representative from New Tradition Homes, a highly respected custom home builder who employs many tradesmen, stopped by to talk with CCCU. He thanked Leah for inviting him and said he was very glad he came. He made the comment in response to Oliver Orjako’s report, and said, “Yea, 8,000 new homes, I’m all for that! But, that report wasn’t accurate, and the potential number of buildable lots is a much smaller number. Jaime Howsley, from the Clark County Chapter of the BIA, did not attend either the Ridgefield Open House or the Hockinson Open House. Perhaps this indicates that he is not adequately representing BIA members, and the building industry is a large part of Clark County’s economy.

In a public forum such as the Hockinson Open House, Clark County Planning Staff has a legal responsibility to the councilors and the public to present all information presented to the public in a factual, informative, neutral and non-biased way, with professional kindness and consideration. The comments that CCCU received did not indicate that was the case.

Sincerely,

Carol Levanen, Ex. Secretary
Clark County Citizens United, Inc.
P.O. Box 2188
Battle Ground, Washington 98604
Mary Beth:

For the index.

Gordy

-----Original Message-----
From: Sydney Reisbick [mailto:reisbicks@comcast.net]
Sent: Wednesday, April 01, 2015 7:36 PM
To: Orjiako, Oliver; Euler, Gordon
Subject: For the record input for open house

To:
Clark County Planning Staff:

First, thank you for putting the maps on the GIS so that people can see what is proposed for their areas.

My Personal Comments on the three altered alternatives is that it is impossible to comment on the alternatives themselves. There is neither data (potential homesites, extent of area affected, etc) nor analysis. There will not be data or analysis within 10 days of the hearing. The open houses should have been delayed until there was basic data. The hearing should definitely be delayed until we have time to consider the data and analysis.

This process is very far out of the norm.

Sincerely,
Sydney Reisbick
PO Box 339
Ridgefield, WA 98642
RE: Tax Acct# 278819000, 278822000, 278820000

We would like to request that the above referenced Tax Lots be updated to reflect R-10 zoning in the 2016 updated comp plan. The adjacent family owned property is already slated for R-10 zoning. For continuity and use of easements, these properties should be zoned R-10 as well.

Thank you,

Lee Levanen
1906 SE 25th St
Battle Ground, WA 98604
To planners, counselors and public servants. April 2, 2015

From: Alina Marie McElveny and Donna J Andrews macbun@q.com donnaandrews0411@gmail.com

ALTERNATIVE 4, Tax Parcel #205384000. 49.25 acres co-inherited by 3 sisters. Timberland east of Hockinson

After studying the new interactive map added on Tuesday we have additional comments.

Under the proposal for lot sizes under Alternative 4, the map indicates the planning commission “may” change our designation from current Forest 40 to Forest 10. The proposed policy is this “reflects the sizes of lots and character of our neighborhood”. A glance at the map of hills east of Hockinson shows this is not correct.

A. Let’s consider “our neighborhood” E-W definition as NE 212th Ave on the west to NE 241st Ave on the east. And from NE 159th St north to NE 169th St We did a straw count of 48 smaller rural parcels here. Eight .5 acres near/near our north border are 2-1/2 acres. Most are 5 acres! Some are forest, some rural.

B. Count from NE 159th south to NE 139th st (and thereafter angling north of Rawson Road where it intersects with Himnes at about NE 241st Ave.). We count 115 small rural lots

C. So “our neighborhood” would include 163 small lots, most 5 acres, some 2-1/2. We disregarded the Plum Creek holdings and a few larger pieces.

D. Historically we would include “Finn Hill” in our neighborhood: North of NE 169th stretching to NE 189th. Wow subdivisions and developments here include 101 smaller lots! Add that to the 163 above = 274 lots of 2-1/2 to 5 acres with a few 10 acre pieces thrown in. (again disregard Plum Creek and other very large parcels)

E. ONLY our Homestead ¼ Section? Maybe the planners were only counting our siblings’ and nephew’s lots within our historic Ahola homestead: NE ¼ of Section 21 T3 R3E WM. If this is what is considered our “neighborhood” then family lot sizes of 2.5 acres, 5, 7.5 acres, 9, 15, 22 11, 10, and 21 acres might lead to a conclusion that our remainder lot of 49.25 acres should only be changed to 10 acre minimum. But the character of our neighbors north, south, east and west of the homestead ¼ section reveals a large preponderance of 5 acre lots. Yes, most of these are rural, and not forest.

We think the planners should allow us to make 5 acre minimum lots, like a couple hundred neighbors on our hillside neighborhood. This would permit us to continue our current use tax designation of ‘timberland – minimum 5 acre’, and if we subdivide into 6 acre lots, some of our grandchildren perhaps could build on 1 acre house lot and continue to grow Douglas firs on 5 acres of timberland.

1
April 1, 2015

Mark McCauley
County Manager
Public Service Center
1300 Franklin Street, 6th Floor
Vancouver, WA 98660

Mr. McCauley:

The City of Ridgefield is writing to you today, asking for your help to assure your Executive planning staff presents a community supported, defensible Comprehensive Growth Management Plan to the County’s planning commission and County Council, as required under Clark County Home Rule Charter Section 3.2(B)(5). We certainly understand the large and complex nature of this undertaking. We also understand that the process is far from over, with an expected completion date sometime in the late Spring of 2016. However, as of the writing of this letter, the City of Ridgefield and other local partners are concerned that the Comprehensive Plan update will not meet either timelines or substantive requirements, due to potential lapses in public participation, lack of oversight and preparation by the County’s professional staff, and a lack of adequate coordination with Cities and other public partners. We believe there is a path forward that addresses these concerns, but for 2016 adoption, time is short.

To be clear, the concerns identified above are not of our creation, but are clear requirements of the State’s Growth Management Act. The Growth Management Act (G.M.A.) governs the development of Comprehensive Plans in the State of Washington. Of the various sections of G.M.A. the most concerning to the City at this time are the various provisions throughout the legislation that require early and continuous public participation in the planning process. Specifically G.M.A Planning Goals seek public involvement:

\[36.70A.020(11)\]  
Citizen participation and coordination. Encourage the involvement of citizens in the planning process and ensure coordination between communities and jurisdictions to reconcile conflicts.

Additionally, the G.M.A requires that Counties and Cities coordinate Comprehensive Planning efforts:

\[RCW 36.70A.100\] The comprehensive plan of each county or city that is adopted pursuant to \[RCW 36.70A.040\] shall be coordinated with, and consistent with, the comprehensive plans adopted pursuant to RCW 36.70A.040 of other counties or cities with which the county or city has, in part, common borders or related regional issues.

The G.M.A also requires a public participation plan that allows for the public to view and comment on various aspects of different proposals:
RCW 36.70A.140 Each county and city that is required or chooses to plan under RCW 36.70A.040 shall establish and broadly disseminate to the public a public participation program identifying procedures providing for early and continuous public participation in the development and amendment of comprehensive land use plans and development regulations implementing such plans. The procedures shall provide for broad dissemination of proposals and alternatives, opportunity for written comments, public meetings after effective notice, provision for open discussion, communication programs, information services, and consideration of and response to public comments.

The City appreciates the Open House held by County staff on March 25, 2015 that allowed residents of our community and those in the surrounding areas an opportunity to view the growth plan alternatives, one of which, Alternative 4, was only first publicly released on March 20, 2015. The people attending also had an opportunity to speak with County staff and verify details and specifics of the alternatives, with the notable exception of Alternative 4, which was not developed or reviewed by County planning or legal staff.

Because our citizens were told at the Ridgefield Open House that these were the alternatives being considered by the County Council, we were stunned to learn that less than 24 hours after the Ridgefield Open House, the Alternative 4 presented by a County Councilor had already been significantly modified – rendering the comments and concerns of our citizens, as well as City concerns, irrelevant. Further, the modifications to Alternative 4 appear to have significantly increased the impacts for areas surrounding Ridgefield. We realize the modified maps were placed in the public domain in error. However, should those maps reappear in an official forum prior to, or at, the scheduled April 14 Board of County Councilors hearing, we would expect a new round of open houses and a full public involvement schedule with the detail to allow an objective analysis of the modified proposal by any interested party. To do otherwise would be to prevent the City and the citizens of Ridgefield from a meaningful opportunity to comment and engage in open discussion and consideration of the proposed plan and to thwart effective participation in this instance.

We have great respect for the professionalism of you and your staff. We have appreciated working with the County on this Comprehensive Plan update, and are committed to the partnership between the City and County. That is why we speak up now, as your partner, to ask that you stop this moving target of Alternative 4 that is being prepared by Council instead of appropriately through qualified County planners. It ignores the intent of RCW 36.70A.100 and 36.70A.140, and, most importantly, it violates our mutually shared desire to coordinate and work cooperatively with each other and our citizens.

Thank you for considering our concerns. We are open to discussing them at an appropriate time.

Sincerely,

Steve Stuart

City Manager

City of Ridgefield

C: Oliver Ortlako, Director of Community Planning
O'Donnell, Mary Beth

From: Peter Uskoski <peteuskoski@yahoo.com>
Date: Thursday, April 02, 2015 11:25 AM
To: Cnty 2016 Comp Plan
Cc: Madore, David; Stewart, Jeanne; Mielke, Tom
Subject: Comprehensive Plan Alternatives

I am in favor of Alternate Plan 4. My family has a property near La Center (Parcel # 266126000) which would be zoned more to match existing parcels around it under plan 4.
Thank You,
Pete Uskoski
A letter to the Councilors from the Chair of the Clark County Food System Council for our record and index. Thanks.

Oliver

From: Food System Council Member [mailto:council@clarkfoodsystem.org]
Sent: Wednesday, April 01, 2015 2:19 PM
To: Orjiako, Oliver
Subject: Letters to councilors regarding Alt. 4 for public record.

I sent this letter to the three councilors on behalf of the Clark County Food System Council. It's the same except for the name. I've attached all three that I sent.

Thank you for all that you and your department do.

Garrett Hoyt, Chair
Clark County Food System Council
April 1, 2015

Councilor David Madore
Board of Clark County Councilors

Councilor Madore:

The Clark County Food System Council is a diverse citizen group working to increase and preserve access to safe, local and healthy food for all residents of Clark County. The multi-stakeholder Council supports a viable, economical and sustainable local food system through multiple strategies including:

- 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 for and advising on food system and food policy implementation.
- Promoting and providing education on food system issues.

The Clark County Food System Council opposes the inclusion of Alternative Four in the Comprehensive Plan Update and the associated environmental review process because additional parcel downsizing runs counter to our mission. Alternative Four would negatively impact the county’s ability to grow food and use rural, natural resource, and other feasible agricultural land for food production.

We oppose Alternative Four because it would decrease agricultural production capacity and impinge on current and future farm viability. Parcelization reduces the profitability of agricultural operations in many ways.

Here are examples:

1. Farms require contiguous acres for expansion, consolidation of parcels, or entry of new owners seeking to start or restart a commercial farm business.
2. Parcelization increases the conflicts between farmers and their new suburban, exurban, residential and/or recreational neighbors.
3. The addition of smaller parcels amid actively farmed parcels could increase such conflicts and “right to farm” provisions.
4. Smaller lot sizes drive up land values, as well as (cost per acre), making it more challenging to have a farm income adequate to pay for the land.
5. Water availability is already a barrier to farming in Clark County. Increased numbers of wells increase the burden on the fresh water supply, which is crucial for farmers.

We welcome the opportunity to further discuss Alternative 4 with you. Please feel free to contact us at hello@clarkfoodsystem.com.

Sincerely,

Garrett Hoyt, Chair
Clark County Food System Council
April 1, 2015

Councilor Tom Mielke
Board of Clark County Councilors

Councilor Mielke:

The Clark County Food System Council is a diverse citizen group working to increase and preserve access to safe, local and healthy food for all residents of Clark County. The multi-stakeholder Council supports a viable, economical and sustainable local food system through multiple strategies including:

- 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 for and advising on food system and food policy implementation.
- Promoting and providing education on food system issues.

The Clark County Food System Council opposes the inclusion of Alternative Four in the Comprehensive Plan Update and the associated environmental review process because additional parcel downsizing runs counter to our mission. Alternative Four would negatively impact the county’s ability to grow food and use rural, natural resource, and other feasible agricultural land for food production.

We oppose Alternative Four because it would decrease agricultural production capacity and impinge on current and future farm viability. Parcelization reduces the profitability of agricultural operations in many ways.

Here are examples:

1. Farms require contiguous acres for expansion, consolidation of parcels, or entry of new owners seeking to start or restart a commercial farm business.
2. Parcelization increases the conflicts between farmers and their new suburban, exurban, residential and/or recreational neighbors.
3. The addition of smaller parcels amid actively farmed parcels could increase such conflicts and “right to farm” provisions.
4. Smaller lot sizes drive up land values, as well as (cost per acre), making it more challenging to have a farm income adequate to pay for the land.
5. Water availability is already a barrier to farming in Clark County. Increased numbers of wells increase the burden on the fresh water supply, which is crucial for farmers.

We welcome the opportunity to further discuss Alternative 4 with you. Please feel free to contact us at hello@clarkfoodsystem.com.

Sincerely,

Garrett Hoyt, Chair
Clark County Food System Council
April 1, 2015

Councilor Jeanne E. Stewart
Board of Clark County Councilors

Councilor Stewart:

The Clark County Food System Council is a diverse citizen group working to increase and preserve access to safe, local and healthy food for all residents of Clark County. The multi-stakeholder Council supports a viable, economical and sustainable local food system through multiple strategies including:

- 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 for and advising on food system and food policy implementation.
- Promoting and providing education on food system issues.

The Clark County Food System Council opposes the inclusion of Alternative Four in the Comprehensive Plan Update and the associated environmental review process because additional parcel downsizing runs counter to our mission. Alternative Four would negatively impact the county’s ability to grow food and use rural, natural resource, and other feasible agricultural land for food production.

We oppose Alternative Four because it would decrease agricultural production capacity and impinge on current and future farm viability. Parcelization reduces the profitability of agricultural operations in many ways.

Here are examples:

1. Farms require contiguous acres for expansion, consolidation of parcels, or entry of new owners seeking to start or restart a commercial farm business.
2. Parcelization increases the conflicts between farmers and their new suburban, exurban, residential and/or recreational neighbors.
3. The addition of smaller parcels amid actively farmed parcels could increase such conflicts and “right to farm” provisions.
4. Smaller lot sizes drive up land values, as well as (cost per acre), making it more challenging to have a farm income adequate to pay for the land.
5. Water availability is already a barrier to farming in Clark County. Increased numbers of wells increase the burden on the fresh water supply, which is crucial for farmers.

We welcome the opportunity to further discuss Alternative 4 with you. Please feel free to contact us at hello@clarkfoodsystem.com.

Sincerely,

Garrett Hoyt, Chair
Clark County Food System Council
O'Donnell, Mary Beth

From: Euler, Gordon
Sent: Wednesday, April 01, 2015 3:14 PM
To: 'Gretchen Starke'
Cc: Orjiako, Oliver; O'Donnell, Mary Beth; McCall, Marilee
Subject: RE: alternative 4

Gretchen:

Thanks for the email. You're asking good questions.

In January, the Board asked that the SEPA (environmental review) process on the three previously agreed-to alternatives be halted so that a fourth alternative could be developed. What has taken place since that time is the development of a fourth alternative; Councilor Madore has done virtually all of the work in developing it. The reason for the open houses is to present the fourth alternative along with the other three.

What we need to do is to get the Board to agree on the alternatives so we can complete the environmental review process, a necessary step as you know in a comp plan update process. This is the purpose of the hearing on April 14. We are still planning on preparing a supplemental EIS; the SEIS will now have four alternatives instead of three. None of the concerns you raise below have been addressed, but will be in the SEIS, which is what we are trying to re-start and then finish. There will be a formal comment period on the draft SEIS as well as a public hearing.

Let me say again—from our standpoint, Alternative 4 is just another alternative in the environmental review process. It seems that it is being trumpeted as what is going to happen, but we're simply trying to get to a decision about what the fourth alternative is so that it can be studied in the environmental review process, hopefully without too much more delay.

We'd be happy to meet with you at any time. Best to check with Marilee (e-mail in the cc line), as she handles Oliver's schedule.

Gordy Euler
Clark County Community Planning

From: Gretchen Starke [mailto:ostarke@pacific.com]
Sent: Wednesday, April 01, 2015 2:12 PM
To: Orjiako, Oliver; Euler, Gordon
Subject: alternative 4

Gordy and Oliver,

First over all question: what is going on? My impression from the Columbian article Saturday and from what Sydney is e-mailing is that the 4th alternative is as firmly settled as a bowl of jello. How do I comment on something like this?

As conservation chair of the Vancouver Audubon Society, my biggest concern is for wildlife and habitat, including wetlands. Is there any analysis on how this 4th alternative would affect habitat in Clark County? What about listed species especially salmon? Would this
alternative encroach on wetlands and streams? How would alternative 4 interact with the county's critical areas ordinance?

Of course, as a citizen of Clark County, I am also concerned about the impact of alternative 4 on roads, schools, police and fire protection, and all other public services. Have there been any analyses of these impacts?

I realize that the staff has had little or nothing to do with the process of the way alternative 4 was developed -- if it is really developed -- and presented to the public. The process has been terrible, something you already know.

I can't go to the open house. I will be at the hearing on April 14. I plan to talk mostly about the process -- or lack thereof. I would like to address wildlife and other elements of an EIS, but feel I lack knowledge of specific impacts. Or am I being premature and that information will be available as the EIS is prepared? What is the status of the EIS, anyway?

If at all possible, I would like to schedule a meeting with one or both of you next week. I would prefer not on Wednesday, April 8. Thanks, and hang in there.

Gretchen Starke
Planners, this may duplicate the comment I tried to send via your link. Word doc attached.

Clark County is making needed changes in the GMA 1994 zoning! Alternative 4 for Rural and Forest zoning is a change in the right direction. I'm an owner in common with 2 sisters of Tax parcel 205384000—49.25 acres east of Hockinson. An unfair 40 acre minimum zoning was applied by GMA to our Ahola grandparents'/parents' quarter section homestead of former farm/timber-growing land. The Alternative 4 Forest maps show our property would be zoned 10 acre minimum. But this is not reflecting the reality of the surrounding neighborhood. In our case, a 5 acre minimum would be far better, still allowing us to keep woodland classification for current use tax purposes, and managing timber production.

Having inherited 49.25 acres in common with two sisters, we three cannot divide it as our mother wished. We need wise and easy management of the trees and land. Without fair & just zoning changes, eventually our 6 adult children (then 9 grandchildren) would need to manage this property in common—an awkward burden.

We desire zoning changes to meet these requirements: Congruence to surrounding 5 acre neighborhoods, Ease of managing woodland, Fair Access to rightful profits.

1. Fairness and Congruence with the surrounding neighborhoods. Adjust lot size to correspond with reality and character of neighboring parcels. The GMA zoning in 1994 overlaid a 40 acre minimum on all our sibling’s lots (divided in the 1970's and '80's from our parent’s quarter section into 10 acres or 11 acre minimum lots) and the remaining 49.25 acres of our parents' land.

More obviously the surrounding neighbors—on former large farms north, west and south of our homestead properties and former timberland east along Bonanza Road—were long ago subdivided into rural 5 or 6 acre lots. Only the State land on our homestead's north east border remains in a large parcel.

2. EASE of Management and Tax Clarity: In one of your work sessions, a county officials said it's perfectly legal and good to cut acreages into smaller parcels, “for tax purposes” so family members would receive and pay their own individual tax bills. This is just a part of managing smaller lots or timber acreage. We want to divide our inheritance as our mother stipulated: 24 acres to me, and 16 and 9 acres to 2 sisters. For our generation and our children, we need changes now.

3. Fairness & access to property income: The Reflector quoted a rural resident who said family rural lands are similar to city-folks’ “bank account savings, IRAs, grandkids’ college funds”. We need access to our financial investments. If there is large financial need in one of our families, it may be easier or swifter to sell an individual 5 or 6 acre parcel, rather than commit to hasty clearcutting, in order to take a ‘withdrawal’ from our “savings bank.”

Of course we appreciate the value of greenspace, clean air, clean water, continuing our family’s stewardship & practice of careful selective logging (since 1951) on these acres. (no clearcuts, and planting of Douglas fir on former orchards & pastures.) A good and beautiful side effect is habitat for birds and wildlife but that is not our main goal.

Thank you also for the good attempt to welcome input from all taxpayers and especially historic rural families.

Respectfully, Donna J Andrews

donnaandrews0411@gmail.com 206-817-5329

Tax lot 205384 We have approval for reclassification for current use as timberland (5 acre minimum).
O'Donnell, Mary Beth

From: Heather Tischbein <htischbein@wa-net.com>
Sent: Monday, March 30, 2015 8:39 AM
To: Stewart, Jeanne
Cc: Cnty 2016 Comp Plan; Euler, Gordon; Swanson, Jeff
Subject: Input on Alternative 4 for the record

Dear Jeanne Stewart,

It was a pleasure to meet with you last Thursday, March 26. Thank you for your generosity in meeting with us for 90 minutes. I hope the meeting was of value to you in terms of serving your learning about the complexities and history of the land use decisions that have been made since the GMA became state law.

Have you been able to access all the historical documents we called to your attention? If not, please let me know and I'll get on that immediately.

I want to reiterate in writing that I oppose the inclusion of Alternative 4 as an option for consideration in this round of GMA updates. At the Ridgefield open house Wednesday, March 25, I witnessed a CCCU member in conversation with a small group of people seated in the bleachers in which she said that the creation of Alternative 4 was initiated by CCCU with the intention to undo what CCCU feels to be the individual property rights restrictions created by the GMA in the 1990s. The statements made by this woman were verified as being accurate in the one-on-one conversations I had that evening with staff of the county's planning department.

It is my opinion that it is not good public policy to propose, and promote in the case of Councilor Madore, the adoption of land use policies based on the perspective and interests of one group of citizens, especially a group of citizens who literally advocate their intention to undo, or do an end run around, the GMA in order to serve their own financial and small interests, literally at the expense of all the rest of us.

As we tried to convey in our meeting, there are two categories of objections to Alternative 4. First, the intent and goal of Alternative 4 fly in the face of state law, the GMA, by knowingly creating conditions that 1) support suburban sprawl and diminish the size and productivity of agricultural lands, and 2) set the stage for the associated infrastructure failures, negative environmental impacts on air and water quality and wildlife protection, and 3) create real risk to the depletion of ground and surface water supplies. Second, Alternative 4 creates credible financial risks to taxpayers in the form of 1) wasted planning staff time, 2) increases in property taxes to all property owners and especially to some rural landowners, and 3) costs to defend against lawsuits re non-compliance with GMA rules and regulations and breaches of the separation of executive and legislative authorities stipulated in the charter. In my opinion, pursuing Alternative 4 by including it in the EIS analysis is a failure of the council's fiduciary responsibility to taxpayers and a failure of what I believe to be your moral responsibility as elected officials to make every sincere effort to understand, respect, and represent the diverse interests of all citizens, not just the interests of those who voted for you or whose personal values and belief systems align with your personal values and belief systems. Last time I checked, We were all in this together...with all our differences.

In the interest of trying to be of service to you, I'm sharing below a recent report issued by King County having to do with local foods. I am sending this along by way of showing why I take issue with the assertion by some that "agriculture is dead" in Clark County. This is not true, though there is compelling evidence that some have been trying, with some success, to kill it off through policy and budget decisions. If you read only page 5 of this report, copied in its entirety below, you will get a sense of what is also true in Clark County as a microcosm, or fractal, of what is happening in terms of the re-structuring of our food systems and land ownership and tenure patterns statewide and nationwide.

_Agriculture is not yet dead in Clark County_ and We (as citizens in collaboration with our public servants) have a right and a responsibility to investigate what is actually happening within and to our agriculture and food systems and to liberate together about what We, as diverse citizens, would like to see happen in our county to manifest and protect a shared, co-created vision of quality of life, and to not be subjected to a vision of quality of life dictated by just a few. The process of updating the GMA is an opportunity to breathe renewed life and vitality into the farming and food sector here and I stand for doing just that with rigor and determination, in order that our children and our children's children have a
chance to live in healthy, vibrant, resilient and thriving communities of place in Clark County. As currently envisoned, Alternative 4 would pretty much take that option off the table by building out 20th century suburban sprawl. We’re in the 21st century. Please take this bad idea off the table, now, so that We, as a community of diverse people, can effectively deal with our 21st century circumstances.

Most sincerely,

Heather Tischbein
1119 NW 131st Way
Apt. A
Vancouver, WA 98685


King County’s Local Food Initiative

MESSAGE FROM THE EXECUTIVE
Few places do food better than King County. Our culinary scene is world-renowned. We have vibrant urban areas within a tractor ride of farms growing delicious, healthy produce. Our residents can browse at more than 40 bustling farmers markets across the county. Nowhere is healthful living more valued. King County has the largest food market of any county in the Pacific Northwest, with close to $6 billion annually spent on food and beverage.

But that’s where our food story begins to... wilt a bit. Only about two percent of that $6 billion is going back to King County’s farms, whose survival is increasingly at risk due to development pressure, regulatory challenges, and fewer growers getting into farming. Our local food system was not built to withstand global threats such as climate change. What’s more, many low-income communities in King County – where residents experience higher rates of obesity and diabetes – suffer from limited access to nutritious foods.

Last year I launched the Local Food Initiative to better connect local farms to consumers, increase access to healthy, affordable foods in underserved areas, support our farmers, and create a farm-to-plate pipeline that is more resilient to the effects of climate change. I asked more than 30 high-level stakeholders in our local food system – our “Kitchen Cabinet” – to take a hard look at these issues. With this report, they have recommended meaningful targets, strategies, and actions for the County and our partners to pursue. In this report you will find my Top 20 priority actions for 2015-17. You will also learn about the Cabinet’s process, the current state of our county’s food system, and see additional Cabinet recommendations for how it can be enhanced over the long term. I believe that, working together, we can achieve our vision for a stronger food system within a decade.

Everyone can help in this process by working to become better “food citizens.” Be aware of what you’re consuming, where it is grown or produced, and whether others also have the opportunity to eat healthy, local food. Through wise food purchasing and consumption we can keep our farms productive, our food businesses thriving, and ensure that everyone has access to affordable, healthy food.
Thank you.
Dow Constantine
King County Executive
FYI

-----Original Message-----
From: Sydney Reischick [mailto:reisbicks@comcast.net]
Sent: Tuesday, March 31, 2015 8:15 AM
To: Orjiako, Oliver; Euler, Gordon; Horne, Chris
Subject: FOCC: Today's official input

Good Morning:
Please forward to Chris Cooke as well.
Here is today's diatribe.

Sydney Reischick
Ends of Clark County

PS: It seems to me (personal) that this Alternative 4 could interfere with acceptance of the ILB. Depending on how it is done and exactly what it is, some of us are in support of these potentially good, sustainable job possibilities.
Are you allowed an opinion about the possible effect(s) of Alternative 4 on the ILB?
Sydney
March 31st, 2015

Community Planning
Comp Plan Comments
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver WA 98666

Comment for the Record

"Alternative 4 is like driving without the driver's manual".

The GMA is the current law of Washington State
- It is necessary to know what that law is to make a Comprehensive Growth Management Plan.
- Acting as though the law does not exist because you disagree with it, is likely to cause problems for Clark County and additional costs to taxpayers.

An analogy could be driving without reading the driver's manual.
- What happens if you decide to drive without knowing all of the many "rules" of the road? Or you drive as if speed limits did not exist?
  
  Tickets
  Fines, fees and penalties from State, at some point increase in insurance costs
  Becoming known to law enforcement as a repeated scoff law (increased fines, penalties)
  Jail (withholding of several kinds of State funds)

Ignorance of the law is not an excuse.
** The Washington State Department of Commerce has a 3-hour short course seminar on the GMA and its parameters for planning (see bottom of letter).
- As we read it, only a Councilor can request them to come give it.

The GMA is the current law of Washington State. Don't we expect everyone to obey the law? Including our public officials?
- Asking Friends of Clark County to "negotiate" on any of these points of current state law is asking us to be accessory to breaking the law. We are simply unwilling to do that.
- The old saying is "If you don't like the law the way it's written, do the work to change the law." Meanwhile, Friends of Clark County implores the Councilors to follow the law as detailed in the GMA.

Sydney Reisbick, President
Friends of Clark County

The Short Course on Local Planning is an opportunity for elected officials, planning commission members, local government staff (clerks, administrators, attorneys), consultants, students, and community members to learn basic information about comprehensive planning and community development, the legal framework for land use planning, and public involvement in the planning process.

Anne Fritzler
Senior Planner
Growth Management Services
Anne.Fritzler@Commerce.wa.gov
360-725-3064
O'Donnell, Mary Beth

From: LISA <irwin36@msn.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 31, 2015 1:38 PM
To: Cnty 2016 Comp Plan
Attachments: Land Use Comment.docx

Comment submitted for Public Record regarding Property #181553000 - Lisa Irwin and Tim Roddy

We have lived at 19115 NE 42nd Ct. in Ridgefield for close to 25 years and have watched areas adjacent to our neighborhood, especially to the south and west, develop into smaller parcels (1/2-2.5 acres). The proposed re-zoning plans for our neighborhood are not consistent with other neighborhoods in our 20-block radius. The neighborhood immediately to the west has been developed into 2.5 acre homes and very recently homes along NE 29th Ave (between 179th and NE 199th) have been built on one acre parcels. All along the periphery of our 20-block radius are homes built on 1-2.5 acre parcels or less.

As we age, we want the ability to sub-divide our property into a smaller parcels, 1 or 2.5 acres so that we can stay in our community while downsizing into a smaller, one level home. This property is part of our retirement and we never imagined that 25 years later as the North County developed we would be placed in urban-10 holding for years and years, or even five acres, zoning which is inconsistent within our same 20 block radius.

With growth around Legacy Salmon Creek Hospital and WSU-V and major road and utility expansion to the north, south, and west, it seems that we should be zoned as our neighbors are at 1 to 2.5 acres.

We are highly opposed having our property zoned as we have been since 1987 when most of the houses in our neighborhood were built on five acre parcels. Most of us built our homes on one section of our property with the concept that we would be able to sub-divide for the purpose of land valuation or to build a smaller one level home.

We would very much appreciate your consideration of re-zoning our area to reflect the North County growth and our desire to use our property in a way that will allow us to stay in our community.
Good morning Jamie:

This is to acknowledge receipt of your letter. Staff will consider the data cited but remember that any growth that is occurring is part of the expected growth in the county. The official OFM April 1, 2015 population estimate will soon be released. We will docket your letter as part of the Plan update process. Thanks for your interest in the Clark County planning process.

Best Regards,

Oliver

From: Lisa McKee [mailto:lisa.mckee@jordanramis.com]
Sent: Friday, March 27, 2015 3:31 PM
To: Orjiako, Oliver
Cc: Jamie Howsley
Subject: Letter from Jamie Howsley re Population Growth in Clark County

Hello,

Attached is a letter from Jamie Howsley. If you have any trouble opening the attachment please let us know.

Thank you.

LISA McKEE  Legal Assistant to James D. Howsley
Jordan Ramis PC  Attorneys at Law
Direct: 360-567-3909  Main: 360-567-3900

Portland OR  Vancouver WA  Bend OR
www.jordanramis.com

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: Please do not read, copy, or disseminate this communication unless you are the intended addressee. This e-mail may contain confidential and/or privileged information intended only for the addressee. If you have received this in error, please notify me via return e-mail.

\X ADVICE NOTICE: IRS Circular 230 requires us to advise you that if this communication or any attachment contains any tax advice, the advice is not intended to be used, and cannot be used, for the purpose of (i) avoiding tax-related penalties or (ii) promoting, marketing, or recommending any transaction, plan, or
arrangement. A taxpayer may rely on professional advice to avoid tax-related penalties only if the advice is reflected in a comprehensive tax opinion that conforms to stringent requirements. Please contact us if you have any questions about this requirement, or would like to discuss preparation of an opinion that conforms to these IRS rules.
Just FYI

From: Lisa McKee [mailto:lisa.mckee@jordanramis.com]
Sent: Friday, March 27, 2015 3:31 PM
To: Orjiako, Oliver
Cc: Jamie Howsley
Subject: Letter from Jamie Howsley re Population Growth in Clark County

Hello,

Attached is a letter from Jamie Howsley. If you have any trouble opening the attachment please let us know.

Thank you.

LISA McKEE : Legal Assistant to James D. Howsley
Jordan Ramis PC    Attorneys at Law
Direct: 360-567-3909   Main: 360-567-3900

Portland OR    Vancouver WA   Bend OR
www.jordanramis.com

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: Please do not read, copy, or disseminate this communication unless you are the intended addressee. This e-mail may contain confidential and/or privileged information intended only for the addressee. If you have received this in error, please notify me via return e-mail.

TAX ADVICE NOTICE: IRS Circular 230 requires us to advise you that if this communication or any attachment contains any tax advice, the advice is not intended to be used, and cannot be used, for the purpose of (i) avoiding tax-related penalties or (ii) promoting, marketing, or recommending any transaction, plan, or arrangement. A taxpayer may rely on professional advice to avoid tax-related penalties only if the advice is reflected in a comprehensive tax opinion that conforms to stringent requirements. Please contact us if you have any questions about this requirement, or would like to discuss preparation of an opinion that conforms to these IRS rules.
March 27, 2015

Clark County Community Planning
ATTN: Oliver Orjiako, Director
PO Box 9810
Vancouver Wa 98668

Re: Clark County Population Growth Exceeds Projections
Brown File No.

Dear Oliver:

The US Census Bureau just announced new population data showing that Clark County is growing 1.7% annually. This far exceeds the county's unreasonably low projections, and is hard data that proves the county is not designating sufficient land to accommodate the growing demand for housing.

Attached is a Columbian article that explains the facts, and we ask that you please include this letter and the article in the record for the 2016 GMA Update. As noted by the Columbian, the growth rate in Clark County also exceeds the rates of other nearby counties.

Of course if the county only plans for two thirds of the actual, documented growth, it will be short many thousands of dwellings over the planning period, and will suffer a corresponding deficit of land for employment, civic and other uses.

We once again urge you to accept the proven facts about population growth, and expand the urban areas of Clark County accordingly.

Sincerely,

JORDAN RAMIS PC

[Signature]

James D. Howley
Admitted in Washington and Oregon
james.howley@jordanramis.com
WA Direct Dial (360) 567-3913
OR Direct Dial (503) 568-5592

Enclosure
Following comments were submitted online:

Parcel No:

Subject: Lagler Dairy

Comments:
Please keep this prime agricultural land in production. Converting it to industrial use is wasteful of a precious productive resource for which our county has ongoing and growing need.

Submitted by:
Tim Carper

Email: carperti@gmail.com

Address:
Following comments were submitted online:

Parcel No:

Subject: Alt4- adding 15K parcels

Comments:
Please consider the ill effects of randomly adding so many 1 acre parcels to rural Clark County. Creating an even more dispersed populace serves no one well in an era where smart planning will be essential. Consider the costs of spreading residents out - not considered smart planning as we go forward into a future of ever more limited resources.

Submitted by:
Tim Carper

Email: carperti@gmail.com

Address:
Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: John R & Sisko Kysar and Jan Kysar

Address: 26706 NE Rotschey Mill Rd Yacolt WA 98678
39484 NE Rotschey Rd

Open house location:
☐ March 25, Ridgefield High School, 2724 South Hillhurst Road, Ridgefield
☐ April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson

Comment:

39484 Rotschey Rd
Our 37.70A on Rotschey Rd. Yacolt WA
98678

#5 - sec 23 T5 NR 3E WM

We would like it to be put into FR A. parcels. To comply with the small parcels around us.

Phone number 360-247-5934 Russell
772-9718 Sisko

Thank you so much! 921-4572 Jans

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: jankysar@gmail.com

Other ways to comment:

Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOCC Hearing.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
Following comments were submitted online:

Parcel No:

Subject: 2016 GMA

Comments:
I want to express my concern that public comment on the proposed GMA update is nigh on impossible since the options keep changing. Changes made by Councilors without insight provided by the professionals in the Planning Dept and without analysis on the overall strategy of future retention of meaningful agriculture and forestry resources is meaningless. By adding options after a public input process on earlier alternatives render all the effort put forth by citizens on earlier choices meaningless. Even after the first meeting on the added Alternative 4 (where little or no description was given of the Alternatives 1, 2 and 3) had changed prior to the second meeting for public comment (in Hockinson). Long term planning is just that - it is not responding to the short term, individual or immediate problems. While I think a long term plan needs way to redress unintended consequences for existing land owners, changing the whole plan for the sake of the few is wrong. And it jeopardizes the long term preservation and viability of rural land in the county. Planning options ed to be reviewed by professionals (and the SEPA process) for equity and balance. Reports that "Alternative 4 enthusiastically embraced" by participants at one meeting (Councillor Madore's Facebook page); the posting of a new Alternative 4 A the very next day (Thursday PM, the Grid), the removal of the new option the very next day (The Columbian, Saturday) do not appear to follow the GMA process. Prior to February of this year, the process and progress was clear. It is now in disarray.

Submitted by:
Bridget McLeman

Email: bridgetmcleman@gmail.com

Address:

Clark County, WA
Thank you for the opportunity to express our excitement over the alternative 4! It has positive effects for us in many ways. It makes so much sense to make the planning realistic to what is already existing in the area!

**SPECIAL REQUEST**

**Rural 2.5 : South of 219th Street E of 50th Ave**
We have a 3 A parcel **193058000** that we bought from CC tax auction in 2010. We could see that it was landlocked before the purchase, but knew an adjacent owner. We could not have foreseen, however, that it was an illegal lot. That 2010 tax foreclosure on only a portion of the 13A property Mr Fleming owned (193125000) in R-20 created 2 illegal lots. It was a great disappointment to find that we could not get a building permit for it. **We purchased the property in good faith from the government.** If it was changed to R 2.5 it would allow us to have use of it. We have an agreement with the owner of 20713 NE 50th Ave to sell us an easement across the side of their property. There are other neighbors in the area that I know would be happy with a 2.5 zoning as well.

**In favor of R-5**
If R-2.5 isn't an option for this parcel, R-5 would suffice. Mr. Fleming would be able to sell us 2 of his acres and then both will be in compliance instead of both being illegal! 2.5 would be preferred, however so that we couldn't have the added burden of additional property transaction for both parties.

**In favor of F-10 AND cluster development: West of Amboy North of NE 399 Street**
We own 3 adjacent parcels: 18206, 18112 and 18214 NE 399 street. 28A, 2A and 8A respectively. Two of these parcels were **non-compliant in F-20 when we purchased them.** We have 3 adult children. It has been our dream that we would be able to provide a home for us and each of our children while maintaining the natural forest and beautiful park-like setting. Right now we rent the houses for our retirement income. It would be a dream come true to be able to divide the 28A parcel into 2 and have a cluster development on 1. **Then we could have our family there and still have income properties—leaving the forest as it should be.**

**Cluster development is a logical solution to make it affordable for landowners to maintain large areas of forest and agricultural lands.**

Vonnie Sheadel
360-887-3304
From: O'Donnell, Mary Beth

To: Orjiako, Oliver

Cc: Troy Uskoski

Subject: RE: 2016 Growth Management Act FR Zoning- Gabriel Rd

Good morning Troy:

Thank you for your email and request. In response, Clark County is updating its Comprehensive Growth Management Plan as required by state statute. At this time in the process, our focus is on what need to be decided next. In order words, the selection of alternatives to be studied and analyzed in the environmental impact statement. Staff will docket your request and encourage you to follow the process by watching out for upcoming meetings, work sessions, open houses, public notices, and hearings relating to the plan update.

You may also submit comment through the county’s website at: http://www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/getinvolved.html I thank you for your interest in the Clark County planning process.

Best Regards,

Oliver

From: Troy Uskoski [mailto:tuskoski@hotmail.com]

To: Orjiako, Oliver

Cc: Madore, David; Mielke, Tom; Stewart, Jeannie; Michael Tapani; Jay Vroman

Subject: RE: 2016 Growth Management Act FR Zoning- Gabriel Rd

Dear Director Orjiako,

First of all, a special thanks to both you and Councilor Madore for taking the time to meet and speak w/ us tonight at Ridgefield High School. It was nice to hear you and speak to Councilor Madore in person. It's been great to see the GMA process open up for more comment, although I'm sure the last minute flurry of activity has made your lives crazy!

Thank you for the informative written response to our original re-zoning request (our original letter is already part of the record and is only attached for reference). In your letter dated 03/20/2015, you note that our initial request de-designates forest resource land and that WAC 365-190-060 states that the classification and designating of forest resource lands must be coordinated as a county or region-wide process. If we had initially known that one of the alternatives offered would include smaller FR lot sizes we would have asked for the smaller compliant zoning classification instead of requesting a R-5 designation.

From my introduction to Alternative 4, it appears that the areas zoned as forest resources will remain intact, but FR lot sizes may change. I am writing to revise our request to ask for the smallest proposed FR-designation (FR-10 at this time) allowed, which would more closely match the neighboring parcel zoning of R-5.

...y reasoning is thus. Although the most recent proposal re-zoning us to FR-20 would give me the ability
to split my property (parcel # 267189000), I don't believe it would give Michael Tapani (parcel # 986029713) or Jay Vroman (parcel # 267197000) the same option with theirs. Mr. Tapani has definitely expressed the desire to be able to sell or give a piece of his property to his son.

We are fairly close to the rural center of Pargher Lake and are currently bordered both by R-5 zoning and also non-compliant lots within the current FR-80 zoning. Our properties have ready access to public power and water w/ the pertinent easements to the property lines. There are many outlying lots at the farther reaches of the county (ex. Rotschy Rd., Allworth Rd, and Dole Valley) without access to public water that are being proposed to change to FR-10 under Alternative 4, so I am hoping that you will take our request into consideration.

Please include this email as a document for the 2016 GMA records.

Thank you,

Troy Uskoski
360.609.1861

From: tuskoski@hotmail.com
To: david.madore@clark.wa.gov; tom.mielke@clark.wa.gov; jeanne.stewart@clark.wa.gov
Subject: 2016 Growth Management Act FR Zoning
Date: Tue, 10 Mar 2015 17:44:53 -0700

Dear commissioners,

I thought I'd write a note following up on my comments at the commission meeting last week and prior to the workshop tomorrow, which I cannot attend. Last June/July, I submitted comments online and also drafted a letter to the commissioners which I both emailed and sent via certified post. For the record, I again submitted a copy of the letter at the meeting last week.

Prior to last week's meeting, I scanned Alternatives 1, 2, and 3, and was disappointed to see that they didn't contain much in the way of options for large rural landholders currently zoned FR-40 or FR-80. The suggested alternatives appear to bring many previously platted lots into conformance, but don't seem to offer many re-zoning options beyond that.

Jay Vroman (Parcel # 267197000), Michael Tapani (Parcel # 986029713), and myself (Parcel # 267189000) currently own adjoining properties zoned FR-80 immediately adjacent to properties zoned R-5. We are in favor of rezoning that would allow us the flexibility of splitting a piece or pieces from our existing parcels. Seeing nothing that better supports our request, we are in favor of Clark County Citizens United Alternative 4 being added to the SEIS.

It would be nice to see an option going forward that would allow greater flexibility for large lot stakeholders. What is decided now will impact us all for years to come.

Thank you for your time,

Troy Uskoski
360.609.1861
Garrett Hoyt I was also there and I find it disturbing that very few see the big picture. Everyone wants to see how the potential changes will affect their property and their potential to subdivide and make more money developing, but nobody seems to be talking about how different our county would look if everyone did that. Nobody seems to be talking about traffic implications or water rights, or local agriculture. I suspect that the individuals who support alt 4 would be the first to complain about the traffic and change of rural feel when it was more than just them that profited from this change.

I also took the opportunity to speak with a few county employees. Mark McCauley (sp?) defended the means by which alt 4 came about. He also mentioned that he's in a difficult situation. He wants to keep his job, and recognizes that the people who make that decision need to be pleased. Another employee that I asked about the charter said that he had a strong opinion, but that wasn't what the open house was about. When I recognized that he couldn't do anything, but I have a voice that could be more vocal, he gave me a look that confirmed my suspicions, and walked away. Just before I left, I got into a bit of an argument with mr. Madore and expressed an opinion different than his. As I walked away, one of the county employees caught me and asked that I continue doing that. He said that the planning department tended to be on the same page, but it wasn't received well from a certain councilor. He went on to talk about his feeling about the implementation of the charter and concluded with, "I've probably said more than I should"

So how do I address the issue with the implementation of the charter as a citizen? I see my legislatures executing, and I want it to stop. The executive goes along with it because he doesn't want to lose his job, so who can hold the county councilors accountable? I want to be an involved citizen, but I don't even know where to start.
Alternative 4 Plan enthusiastically embraced:

This evening’s Open House at Ridgefield High School was well attended, especially by rural citizens interested in the Comp Plan that may determine the future of their property. Clark County staff did a great job preparing and then conversing with citizens.

The Reflector did a great job on Alternative 4 as well:
http://www.thereflector.com/eedition/page_58f281c4-19bc-57d9-8c01-2e74382571bf.html

http://www.thereflector.com/eedition/page_8f977d70-835f-52cf-813c-179691804cee.html#page_a3

Every seven years, we make necessary changes to ensure that our citizens have ample, affordable and useful land for our community to grow, prosper, and thrive for the next 20 years.

6 of every 10 parcels in the Rural category do not comply with our current zoning map.
7 of every 10 parcels in the AG category do not comply with our current zoning map.
8 of every 10 parcels in the FR category do not comply with our current zoning map.

And those numbers do not even include the remnants ( parcels that are smaller than 1 acre for R, 5 acres for AG, and 10 acres for FR.

The problem is not with the rural community. The vast majority of those parcels predated our zoning map. The problem is instead, the inappropriate zones that did not align with reality. Our job is to update our zoning maps to recognize the existing parcels (the real world) and determine the appropriate zones including the minimum lot sizes for each area including the size of the neighboring parcels that form local rural character.

The Alternative 4 proposal was enthusiastically embraced by the vast majority of citizens participating this evening. Yet, they encourage us to do better.

The most common request was for larger AG and FR parcels to be made smaller if they were surrounded by predominantly smaller parcels. In case that them was communicated by many citizens tonight (and that was the most frequent request shared with me), Option-A maps have already been prepared for that contingency.

They should be posted on Thursday and should also be displayed at the Hockinson High School Open House next Wednesday, April 1 at 5:30 pm. Citizen can then share which AG and FR version they like best, the original or the Option-A.

Citizen feedback always makes plans better. We are here to serve you as we work together for a future where we can all prosper and Thrive.

Thank God! Yea Clark County!
Alternative 4 Plan enthusiastically embraced:

This evening's Open House at Ridgefield High School was well attended, especially by rural citizens interested in the Comp Plan that may determine the future of their property. Clark County staff did a great job preparing and then conversing with citizens.

The Reflector did a great job on Alternative 4 as well:
http://www.therefinder.com/eedition/page_58f281c4-19bc-57d9-8c01-2e74382571bf.html

http://www.therefinder.com/eedition/page_8f977d70-835f-52cf-813c-179691804cee.html#page_a3

Every seven years, we make necessary changes to ensure that our citizens have ample, affordable and useful land for our community to grow, prosper and thrive for the next 20 years.

Yet 6 of every 10 parcels in the Rural category do not conform to our current zoning map.
7 of every 10 parcels in the AG category do not conform to our current zoning map.
8 of every 10 parcels in the FR category do not conform to our current zoning map.

And those numbers do not even include the remnants, parcels that are smaller than 1 acre for R, 5 acres for AG, and 10 acres for FR.

The problem is not with the rural community. The vast majority of those parcels predated our zoning map. The problem is instead, the inappropriate 20-year old zoning map that did not align with reality when it was created.

State law requires us to update our zoning map to recognize the existing reasonable parcels (the real world) and determine the appropriate zones including the minimum lot sizes for each area while considering the size of the neighboring parcels that form the rural character of each area.

The Alternative 4 proposal was enthusiastically embraced by the vast majority of citizens participating this evening. Yet, they encouraged us to do better.

The most common request was for larger AG and FR parcels to be made smaller if they were surrounded by predominantly smaller parcels. In case that theme was communicated by many citizens tonight (and that was the most frequent request shared with me), Option-A maps have already been prepared for that contingency.

They should be posted on Thursday and should also be displayed at the Hockinson High School Open House next Wednesday, April 1 at 5:30 pm. Citizens can then share which AG and FR version they like best, the original or the Option-A maps.

Citizen feedback always makes plans better. We are here to serve you as we work together for a future where we can all prosper and thrive.

Thank God! Yea Clark County!
David Madore
6 hrs · Edited ·

Alternative 4 Plan enthusiastically embraced:

This evening’s Open House at Ridgefield High School was well attended, especially by rural citizens interested in the Comp Plan that may determine the future of their property. Clark County staff did a great job preparing and then conversing with citizens.

The Reflector did a great job on Alternative 4 as well:
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Every seven years, we make necessary changes to ensure that our citizens have ample, affordable and useful land for our community to grow, prosper and thrive for the next 20 years.

Yet 6 of every 10 parcels in the Rural category do not conform to our current zoning map.
7 of every 10 parcels in the AG category do not conform to our current zoning map.
8 of every 10 parcels in the FR category do not conform to our current zoning map.

And those numbers do not even include the remnants, parcels that are smaller than 1 acre for R, 5 acres for AG, and 10 acres for FR.

The problem is not with the rural community. The vast majority of those parcels predated our zoning map. The problem is instead, the inappropriate 20-year old zoning map that did not align with reality when it was created.

State law requires us to update our zoning map to recognize the existing reasonable parcels (the real world) and determine the appropriate zones including the minimum lot sizes for each area while considering a size of the neighboring parcels that form the rural character of each area.

The Alternative 4 proposal was enthusiastically embraced by the vast majority of citizens participating this evening. Yet, they encouraged us to do better.

The most common request was for larger AG and FR parcels to be made smaller if they were surrounded by predominantly smaller parcels. In case that theme was communicated by many citizens tonight (and that was the most frequent request shared with me), Option-A maps have already been prepared for that contingency.

They should be posted on Thursday and should also be displayed at the Hockinson High School Open House next Wednesday, April 1 at 5:30 pm. Citizens can then share which AG and FR version they like best, the original or the Option-A maps.

Citizen feedback always makes plans better. We are here to serve you as we work together for a future where we can all prosper and thrive.

Thank God! Yea Clark County!
Keri Debra, Chuck Miller and Thomas Hann like this.

Chuck Miller David, great job thank you for your countless hours of work with very little sleep in getting this set up for our Citizens & thanks to the staff that also helped you!!

Like · Reply ·
From: Lynn Carman [mailto:lynn.carman@comcast.net]
Sent: Wednesday, March 25, 2015 12:05 PM
To: Madore, David; Mielke, Tom; Stewart, Jeanne
Cc: Orjiako, Oliver; kaitlin.gillespie@columbian.com; Ken Vance
Subject: GMA

Lynn Carman
11104 NW 33 Avenue
Felida, WA 98685
3/25/2015

Clark County Councilor
1300 Franklin Street
Vancouver, WA 98666

Honorable Clark County Councilors:

RE: Growth Management Act 2016

I am requesting that my comments are included in any current or developed Administrative Record assigned or established for this said Proposal. I am also requesting to be a party of record and informed of the ruling be made for this proposed change.

I am just shaking my head at how this process is being done, not abiding by the process and procedures that have been in place for the past 20 years. The micromanaging that has been done and not allowing the process and procedures that can be found on Clark County’s website to be followed. Alternative #4 should be handled through the rezoning process not the way it’s being proposed here with the Alternative #4. These rural landowners should be going to the Clark County Planning Commissioners for their zone changed. Building on rural lands doesn’t comply with the true meaning of what GMA was proposed. Nor does it comply with the RCWs handed down by the state nor does it meet the concurrency issues.

Alt. #3, if the boundaries were not submitted by the first deadline then these should be tossed out. Then there is the issue if these expanded boundaries do not help expand the job market on a whole they too should be tossed out. These expansions should be for industrial or commercial use not for houses.

Alt. #2 If this is truly for jobs and not houses then it should be allowed but again we still have lands that have yet to be developed that are sitting empty. All those lots across from Cosco are still empty and not built upon, so why add more
out in the rural setting until these lands are developed to the fullest?

Alt. #1 Do nothing!! Well that is also a joke. The density that was deemed upon us all is now showing how concurrency is not being met, roadways are failing due to the density in some areas that shouldn't have been deemed with the density that we currently are seeing. Level E is not acceptable to get area residents out of an area that is deemed dangerous. Not abiding by what was filed with the courts is a total waste of time and money. Development needs to be stopped and a serious look at the density of all of Clark County. Fix the roadways or do not allow development to happen. If density is to happen then you need to fix the roadways to the standards that will handle the traffic that you have allowed to happen. Doing nothing is what got us in the problems that we currently see today.

All Alt. have or will fail the citizens/taxpayers of Clark County. You have just wasted staff's time and our money in not taking GMA seriously. Your micro managing and by passing the procedures and process is just mind boggling. If you don't know the procedures or why the process is in place do nothing and ask staff. Or take some time and read our own county website to learn why things are done. Building it and they will come is not planning.

Sincerely,
Lynn Carman
To the commissioners,

In September 2012 we three Ahola sisters inherited "tenants in common" 49.05 acres (forest Tier II) east of Hockinson (Tax parcel # 2053840).
This 49.05 acres is the reminder of our Finnish immigrant Grandfather Eliel Ahola's 1905 Homestead.
The rest of the 160 acre tree farm (except for 2.2 WN corner acres) are owned by our Ahola siblings and my son Mickael McElveny.
In 2013 we had the 160 acres surveyed, hired a professional Forester, submitted a Timber Management Plan, communicated with the Fish and wildlife so they could inspect and designate properly and ecologically our two creeks,
and we have continued to consult our family lawyers.
On legal advice we have changed the designation from Forestry to Timberlands, in preparation to divide this last 49.05 acres.
We have carefully marked all the boundaries of the separate pieces of this family land.
Now in 2015, or 2016, we want to divide the 49.05 acres inherited from our Mother's trust.
Alice "Ahola" Chandler would receive 18% (9 acres), to add to her 15 acres, (Tax#205455 & #205410).
Donna "Ahola" Andrews would receive 49% (24 acres) as her fair share.
and I, Alina "Ahola" McElveny would receive 33% (16 acres), having already received 6 acres which my son

Zoned at R-40 as it is now, or R-20 which you say it WILL possibly be, you can see that this is NOT possible.
We need the new zoning under the Comprehensive Growth Plan to be 5 acres as are almost all the lands around us to the West, South, East and about 1/2 of the North boundary which we share with school land, and a few small home sites.
Will you help us? What do you advise???
Yours to help,
truly,
Alina "Ahola" McElveny
22501 NE 159th St.
Brush Prairie, WA 98606
Clark County Board of Councilors  
P.O. Box 5000  
Vancouver, Washington 98666  

March 23, 2015

Re: Futurewise Letter of November 13, 2014

Clark County received a letter from Futurewise supporting Alternative 1, the do nothing choice. The letter claimed many things, but did not back it up with facts. Futurewise claims the GMA requires urban growth areas and limits their size to save money. Actually, the GMA allows expansion when infrastructure is adequate, but does not say the reason is to save money. Futurewise says * large lots and low densities increase water demand...leakage...and costs to .....customers.* Logic says the more households using water, the more the demand. Leakage happens no matter how much is used and water costs are borne by each user, regardless of the number. Futurewise claims compelling evidence that reduced development in rural areas, results in increased construction in urban areas. If you stop housing in one area, it only happens in areas that allow it. But, this reduces housing options and is not a requirement in the GMA.

This letter uses King County as an example, but King County has had numerous court actions against it's land use planning, and is probably not the best choice. One so called study states, "it was too early to tell if it (GMA) was successful since it had only been in place for seven years...." The letter references agricultural lands of long term significance, then references sales of horses, ponies, mules, burros, and donkeys. These items are not GMA criteria for preservation of agriculture land. The letter states Clark County does not have water to provide for increased development. But, the county's proposal is to simply recognize existing parcels, already using water, so the increase would be minimal. In addition, septic systems play a major role in groundwater recharge, when water goes in and out of the systems. The letter references irrigation wells and claims residential development will suck wells dry. Irrigation wells tap much deeper than domestic wells and water usage is much higher for agriculture use than domestic use. The letter claims that smaller forest parcels have lower timber harvest rates, which is to be expected, but is not harmful to the industry. Futurewise says not to allow development, then says development doesn't allow for a house for a son or daughter. They spout there is not enough water but, a recent Clark Public Utilities survey states there is more than adequate water supplied by their systems, well into the year 2035 and beyond. In a recent Executive Report - Best Available Science, Volume I, February 2004 Chapter 6, Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas it discusses water needs in Washington state as well as supply and demand. The report discusses septic systems design and recommends their use for one acre parcels or larger, but no mention of a lack of water.

Futurewise would do well to thoroughly research their data before they make claims to it. Taking information out of context does nothing for their credibility. Such an organization from Seattle has no idea what the community needs are for Clark County and it is a stretch for them to make an attempt to guess. That organization would do well to simply stay out of other people's business.

Sincerely,  
Carol Levanen, Ex. Secretary  
Clark County Citizens United, Inc.  
P.O. Box 2188, Battle Ground, Washington 98604
March 24, 2015

To the Clark County Board of Councilors:

Thank you for hearing my comments. I am concerned about the recent changes in the comprehensive plan update.

Adding the 4th alternative just as our planning staff is wrapping up almost two years of a reasonable set of choices to complete the required update, has done a great injustice to these highly trained, faithful employees.

The county risks some actions by the state, including withholding of substantial funding, by ignoring the timing requirements for including the public in the decisions on the update.

Asking the planning staff to present open houses on an alternative that they have not been part of, and without the time to properly prepare the information for the public is a terrible disservice to them and to Clark County Voters.

As a board member of Friends of Clark County, and as the chair of a neighborhood association, I have been asked by several people to explain what is happening and how it will affect them. I have planned a meeting for the neighborhood to meet that need, but I’m afraid we still will not have the proper information for them.

At the very least, I’m hoping that the county will be able to create a map with which citizens will be able to type in their addresses and see how close they are to the areas proposed that will be affected by the 4th alternative.

Thank you, Val Alexander
Chair, East Fork Hills Rural Assn.
2404 NW Coyote Ridge Rd.
La Center, WA 98629
360-263-2521
coyoteridge@tds.net
BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

1300 Franklin, 6th Floor, Vancouver, WA 98660
boardcom@clark.wa.gov

MARCH 24, 2015

Dear Sirs and Madam,

Financial Consequences of violations of process or law: Background

Due to problems before the current Council or any current Councilors, Clark County had two huge payouts and was ejected from the Washington State Risk Pool. We no longer have that backup for future payouts or legal costs.

The need for large payouts also affected our County Insurance. At some point, which no one will predict, future large payouts will increase the rate for our County Insurance. That would impact all citizens.

By Initiative, Washington State entities are allowed only a 1% increase in property taxes a year, which is far below inflation. The current Board has been rejecting even that increase, so our general budget is not growing at all. With a frozen general fund, any money spent on legal costs by the general fund will decrease services.

Therefore any legal costs have far reaching consequences for insurance rates, the general fund and lowered services.

Friends of Clark County holds that, in this environment, true fiscal conservatism advises adoption of Alternative 1, which avoids all sins of commission for the Growth Management Plan. The other Alternatives contain potential issues.

Alternative 1 has enough land to meet the population growth estimate. It is in compliance with the process and laws of the Growth Management Act. Legal action would probably come from CCCU but would be less likely to come from both sides. That would cost less.

Ydney Reisbick, President
From: Sydney Reisbick [mailto:reisbicks@comcast.net]
Sent: Tuesday, March 24, 2015 8:58 AM
To: Cnty Board of County Councilors General Delivery
Cc: Orjiako, Oliver; Euler, Gordon
Subject: FOCC to BOCC: for record: Hearing of 3/24/15: GMP financial considerations

Good Morning Councilors:
For the record, here is part of our input for today's hearing.

Thank you,
Sydney Reisbick
Friends of Clark County
David Madore
March 20 at 11:07pm · Edited ·

' alive! The new proposed zoning maps for rural Clark County!
Check out the Alternative 4 maps to correct the zoning problems that persisted since 1994. The maps are posted in the last entries of the March 11 entry of The Grid
http://clark.wa.gov/thegrid/

Two Open Houses are scheduled to cover the 4 Comprehensive Plan Update Alternatives 1 - 4 (options). I will be there for two way conversations. We want to hear from citizens:
Ridgefield High School:
Wednesday, March 25 @ 5:30 pm - 7:00 pm

Hockinson High School
Wednesday, April 1 @ 5:30 pm - 7:00 pm

You can also learn more at:

The current zoning map says that only 43% of existing Rural lots => 1 acre, conform.
The new proposed map recognizes that 76% of those lots conform.
The main problem is not with the existing lots. Rather, the non-conformance is caused by the inappropriate lot sizes specified in our zoning map. It is our responsibility to fix that.

It is not possible to have 100% of the lots conform. When we get the zoning map right, a portion of the lots will still be nonconforming since the state prohibits "spot zoning". Spot zoning is where 1 or a few lots are

I see that the map color codes for each zone have little contrast. That makes it difficult to differentiate between the zoned specified minimum lot sizes. I hope to fix that on Monday.

After 20 years, we finally have a chance to fix the inappropriate zoning in this county and make life better for rural land owners.

Thank God! Yea Clark County!

Battle Ground
Chuck Miller, Mark Butler, Keri Debra and 7 others like this.

2 shares

Kevin VanGelder Different shades of the same color make reading the map on a high level difficult.
Like · Reply · March 21 at 12:03am

Aj Gomez You mean a "property owner" could choose to do more with "their" land?
Top priority — Alternative 4 — Rural Lands:

Other priorities have been set aside to complete the work on the plan for rural landowners. The goal is to post the maps on The Grid by the close of Friday.

Since 1994, rural landowners have waited for our county to correct our zoning map that defined the legal lot sizes for every parcel. It is finally happening.  

This top priority even trumped this evening’s C-Tran Board meeting even after we were unable to reach Tom Mielke to cover my place. Their agenda included the nonsense of raising fares again to continue reducing ridership.

Also on the agenda was a fat pay raise for CEO Director Jeff Hamm for a multi-year pattern of skyrocketing costs, declining ridership, betraying the voters, and inefficiency. I would like to have been there to vote against the disastrous mismanagement of what could otherwise be great bus service for Clark County. We could do so much better with new management.

Back to alternative 4... The significance of this comprehensive plan update for rural citizens cannot be overstated. It's been a lot of work and I must thank Ken Pearrow and Barbara Hatman in GIS for tremendous help optimizing the zoning maps.

Clark County Rural citizens are finally going to get a fresh breath of air in this Comprehensive Plan Update. Stay tuned.

Thank God! Yea Clark County!

Alternative 4 Options to be Analyzed

- Forest zones: Include 20 and 10 acre minimum lot size areas where appropriate (considering the existing rural nature and predominant lot sizes)

- Agriculture zones: Include 5 acre minimum lot size areas where appropriate (considering the existing rural nature and predominant lot sizes)

- Rural zones: Include 1, 2.5, and 5 acre minimum lot size areas where appropriate (considering the already developed lots, the existing rural nature, and predominant lot sizes)

- Clustering Options to aggregate and preserve 70% of R, AG, and FR land into open space for agriculture, forest, or other non-residential uses.

Note: Smaller Forest, Agriculture, and Rural lot sizes and clustering options are already recognized in a variety of other counties.

Allen Hoff and Tim Lutz like this.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Status Quo</th>
<th>Alternative 2</th>
<th>Proposed Alternative 4</th>
<th>Rationale/Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Predominant Lot Size Process, w/o</td>
<td>not included</td>
<td>not included</td>
<td>included</td>
<td>Recognition of rural character. Equity with neighbors. Several variations of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de-designation of R, AG, &amp; F design.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;neighboring area&quot; possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AG Minimum Lot</td>
<td>AG-20</td>
<td>AG-10</td>
<td>AG-5</td>
<td>Flexibility. Precedence in other Counties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Tier 2 Designation</td>
<td>FR-40</td>
<td>FR-20</td>
<td>FR-10</td>
<td>Flexibility. Precedence in other Counties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Largest Rural Designation</td>
<td>R-20</td>
<td>single R design.</td>
<td>R-5</td>
<td>Recognition of rural characteristics, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate Rural Designation</td>
<td>R-10</td>
<td>single R design.</td>
<td>R-5</td>
<td>Recognition of rural characteristics, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smallest Rural Designation</td>
<td>R-5</td>
<td>single R design.</td>
<td>R-5</td>
<td>Recognition of rural characteristics, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster Development in AG</td>
<td>not included</td>
<td>not included</td>
<td>included</td>
<td>Flexibility. Precedence in other Counties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster Development in FR</td>
<td>not included</td>
<td>not included</td>
<td>included</td>
<td>Flexibility. Precedence in other Counties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster Development in R</td>
<td>not included</td>
<td>unclear</td>
<td>included</td>
<td>Flexibility. Precedence in other Counties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Reserve and Urban Holding</td>
<td>included</td>
<td>unclear</td>
<td>included</td>
<td>URO and UHO to be lifted and either (A) revert to prior zoning or (B) designated as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overlay Releases and Revisions</td>
<td>not included</td>
<td>not included</td>
<td>included</td>
<td>business commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognize Existing R-Zoned Lots with min of R-2.5; R-5 similar rezone</td>
<td>not included</td>
<td>not included</td>
<td>included</td>
<td>Future flexibility. No new lots created.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Type Updates</td>
<td>not included</td>
<td>not included</td>
<td>delayed process</td>
<td>Updates with most current science and implications to be delayed to a separate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>process that would start within 36 months; certainty of process to be instituted by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>formal inclusion as an Objective in the revised CMP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CLARK COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
THURSDAY, MARCH 19, 2015

6:30 P.M. - PUBLIC HEARING

BOCC HEARING ROOM, 6TH FLOOR
PUBLIC SERVICES BUILDING
1300 FRANKLIN STREET
VANCOUVER, WA

AGENDA

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. ROLL CALL & INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

III. GENERAL & NEW BUSINESS
    A. Approval of Agenda for March 19, 2015
    B. Approval of Minutes for January 15, 2015
    C. Communications from the Public

IV. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS & PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION:
    A. Amendments to Home Business and Multi-Family codes
       This proposal would amend the Clark County Code as follows:
       • Amend the County's Home Business provisions (Section 40.260.100) to remove
         the limit on the maximum number of non-resident employees for Major Home
         Businesses; and
       • Amend the County's "multifamily" zoning code (Section 40.220.020) to prohibit
         new single family detached dwelling developments in the R-12, R-18, R-22, OR-
         15, OR-18, and OR-22 zoning districts.
       Contact: Jan Bazala (360) 397-2375, Ext. 4499
       E-Mail: jan.bazala@clark.wa.gov

V. OLD BUSINESS

VI. NEW BUSINESS

VII. COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION

VIII. ADJOURNMENT
STAFF REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS:
Staff recommendations to Planning Commission will be available 14 days prior to the hearing date listed above on the county's web page at http://www.clark.wa.gov/planning/PCmeetings.html. Copies are also available at Clark County Community Planning, 1300 Franklin Street, 3rd Floor, Vancouver, Washington.

SUBMISSION OF WRITTEN TESTIMONY:
If you bring written testimony to read at the hearing, the Planning Commission would request submission of at least ten copies for the record (seven copies for Planning Commission and three copies for staff).

E-MAIL TESTIMONY:
PLEASE NOTE: All e-mails need to be received no later than 48 hours prior to the hearing and need to include full name, address, city, zip code, and phone number to be included as parties of record. Testimony can be e-mailed to the above-listed planners or to marilee.mccall@clark.wa.gov.

ACCOMMODATION OF PHYSICAL IMPAIRMENTS:
The Public Service Center is wheelchair accessible. If you need auxiliary aids or services in order to attend, contact the Clark County ADA Office. Relay (800) 833-6384 or 711; E-mail ADA@clark.wa.gov.

HEARING COVERAGE:
Coverage of this evening's hearing may be cable cast live on Clark/Vancouver television channel 23 or 21, on cable television systems. For replay dates and times, please check your local television guide or www.cvtf.org.

Web Page at: http://www.clark.wa.gov/planning/PCmeetings.html
O'Donnell, Mary Beth

From: Orjiako, Oliver
Sent: Tuesday, March 17, 2015 9:11 AM
To: O'Donnell, Mary Beth
Cc: Cook, Christine
Subject: FW: For the record: Input from FOCC
Attachments: FOCC to BOCC 3-17-15.doc

Just FYI and for index! Thanks.

From: Sydney Reisbick [mailto:reisbicks@comcast.net]
Sent: Tuesday, March 17, 2015 8:53 AM
To: Cnty Board of County Councilors General Delivery
Cc: Orjiako, Oliver; Euler, Gordon
Subject: For the record: Input from FOCC

Good Morning.
Here is a "for the record" written version of our input during the public comment period the 3/3/15 hearing. With a thank you and a request.
Sydney Reisbick
Friends of Clark County
BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS  

1300 Franklin, 6th Floor, Vancouver, WA 98660  
boardcom@clark.wa.gov  

MARCH 17, 2015  

Dear Sirs and Madam,  

Here, for the record, is my presentation at the BOCC hearing of 3-3-15. Thank you for taking the de-designation goal out of Alternative 4. This is also the basis for our official request to be “at the table” for future discussions of the Growth Management Plan.  

THE GMAP Alternative 4 is not just the concern of rural landowners.  

Friends of Clark County speaks for smart (efficient, organic) growth in Clark County. We have status to comment on this rural alternative because we speak for home-owning taxpayers who pay thousands of dollars every year to Clark County for services. We advocate for smart, efficient, organic development of our county because sprawl, scattering or spot zoning is more expensive to maintain services. If the 4th alternative is included in the GMP, it will either increase taxes for all homeowners or decrease services. This will happen whether or not there are financial repercussions from being out of compliance or breaking laws or rules of the Growth Management Act (GMA).  

Clark County Board of County Councilors propose a new “Rural Alternative” for the County’s Growth Management Plan (GMP) effectively proposing to de-designate over 6,500 acres of resource lands of 9.5 acres or less to rural parcels. Rural parcels are eligible for development into houses and home businesses.  

How large is 6,500 acres? It is 10 square miles. This is more land than the cities Ridgefield and La Center combined, larger than Ridgefield National Wildlife Refuge and equivalent to a swath one mile wide from the Welcome to Washington sign on the I-5 bridge to past the Fairgrounds (Exit 9). Even zoning this much land is legally questionable. De-designating it from resource land will get our an appealed.
At the January GMP work session, staff was instructed to delay the release of the completed Supplementary Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS). Blocking the release of the SEIS for the first 3 alternatives stopped the Growth Management process until the new alternative can be constructed and analyzed.

Costs to County taxpayers for this expansion of the Growth Management Plan include the costs to create, present, solicit public input for, and analyze the environmental effects of the new alternative. Legal costs will also land in our laps.

All county citizens absorb the cost of increased infrastructure (roads and utilities) when development occurs in our rural areas. Water availability is a major concern already as wells dry up as more development takes place. What happens to water for growing the produce and raising the livestock that feeds our community? It is a concern of anyone who wishes to eat healthy, local, unadulterated food.

The 4th alternative is not just the concern of rural landowners.

Sydney Reisbick, President
Friends of Clark County
O'Donnell, Mary Beth

From: Euler, Gordon
Sent: Tuesday, April 07, 2015 5:07 PM
To: O'Donnell, Mary Beth
Cc: Orjiako, Oliver; Cook, Christine
Subject: FW: Clark County Comprehensive Plan update SEPA question

Mary Beth:

For the index.

Gordy

-----Original Message-----
From: ECY RE SEPA HELP [mailto:sepahelp@ECY.WA.GOV]
Sent: Thursday, March 05, 2015 2:29 PM
To: Euler, Gordon; ECY RE SEPA HELP
Cc: Orjiako, Oliver; Cook, Christine
Subject: RE: Clark County Comprehensive Plan update SEPA question

Hi Gordy,

I apologize for the delay in my reply, I have been in quite a few meetings the last two days.

Yes, the County can consider as many alternatives that are reasonable per WAC 197-11-440 (5) http://apps.leg.wa.gov/WAC/default.aspx?cite=197-11-440 for consideration in the SEIS. The county would need to analyze the impacts of all reasonable alternatives considered. It may end up that your supplemental EIS is a rather lengthy document but that is ok. There is no size limit on a SEIS. The EIS and SEIS should function as a combined package to be relied on by those making decisions on the comp plan. So if info in the original EIS is relevant to current decisions, that info should be used and doesn't need to be reproduced in the SEIS.

The SEIS is intended to capture and analyze significant new information and substantial changes to a proposal that was not originally analyzed in the EIS. The fact that you are identifying new geography and changes in the rural areas of the county compared to what was analyzed in the original EIS seem to make this a good example of why a SEIS is appropriate to prepare.

WAC 197-11-405 (4) (a) (b) states that:
(4) A supplemental EIS (SEIS) shall be prepared as an addition to either a draft or final statement if:
(a) There are substantial changes to a proposal so that the proposal is likely to have significant adverse environmental impacts; or
(b) There is significant new information indicating, or on, a proposal's probable significant adverse environmental impacts.

Please let me know if you have any additional questions.
Thanks and have a great day.

Fran Sant
Department of Ecology
SEPA Technical Assistance/Rule Coordinator
360.407.6004

-----Original Message-----
From: Euler, Gordon [mailto:Gordon.Euler@clark.wa.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, March 03, 2015 4:36 PM
To: ECY RE SEPA HELP
Cc: Orjiako, Oliver; Cook, Christine
Subject: RE: Clark County Comprehensive Plan update SEPA question

Fran:

The comp plan SEPA process continues to unfold here in Clark County......

I am hearing now that we may have up to four additional alternatives, all dealing with changes in the rural area. Each would create some number of additional lots, and I think one of the alternatives would de-designate a large number of parcels zoned for agriculture and forest. We won't actually know until a Board work session March 11.

So the question is, could we still do a supplemental with up to four additional alternatives? Or are we now headed for a full blown EIS? We've already analyzed three fairly innocuous alternatives to date in a preliminary draft SEIS. Thanks.

Gordy Euler
Clark County Community Planning

-----Original Message-----
From: Sant, Fran (ECY) [mailto:fsan461@ECY.WA.GOV] On Behalf Of ECY RE SEPA HELP
Sent: Wednesday, February 25, 2015 3:11 PM
To: Euler, Gordon
Subject: RE: Clark County Comprehensive Plan update SEPA question

Hi Gordy,

Thanks for the feedback. As we discussed yesterday I had my Environmental Review Section manager review your questions and my responses before I sent them off to you today.

Thanks- Fran

-----Original Message-----
From: Euler, Gordon [mailto:Gordon.Euler@clark.wa.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, February 25, 2015 2:47 PM
To: ECY RE SEPA HELP
Subject: RE: Clark County Comprehensive Plan update SEPA question

Fran:

thank you for this response and the quick turnaround--much appreciated!! I will pass this on to our comp plan team for reactions. I'll certainly be back in touch with any additional questions.

Gordy Euler
Clark County Community Planning

-----Original Message-----
From: Sant, Fran (ECY) [mailto:fsan461@ECY.WA.GOV] On Behalf Of ECY RE SEPA HELP
Sent: Wednesday, February 25, 2015 1:51 PM
To: Euler, Gordon
Subject: RE: Clark County Comprehensive Plan update SEPA question

Hi Gordon,

Thanks for the discussion yesterday and your follow-up questions.

Please see my responses below:

1) If the fourth alternative has the potential for environmental impacts in the rural area, can we still include it as an alternative in an SEIS, along with the other three?

   As you can include the fourth alternative in the SEIS. That is the purpose of the SEIS, to identify and analyze new information. Perhaps the question here is whether to ask for added scoping comments? Is the 4th alternative is in response to comments rec'd during scoping or if it is brand new idea different from anything discussed during scoping? If you already did scoping on the other 3 alternatives and this new alternative is completely different, it may make sense to share the 4th alternative with the public. Since you have two more scoping meetings you have an opportunity to do if warranted.

2) The fourth alternative is entirely about possible changes in rural areas (new geography). The 2007 EIS did not focus at all on rural areas. In this regard, can it still be considered in an SEIS, or does the new geography of the fourth alternative elevate it to an EIS?

Yes, it can be considered an SEIS. The SEIS is intended to capture and analyze significant new information and substantial changes to a proposal that was not originally analyzed in the EIS. The fact that you are identifying new geography and changes in the rural areas of the county compared to what was analyzed in the original EIS seem to make this a good example of why a SEIS is appropriate to prepare.

WAC 197-11-405 (4) (a) (b) states that:
(4) A supplemental EIS (SEIS) shall be prepared as an addition to either a draft or final statement if:
(a) There are substantial changes to a proposal so that the proposal is likely to have significant adverse environmental impacts; or
(b) There is significant new information indicating, or on, a proposal's probable significant adverse environmental impacts.
3) In this situation what, practically speaking, is the difference between an SEIS and an EIS? Understandably, if an SEIS will suffice, we do not want to start over with an EIS process. Our biggest problem at this point is one of time.

The difference between an SEIS and EIS is that the SEIS adds new information and analysis to supplement the information is a previously issued EIS. The statutory requirements for preparation are the same as an EIS except that scoping is optional. As per WAC 197-11-620 "The SEIS should not include analysis of actions, alternatives, or impacts that is in the previously prepared EIS". The EIS and SEIS should function as a combined package to be relied on by those making decisions on the comp plan. So if info in the original EIS is relevant to current decisions, that info should be used and doesn't need to be reproduced in the SEIS.

For more information on the Supplementing an EIS please see Chapter 3.6 in the SEPA handbook: http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/sea/sepa/handbk/hbch03.html#3.6

Please let me know if you have any follow-up questions.

Thanks and have a great day.

Fran Sant
Department of Ecology
SEPA Technical Assistance/Rule Coordinator
360.407.6004

-----Original Message-----
From: Euler, Gordon [mailto:Gordon.Euler@clark.wa.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, February 24, 2015 2:41 PM
To: ECY RE SEPA HELP
Cc: Orjiako, Oliver; Cook, Christine
Subject: Clark County Comprehensive Plan update SEPA question
Importance: High

Hello:

Thanks for chatting with me earlier this afternoon.

Clark County is in the process of updating its comprehensive plan, with a June 30, 2016 deadline. The Board adopted a population and jobs target for the 20-year planning horizon (2015-2035). Subsequently, it was determined that there is enough developable land inside current urban growth areas (UGAs) to accommodate population and jobs. This is due to the fact that Clark County added huge amounts of land to UGAs in 2007 (the last comp plan update). As such, we made the decision to re-adopt the 2007 comp plan EIS and prepare an supplemental EIS outlining a few things we are doing in this update (notices were published in July 2014). We had scoping meetings (even though not required) last August and settled on three alternatives for the SEIS. We had two additional open houses on the alternatives in October. Work on the SEIS commenced in October. On January 21, 2015 the Board asked that work on the SEIS be stopped while a fourth alternative was developed.
We plan to have two open houses and a Board hearing on the alternative. The question is how to proceed, given the fourth alternative. Here are some questions/concerns:

1) If the fourth alternative has the potential for environmental impacts in the rural area, can we still include it as an alternative in an SEIS, along with the other three?

2) The fourth alternative is entirely about possible changes in rural areas (new geography). The 2007 EIS did not focus at all on rural areas. In this regard, can it still be considered in an SEIS, or does the new geography of the fourth alternative elevate it to an EIS?

3) In this situation what, practically speaking, is the difference between an SEIS and an EIS? Understandably, if an SEIS will suffice, we do not want to start over with an EIS process. Our biggest problem at this point is one of time.

So, we are looking for guidance on how to proceed. Please let me know if I can provide further details. Thank you!

Gordy Euler
Clark County Community Planning
(360) 397-2280 x4968
gordon.euler@clark.wa.gov

*is e-mail and related attachments and any response may be subject to public disclosure under state law.*

This e-mail and related attachments and any response may be subject to public disclosure under state law.

This e-mail and related attachments and any response may be subject to public disclosure under state law.
Public Comment
SEPA Alternatives
03/17/15 – 04/09/15
<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>Fred Marijn Bakker</td>
<td>PO Box 886</td>
<td>98605</td>
<td><a href="mailto:fnl.bakker@cas.net">fnl.bakker@cas.net</a></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lur. Frohns</td>
<td></td>
<td>98605</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred Pickering</td>
<td>21546 NE</td>
<td>98675</td>
<td><a href="mailto:fredp@ycolorado.com">fredp@ycolorado.com</a></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucia Folkens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dick Blegen</td>
<td>98606 DickBlegen</td>
<td>98606</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kit &amp; Carl George</td>
<td>20011 NE 98383 Amboy</td>
<td>98601</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Kitcarl@yos.net">Kitcarl@yos.net</a></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wonya Dut</td>
<td>3404 NE Helstad Blvd</td>
<td>98625</td>
<td><a href="mailto:wonya.dut@comptel.net">wonya.dut@comptel.net</a></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Keltz</td>
<td>Clark County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Egbert</td>
<td>24213 NE 98302</td>
<td>98604</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dle38@comcast.net">dle38@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irven Ginter</td>
<td>21711 NE</td>
<td>98604</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quinton Tormann</td>
<td>PO Box 2706</td>
<td>98604</td>
<td><a href="mailto:q.tormann@gmail.com">q.tormann@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Kapitanov</td>
<td>21104 NE 98604</td>
<td>98604</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dan.kapitanov@ymail.com">dan.kapitanov@ymail.com</a></td>
<td>N</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>Greg Bender</td>
<td>8906 NE 159th ST. Battle Ground, WA 98604</td>
<td>98604</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gbender@gmail.com">gbender@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evan Mattila</td>
<td>7215 NE 25th STREET Battle Ground, WA</td>
<td>93604</td>
<td>evancnorthern-56.com</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Lindberg</td>
<td>20101 NE 196th Way</td>
<td>98604</td>
<td><a href="mailto:blindberg46@gmail.com">blindberg46@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen M. Wilson</td>
<td>13219 NE Prarie Rd Prarie</td>
<td>98604</td>
<td><a href="mailto:newilson_3272@yahoo.com">newilson_3272@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Koski</td>
<td>PO Box 287 Brush Prairie</td>
<td>98606</td>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon Warnke</td>
<td>10400 NE Erickson Rd B. P. WA</td>
<td>98606</td>
<td><a href="mailto:warnkejm@msn.com">warnkejm@msn.com</a></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annelise Ericka</td>
<td>PO Box 32 Yacolt WA</td>
<td>98675</td>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Heermann</td>
<td>39809 N.W. Cardai Woodland, WA Hill 8th Hill</td>
<td>98647</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitch Kneipp</td>
<td>1701 C Street, Unkutzel</td>
<td>98671</td>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnie Friesen</td>
<td>30200 NE 123rd A.B. G.</td>
<td>98604</td>
<td><a href="mailto:afriesen@unicorp.com">afriesen@unicorp.com</a></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Vancoovering</td>
<td>5406 NE 133rd St.</td>
<td>98686</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dv@xprl.net">dv@xprl.net</a></td>
<td>NO</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>Chris Kauten</td>
<td>28300 NE Berry Rd 84</td>
<td>98604</td>
<td><a href="mailto:chris.kauten@verizon.com">chris.kauten@verizon.com</a></td>
<td>□ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARLENNE Cole</td>
<td>13511 NE 155th Ave</td>
<td>98606</td>
<td></td>
<td>□ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Wood</td>
<td>21910 NE 147th St</td>
<td>98606</td>
<td><a href="mailto:swood5star@hotmail.com">swood5star@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td>□ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodger &amp; Ruth Anne Lancein</td>
<td>8309 NE 152nd Ave, Vancouver WA 98682</td>
<td>98606</td>
<td><a href="mailto:vlance@comcast.net">vlance@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>□ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Nuni</td>
<td>3101 NE 145th St</td>
<td>98604</td>
<td><a href="mailto:steve@trademenelectric.com">steve@trademenelectric.com</a></td>
<td>□ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stacy Hickman</td>
<td>11085 NE 153rd St</td>
<td>98604</td>
<td><a href="mailto:stacy.hickman@gmail.com">stacy.hickman@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>□ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Helmeren</td>
<td>2401 NE Johnson Rd</td>
<td>98615</td>
<td></td>
<td>□ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Ny (2012)</td>
<td>19712 NE 174th St</td>
<td>98606</td>
<td><a href="mailto:steven@deco.com">steven@deco.com</a></td>
<td>□ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEVE WISNEWSKI</td>
<td>38209 NE 41st Ave</td>
<td>98629</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rctf@tds.net">rctf@tds.net</a></td>
<td>□ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derek Huegel</td>
<td>16504 NE 102nd Ave</td>
<td>98604</td>
<td><a href="mailto:DH@WOLFIND.COM">DH@WOLFIND.COM</a></td>
<td>□ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren Neth</td>
<td>1107 Grand Blvd</td>
<td>98661</td>
<td><a href="mailto:warren.cascade@gmail.com">warren.cascade@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>□ NO</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>Nita Countryman</td>
<td>15215 NE Aholo Dr.</td>
<td>98606</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nita.countryman@gmail.com">nita.countryman@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn Crand</td>
<td>5917 NE 47th St.</td>
<td>98661</td>
<td>hazel-X2@comcast</td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen (Dennis)</td>
<td>35809 NE 31st Ave</td>
<td>98639</td>
<td><a href="mailto:KMe.98629@yahoo.com">KMe.98629@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Paladent</td>
<td>3101 NE Dewo</td>
<td>98642</td>
<td></td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzanne Kendall</td>
<td>98683 <a href="mailto:SpKendall@comcast.net">SpKendall@comcast.net</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackie Schroeder</td>
<td>17815 NE 120th Ave</td>
<td>98604</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jackan15@comcast.net">jackan15@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy Johnston</td>
<td>PO Box 242</td>
<td>98675</td>
<td>Andyjeajcinc.net</td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jahnavi Hastings</td>
<td>15116 NE 244th Ave</td>
<td>98606</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bonesandfeathers@gmail.com">bonesandfeathers@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawn Deutner (Michael)</td>
<td>6505 NE 209th St.</td>
<td>98604</td>
<td><a href="mailto:majus@aracnet.com">majus@aracnet.com</a></td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuck &amp; Gayle</td>
<td>823 N 6th St.</td>
<td>98621</td>
<td></td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Lawrence</td>
<td>6227 NE 124th St.</td>
<td>98686</td>
<td><a href="mailto:storytree-farm@gmail.com">storytree-farm@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>☑ YES</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>Darrell Smith</td>
<td>100 25 NE Wood Rd, Brush Prairie WA</td>
<td>98606</td>
<td><a href="mailto:herovank@msn.com">herovank@msn.com</a></td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Chandler</td>
<td>345211 NE 7th Pl, Brush Prairie WA</td>
<td>98606</td>
<td><a href="mailto:chandler1970@live.com">chandler1970@live.com</a></td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice Chandler</td>
<td>2502 NE Rotschy Mill Rd, Yacolt WA 98675</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Erickson</td>
<td>26992 NE Rotschy Mill Rd, Yacolt WA 98675</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:mark.annelisa.erickson@gmail.com">mark.annelisa.erickson@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugene T. Jenny V.</td>
<td>1800 NE 159th St 'A', Brush Prairie WA</td>
<td>98606</td>
<td><a href="mailto:vankell@gmail.com">vankell@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Garrett</td>
<td>15714 NE 2440 St, B C WA 9</td>
<td>98604</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mghmri@gmail.com">mghmri@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie Misner</td>
<td>18013 NE 159th St 'A', Brush Prairie WA 98606</td>
<td>98606</td>
<td><a href="mailto:stephanie.misner@live.com">stephanie.misner@live.com</a></td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Case</td>
<td>888 W 2221st, 86, 98601</td>
<td>98601</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Martincase@msn.com">Martincase@msn.com</a></td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roxanne William D. t</td>
<td>15518 NE Eagle Lake Hwy, Yacolt 98675</td>
<td>98675</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Farmhasterdorfer@gmail.com">Farmhasterdorfer@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil B.</td>
<td>City of Camas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Van Norden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☑ YES</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>Bridget Schwarz</td>
<td>2110 NW 179th St</td>
<td>98612</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bridgest@bridge-it.com">bridgest@bridge-it.com</a></td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo Lee Moon</td>
<td>11817 NE 177th Cir BG</td>
<td>98604</td>
<td></td>
<td>☑ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penny Rose</td>
<td>15640 NE 51st St Vane</td>
<td>98602</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pennyjrose2@ymail.com">pennyjrose2@ymail.com</a></td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Len Walke</td>
<td>15919 NE 139th Ave. Ridgetfield, WA</td>
<td>98604</td>
<td><a href="mailto:len.walke@hotmail.com">len.walke@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td>☑ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Scott</td>
<td>18218 NW 28th Ave</td>
<td>98602</td>
<td><a href="mailto:michelle.scott100@hotmail.com">michelle.scott100@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Van Dyke</td>
<td>9600 NW Lakeshore</td>
<td>98605</td>
<td></td>
<td>☑ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Hodges</td>
<td>15218 NE 369th St</td>
<td>98609</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hodgesjeffrey@msn.com">hodgesjeffrey@msn.com</a></td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne Bergerw</td>
<td>17416 NE 122nd Ave</td>
<td>98601</td>
<td>BERGERW4 @ AOL.COM</td>
<td>☑ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Snarsen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>jessnarsen @ clark. wa. gov</td>
<td>☑ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristi Unholz</td>
<td>18733 NE 27th St Battle Ground</td>
<td>98604</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kmu317@hotmail.com">kmu317@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Sillima</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☑ NO</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>Danny Morgan</td>
<td>20325 N E 56th Stt</td>
<td>98692</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jrdrmorgan@comcast.net">jrdrmorgan@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis</td>
<td>5269 NE 34th Stt</td>
<td>98601</td>
<td>thicks4@qcom</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Les Cotton</td>
<td>1209 NE 102nd Ave</td>
<td>98604</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Cotton12@comcast.net">Cotton12@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al &amp; Lois Matson</td>
<td>20211 NE Yacolt Rd</td>
<td>98625</td>
<td><a href="mailto:matson.home1983@hotmail.com">matson.home1983@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joyce Christensen</td>
<td>16314 NE 142nd Ave</td>
<td>98606</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Joycechristensenchristensenci@earthlink.net">Joycechristensenchristensenci@earthlink.net</a></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George &amp; Charlotte Peters</td>
<td>2211 NE 182nd Ave</td>
<td>98606</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Petersgeorge40@hotmail.com">Petersgeorge40@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathan Keysan</td>
<td>12108 NE 182nd Ave BP</td>
<td>98606</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nathan@natesplumbing.com">nathan@natesplumbing.com</a></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Shaw</td>
<td>PO Box 2438</td>
<td>98604</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bcis.susanshaw@gmail.com">bcis.susanshaw@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Karlson</td>
<td>1714 NE 5th Ave</td>
<td>98604</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kukar@comcast.net">kukar@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dick Rylander</td>
<td>1416 NE 177th Ave</td>
<td>98604</td>
<td>drylander61@qcom</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO</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>Karenwood</td>
<td>14010 NE 167th St, Vanc.</td>
<td>98068</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kwood@pacific.com">kwood@pacific.com</a></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stacey Righton</td>
<td>P.O. Box 149, Ridgefield</td>
<td>98642</td>
<td><a href="mailto:doobinsfarms@gmail.com">doobinsfarms@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atia McElwain</td>
<td>22501 NE 159th St, WA</td>
<td>98606</td>
<td><a href="mailto:macleun@q.com">macleun@q.com</a></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul McDonald</td>
<td>2200 N. Washougal River Rd, Washougal</td>
<td>98671</td>
<td><a href="mailto:davidmcdonald@windermere.com">davidmcdonald@windermere.com</a></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean &amp; Sylvia V. Lander</td>
<td>306 SE Rasmussen Blvd, Battle Ground WA</td>
<td>98604</td>
<td><a href="mailto:marloean@hotmail.com">marloean@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Munoz</td>
<td>Battle Ground WA</td>
<td>98604</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Andrewm@prattelectric.com">Andrewm@prattelectric.com</a></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather Tschelin</td>
<td>Vanc.</td>
<td>98685</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.J. Maxey</td>
<td>34 Ave Ridgefield</td>
<td>98642</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cmaxey@gmail.com">cmaxey@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Gaubler</td>
<td>17802 NE 58th St, Vancouer WA</td>
<td>98645</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Malinowski</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Harper</td>
<td>185 Ave 20501 NE 158th St, Battle Ground</td>
<td>98604</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>Georgia Goff</td>
<td>30511 NE 152 Ave Be</td>
<td>98604</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally Frohs</td>
<td>13604 N.E 212 Av. Bnky</td>
<td>98604</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David R.</td>
<td>18714 NE 217th St</td>
<td>98606</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Gooden</td>
<td>6614 NE 139th St</td>
<td>98606</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leah Higgin</td>
<td>17416 NE 269th St</td>
<td>98605</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Lustwick</td>
<td>8004 University Ave</td>
<td>98606</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curt Gustafson</td>
<td>18108 NE 84th Cir</td>
<td>98662</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shane Besner</td>
<td>12901 NE 132nd Ave</td>
<td>98606</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jatko@comcast.net">jatko@comcast.net</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharee Sprag</td>
<td>32105 NE 82nd Ave</td>
<td>98605</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ds4tnv1@centurylink.net">ds4tnv1@centurylink.net</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shellenwood</td>
<td>12219 NE 185th st</td>
<td>98606</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rod and</td>
<td>6800 NE 58th st</td>
<td>98604</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pauline Warren</td>
<td>1301 SE 22nd Ave 3rd</td>
<td>98604</td>
<td>carol@<a href="mailto:331@comcast.net">331@comcast.net</a></td>
<td></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>Karen Kumpuk</td>
<td>36415 NW 24th Ave</td>
<td>98629</td>
<td><a href="mailto:KaremK1@tds.net">KaremK1@tds.net</a></td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyn Cornelien</td>
<td>14101 NE 147th St, Brush Prairie, WA</td>
<td>98606</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lyn.cornelsen@gmail.com">lyn.cornelsen@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dianne Kocer</td>
<td>17818 NE 201st CT, Brush Prairie</td>
<td>98606</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rmhmltz@gmail.com">rmhmltz@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Les &amp; Carol</td>
<td>PO Box 246 Amy</td>
<td>98601</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lgc5080@tds.net">lgc5080@tds.net</a></td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Wrightson</td>
<td>17718 NE 155th ST, Brush Prairie</td>
<td>98606</td>
<td><a href="mailto:stevec@fire3.org">stevec@fire3.org</a></td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald Hall</td>
<td>16203 NE 205th Ave, Brush Prairie</td>
<td>98606</td>
<td></td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drew Whitaker</td>
<td>19641 NE 167th Ave, K.</td>
<td>98606</td>
<td></td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerry M. Carper</td>
<td>767 W S St, Washougal</td>
<td>98671</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bdcappedge@comcast.net">bdcappedge@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna Andrews</td>
<td>5670 S 144th Ave</td>
<td>98168</td>
<td><a href="mailto:donna.andrews.0411@gmail.com">donna.andrews.0411@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Sullivan</td>
<td>34817 NE 230th Ave, K.</td>
<td>98629</td>
<td></td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry Olson</td>
<td>222 E Evergreen Rd, K.</td>
<td>98601</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jdsol@dsonewgr.com">jdsol@dsonewgr.com</a></td>
<td>☑ YES</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>Kevin Cornelison</td>
<td>14101 NE 144th St</td>
<td>98606</td>
<td></td>
<td>□ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Janice England</td>
<td>31907 NE 21st Ave</td>
<td>98674</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sjenland@tds.net">sjenland@tds.net</a></td>
<td>□ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Shaw</td>
<td>13505 NE 152nd Ave</td>
<td>98606</td>
<td></td>
<td>□ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuck Green</td>
<td>2705 NE 170th St</td>
<td>98603</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sjclgreen@yahoo.com">sjclgreen@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>□ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeanne Koji</td>
<td>9110 NE 29th Ave</td>
<td>98682</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ybnormal@pacific.com">ybnormal@pacific.com</a></td>
<td>□ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenda Browning</td>
<td>12723 NE 132nd Ave</td>
<td>98606</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rfemling@netzero.com">rfemling@netzero.com</a></td>
<td>□ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathan EK</td>
<td>3500 NE 178th Ave Yacolt</td>
<td>98675</td>
<td></td>
<td>□ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Korbel</td>
<td>11816 NE 160th St EP</td>
<td>98601</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Butch.Korbel@Gmail.com">Butch.Korbel@Gmail.com</a></td>
<td>□ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Massie</td>
<td>2401 SE 124th B8</td>
<td>98669</td>
<td></td>
<td>□ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue Cranke</td>
<td>31403 NE 152nd Ave</td>
<td>98601</td>
<td></td>
<td>□ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick Dunning</td>
<td>9300 NE 255th Circle</td>
<td>98601</td>
<td></td>
<td>□ NO</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>Dave Larwick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:Larwick@tds.net">Larwick@tds.net</a></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray Frohs</td>
<td>20900 NE 136th ST, BRUSH Prairie, WA</td>
<td>98606</td>
<td><a href="mailto:FROMACENC@HOTMAIL.COM">FROMACENC@HOTMAIL.COM</a></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd Klein</td>
<td>22413 N.E. Kelly Rd., Yacolt, WA 98675</td>
<td>98675</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tcmfunc5@gmail.com">tcmfunc5@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Tapper</td>
<td>14101 N.E. 50th Ave, Vancouver, WA</td>
<td>98685</td>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda M. Chavez</td>
<td></td>
<td>98606</td>
<td><a href="mailto:MICHAELZ5436@GMAIL.COM">MICHAELZ5436@GMAIL.COM</a></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan Pelkey</td>
<td>27124 NE Bradford Rd., Vancouver, WA</td>
<td>98682</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bo-peep@q.com">bo-peep@q.com</a></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.L. Okan</td>
<td>1700 Davis Ave</td>
<td>98661</td>
<td><a href="mailto:05005870@COAST.COM">05005870@COAST.COM</a></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Thornton</td>
<td>34401 N.W. 11th Ave, Bellevue</td>
<td>98628</td>
<td>greg <a href="mailto:Thornton@tds.net">Thornton@tds.net</a></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorette Pinard</td>
<td>21201 NE 176th Ave.</td>
<td>98604</td>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lola Massie</td>
<td>2401 SE 12th St.</td>
<td>98604</td>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frances Hendler</td>
<td>2111 NW Cougar Ridge</td>
<td>98629</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</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>John Hamilton</td>
<td>PO Box 3074 Battle Ground, WA</td>
<td>98604</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hwe23smile2@gmail.com">hwe23smile2@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>□ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary + Krista Reeves</td>
<td>38315 NE 41st Ave, WA</td>
<td>98039</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gweeves@tds.net">gweeves@tds.net</a></td>
<td>□ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray Steiger</td>
<td>16101 NE 183rd St, WA</td>
<td>98636</td>
<td><a href="mailto:steiger@teleport.com">steiger@teleport.com</a></td>
<td>□ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Letcher</td>
<td>17614 NE 299th St, WA</td>
<td>98675</td>
<td></td>
<td>□ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert J. Reeves</td>
<td>PO Box 2799 BG, WA</td>
<td>98604</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pjrmrfair@q.com">pjrmrfair@q.com</a></td>
<td>□ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Sarkinen</td>
<td>27113 NE 152 Ave, WA</td>
<td>98604</td>
<td></td>
<td>□ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lars Kysar</td>
<td>PO Box 645, Yacolt, WA</td>
<td>98675</td>
<td></td>
<td>□ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geo. Schumacher</td>
<td>271 E NE 53rd Ave, WA</td>
<td>98665</td>
<td></td>
<td>□ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton + Molly Wasike</td>
<td>23001 NE Dye Valley Rd, WA</td>
<td>98675</td>
<td></td>
<td>□ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Kapitanovich</td>
<td>21004 NE 170th Ave BG</td>
<td>98604</td>
<td></td>
<td>□ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Tidingsa</td>
<td>1200 W 19th St, BG</td>
<td>98604</td>
<td></td>
<td>□ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derek &amp; Carolyn Ringa</td>
<td>PO Box 12, Brush Prairie, WA</td>
<td>98606</td>
<td></td>
<td>□ NO</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>Marge White</td>
<td>25209 NE Amberknoll</td>
<td>98025</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank White</td>
<td></td>
<td>98603</td>
<td>farm@<a href="mailto:farmer@yahoo.com">farmer@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Frohs</td>
<td>20900 NE 139th St.</td>
<td>98606</td>
<td><a href="mailto:matt-frohs@gmail.com">matt-frohs@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lou Nichols</td>
<td>7815 146th Av N</td>
<td>98145</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rmhml7@gmail.com">rmhml7@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob McElwee</td>
<td>11413 NE 368 St.</td>
<td>98606</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick &amp; Beth Malinowski</td>
<td>P.O. Box 318</td>
<td>98675</td>
<td>biodynamics @ centurytel.net</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Keller</td>
<td>12802 NE 187th Ave</td>
<td>98026</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cKeller360@gmail.com">cKeller360@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herb Maxey</td>
<td>13505 NE 190th Ave</td>
<td>98603</td>
<td><a href="mailto:R6990@outlook.com">R6990@outlook.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon Whitley</td>
<td>19547 NE 167th Ave</td>
<td>98605</td>
<td>svwhittle @ aol.com</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Alexander</td>
<td>9830 S.W. Screenway Dr</td>
<td>97224</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue Sutton</td>
<td>12911 NE 399th St. Amboy</td>
<td>98601</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ssuttonbmb@hotmail.com">ssuttonbmb@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carie Countryman</td>
<td>15215 NE Phila Drive</td>
<td>98006</td>
<td><a href="mailto:carie.countryman@ymail.com">carie.countryman@ymail.com</a></td>
<td></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>David P. Tola</td>
<td>B.P. WA 14214 NE 202nd Ave</td>
<td>98606</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Mainschmidt</td>
<td>2400 NE Rainbow Rd</td>
<td>98606</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Mackenzie</td>
<td>77300 NE 169th St</td>
<td>98606</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kcramkram@gmail.com">kcramkram@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brad Riggs</td>
<td>16304 NE 239th Ave</td>
<td>98606</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edith L. Kline</td>
<td>14905 NE 222nd Ave</td>
<td>98604</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted Hager</td>
<td>29602 NE 4995th St</td>
<td>98601</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betty Martin</td>
<td>18202 NE 182nd Ave</td>
<td>98606</td>
<td><a href="mailto:martonshine@msn.com">martonshine@msn.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Farrell</td>
<td>22702 NE 251st St</td>
<td>98604</td>
<td>Farrell.DW @ GMAK.COM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Owens</td>
<td>5400 NE 123rd St</td>
<td>98606</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mgirtst@aol.com">mgirtst@aol.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry Winters</td>
<td>5420 Idaho St</td>
<td>98601</td>
<td><a href="mailto:deerfeeder@juno.com">deerfeeder@juno.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie Leavenen</td>
<td>1906 SE 25th St Battle Ground WA</td>
<td>98604</td>
<td><a href="mailto:levanenlog@aol.com">levanenlog@aol.com</a></td>
<td></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>J+S Syverson</td>
<td>PO Box 1824</td>
<td>98668</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Korpel</td>
<td>2111 NE 19th St. B6</td>
<td>98604</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Johnstone</td>
<td>2001 NE 3102</td>
<td>98609</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kstrawno@centurytel.net">kstrawno@centurytel.net</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Jimstra</td>
<td>YACULT</td>
<td>98609</td>
<td><a href="mailto:alliedine@att.net">alliedine@att.net</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Greene</td>
<td>P.O.B. 2844</td>
<td>98604</td>
<td><a href="mailto:alliedine@att.net">alliedine@att.net</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayla Gilbert</td>
<td>11310 NE 124 Ave</td>
<td>98682</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Hoffman</td>
<td>1740 NE 307th St.</td>
<td>98675</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Sullivan</td>
<td>2216 NW 179th St.</td>
<td>98642</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth Mayhew</td>
<td>2111 NE 59th St.</td>
<td>98601</td>
<td><a href="mailto:KMAYHUNE@aol.com">KMAYHUNE@aol.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wally Massie</td>
<td>PO Box 201</td>
<td>98601</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Noble</td>
<td>2111 NE 149th Ave.</td>
<td>98687</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>Jeff Lipka</td>
<td>25707 NE C. London Rd. Yacolt WA.</td>
<td>98675</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa Pace</td>
<td>PO Box 1571 Battle Ground WA</td>
<td>98604</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Redder</td>
<td>13906 NE Kelly Rd. Yacolt WA</td>
<td>98675</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Sprunger</td>
<td>1010 NW 199-TH. Str. Ridgefield WA</td>
<td>98642</td>
<td><a href="mailto:d.sprunger@yahoo.com">d.sprunger@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Jolins</td>
<td>13010 NE 1ST AVENue Brush Prairie WA.</td>
<td>98604</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allan Mattson</td>
<td>Battle Ground WA.</td>
<td>98604</td>
<td><a href="mailto:amattson@aol.com">amattson@aol.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Mattson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuck Smith</td>
<td>Clark County Court House</td>
<td>98604</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert E.</td>
<td>1945 NE 82nd Ave, Battle Ground WA</td>
<td>98604</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM
March/April 2015

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Brad Riggs

Address: 16604 NE 239th Ave Brush Prairie

Open house location: ☒ April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson

☐ March 25, Ridgefield High School, 2724 South Hillhurst Road, Ridgefield

Comment:

Stop eating up the land. No more urban sprawl. Go up. Build high-rises with parks if you must have more "population growth." Do not destroy existing forest and small farms (5 to 50 acres) with urbanization. Keep Clark County rural. Do not allow urban expansion by eating up the land. Build up, not out. Do not make the same mistake that L.A. did. Cities do not "need" to grow bigger. They need to build up, not out.

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: ________________________________________________

Other ways to comment:

Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

E-mail your comment to us:
comp.plan@clark.wa.gov

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOCC Hearing.

Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.

013031
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM
March/April 2015

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Dawn Butzwein/Michael Steigelman
Address: 6505 NE 29th St, Battle Ground, WA 98604

Open house location: ☒ March 25, Ridgefield High School, 2724 South Hillhurst Road, Ridgefield
☐ April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson

Comment:

1) We have 20 acres and will likely have
   We are totally opposed to it. It takes
   chances away from us and is a gift
to developers.

2) We endorse Alternative 1.

3) We see the blueprints of Alt 2, 3, 4,
   4. Ruining the rural appeal nature
   of Clark County. It takes our precious
   agricultural land away to turn into strip malls.

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below.

E-mail address: majus@avacnet.com

Other ways to comment:
Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOCC Hearing.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.

At the same time, these 2, 3, 4 will increase taxes
for the poor. As a rural resident, I think a new housing development is a good thing. We need to make our community better.
Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: ________________________
Stacey Righter

Address: ________________________
P.O. Box 149 Ridgefield

Open house location: ☑️ March 25, Ridgefield High School, 2724 South Hillhurst Road, Ridgefield
☑️ April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson attended both

Comment:

I worry about the legal implications regarding Alternative 4. I do not believe it is the correct answer, neither is 1, 2, or 3 but #1 allows us to readdress all issues correctly w/ more time.

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: ________________________

Other ways to comment:
Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

E-mail your comment to us:
comp_plan@clark.wa.gov

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOCC Hearing.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM
March/April 2015

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Chuck Green
Address: 2705 NE 170th St, Ridgefield 98642

Open house location: □ March 25, Ridgefield High School, 2724 South Hillhurst Road, Ridgefield
□ April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson

Comment:
- The council should request a 3-month extension in 2016 to allow two new councilors to vote on the plan.
- Areas 2 & 4 essentially lock small cities from future economic development & expansion.
- Need a value-based managed growth scenario. Areas 2-4 don’t do that. Needs to be led by an impartial person, not a county councilor.

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: Sjc1green@yahoo.com

Other ways to comment:
Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

E-mail your comment to us:
comp_plan@clark.wa.gov

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOCC Hearing.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM
March/April 2015

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name:  Dennis Dykes

Address:  3800 NE 399 1/4 St, La Center

Open house location:  ☐ March 25, Ridgefield High School, 2724 South Hillhurst Road, Ridgefield
                      ☑ April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson

Comment:

April Fools—now withdraw Alternative 4.  And alternatives 2 & 3 while you’re at it.  We lived through a long arduous process in the 1990s.  We are still in line with the goals and plan that resulted.  No changes are needed.  The changes proposed WILL raise my property taxes and lower my quality of life.

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address:

Other ways to comment:

Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

E-mail your comment to us:
comp.plan@clark.wa.gov

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOCC Hearing.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
A letter from Mr. David Taylor – a City of Ridgefield Council member to Mark relating to Alt.4 for our record and index. I don’t think that staff was promoting any particular alternative. Thanks.

Oliver

David, thank you for your comments. We will ensure they become part of the official record. Mark

April 1, 2015

To: Mark McCauley
Acting County Manager
Clark County, Washington

I am writing to express my personal concern at the County Plan for the proposed changes to the Clark County Comprehensive Land Use Plan as presented at the Ridgefield open house on Wednesday evening March 25. There were four plans presented but Mr. Madore and staff was promoting what they called Option 4.
were considering a regionalized Sewer Plan by joining with
the CCRWWD as the single provider of sewer services for
these communities. A study was made which showed that
the City of Ridgefield had over 100 twenty-plus acre parcels
within two miles of a major road for potential development
of commercial/industrial properties. It also showed the
availability of properties for residential development
purposes to support a twenty-year or more growth plan. On
the basis of that and other factors, the city of Ridgefield
ceded its Sewer system and treatment plant to CCRWWD
because the cost of following that expansion was prohibitive
for the small city of Ridgefield. As a result the CCRWWD is
in the process of building a $19,000,000 sewer line from
Ridgefield to tie it into the Salmon Creel Plant.

Consider the following:

- What are the county tax revenues that come from city
  and neighborhood development versus what is
derived from five to ten acre single family
parcels? The R-8 to R-13 zoning in the developable
properties annexed into the cities results in a tax base
of $2 to $2.5 Million per acre. The small single family
mini-mansion properties for a ten acre parcel may
result in a $.75 to $1.25 Million for the parcel or
$125,000/acre.

- Providing county services to these smaller ten acre
parcels is many times the cost of developed
residential properties. Since they are all in the
county, consider the increased cost of a County
maintained road system in perpetuity. A County
Sheriff patrolled area versus a city patrolled area,
increasing the cost of operating the Sheriff’s
Dept. Maintaining the Barrow Ditches in the Public
Right-of-Way in these areas at an assessed tax
revenue of $125,000 per acre.
My personal preference and with the people I talked to was that we would prefer the No Change option plan and let business take its own coarse within current land use policies. The cities need the ability to grow as the demand continues for the style of living and environment the small cities offer.

David P. Taylor  
Councilman, City of Ridgefield  
1180 N. 1st. Ave  
Ridgefield, WA 98642  
Ph. 360-887-2200

CC: Commissioner David Madore, County Chairman  @ david.madore@clark.wa.gov Commissioner Tom Milke @ tom.milke@clark.wa.gov Jeanne Stewart @ jeanne.stewart@clark.wa.gov
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM
March/April 2015

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: WAYNE BERGERON

Address: 17416 NE 122nd Ave, Battle Ground, WA 98604

Open house location: □ March 25, Ridgefield High School, 2724 South Hillhurst Road, Ridgefield
☑ April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson

Comment: 
I'm in favor of AG 10 acres

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: BERGHAL@A.O.C., COU

Other ways to comment:
Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

E-mail your comment to us:
comp.plan@clark.wa.gov

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOCC Hearing.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM
March/April 2015

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Casey M. Commerce
Address: 707 W S St Washougal WA 98671

Open house location: 
- March 25, Ridgefield High School, 2724 South Hillhurst Road, Ridgefield
- April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson

Comment:

Need more/better info on 20 zone.
East of La Center off Laderholm Rd.
5705 Laderholm Rd.

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: B.D. Commerce@comcast.net

Other ways to comment:

Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

E-mail your comment to us:
comp.plan@clark.wa.gov

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOCC Hearing.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM
March/April 2015

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: KELVIN LINDGREN

Address: 2404 COYOTE RIDGE RD LA CENTER WA.

Open house location: □ March 25, Ridgefield High School, 2724 South Hillhurst Road, Ridgefield
□ April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson

Comment:

[Handwritten text:]

ALT is another attempt to
californicate SW. WASH. Lets
pace the whole county & get
permits to grow something like
food. I thought there was
a comp plan to be implemented
lets get on with it.

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: ____________________________

Other ways to comment:

Submit a comment on the web: www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

E-mail your comment to us: comp.plan@clark.wa.gov

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOCC Hearing.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM
March/April 2015

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Van Alexander

Address: 2404 NW Coyote Ridge Rd, Buckley, WA 98321

Open house location: ☑ March 25, Ridgefield High School, 2724 South Hillhurst Road, Ridgefield
☐ April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson

Comment:

Alternative 4 is not only illegal, the entire process has been bypassed to please a small, special interest group. This is pure corruption and an insult to the planning staff that are best qualified to manage the comp. plan update. You should listen to them!

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: coyoteridge@TAS, Net

Other ways to comment:

Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

E-mail your comment to us:
comp.plan@clark.wa.gov

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOCC Hearing.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
Dear County Councilors-

I do not support Alt 4 and would like to see it removed as an option in the upcoming comp plan and associated environmental review. This alternative raises many concerns for me as a citizen of our community, a local farmer, teacher and mother.

I strongly oppose Alt 4 because it would decrease our community’s agricultural production capacity and would add significant pressure on our current farm community and our future farm viability. Decreasing parcel sizes reduces the profitability of ag operations and also places increased burden on rural communities. Increased taxes will be needed for additional infrastructure such as roads, water, and electrical to name a few. Additionally, with more people living in rural areas on smaller lots, this increases the demand for groundwater in those areas, and could lead to loss of water for already established rural lots. I have personally worked with small acreage landowners who have experienced this during the height of the summer, and the costs and stress were enormous. Water availability is already a huge barrier to farms and rural landowners alike.

From a farming perspective, as farms seek to expand, continuous acres are ideal and allow easier entry to new farmers seeking to get started in commercial farming. Attempting to farm property with surrounding smaller parcels may lead to conflicts between farmers and their newly arrived neighbors, as they often don’t understand the needs of farming (early rise, tractor work throughout the day, late to finish the day). Our county has provided us with the right to farm in all parcels – decreasing those parcel sizes will likely lead to an increase in these conflicts.

Smaller lot sizes increase land values, making it more costly per acre for a farmer to get started and making it more challenging to have a farm income adequate to pay for the land. This is where a transfer of development rights program would beneficial. This is a tool that could be used by those very landowners who are upset they cannot subdivide their land. With the ability to sell the development rights for their land, they can still make a good retirement income off of the land without having the land subdivided up. It could then be sold at a more reasonable price to a farmer interested in farming it (including farm forestry properties).

Please consider carefully the future of our community as you move through the comp plan process and do not utilize alt 4 in the environmental review.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Erin Harwood
Farmer and Teacher
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM

March/April 2015

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Carolyn Riggs

Address: 16604 NE 239th Ave, Brush Prairie

Open house location: □ March 25, Ridgefield High School, 2724 South Hillhurst Road, Ridgefield
☑ April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson

Comment:

We bought a 5 acre rural lot 23 yrs ago, because we wanted to be out in the country with peace and quiet. We do not want the area divided up in smaller 1 or 2.5 acre sections which would give us 2-5 x the population and noise! People who want smaller lots should live in a city, not turn the country land into "city." Consider high rise condos surrounded by nice parks instead of dividing the current rural lots.

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: NurseCarolynRN2aol.com

Other ways to comment:

Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

E-mail your comment to us:
cmp.plan@clark.wa.gov

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOCC Hearing.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM
March/April 2015

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Sheleen Meadows
Address: 32105 NE 82nd Ave. La Center, WA 98629

Open house location: ☑️ March 25, Ridgefield High School, 2724 South Hillhurst Road, Ridgefield
☐️ April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson

Comment:

*No to Alternative 4!!*
Growth in our area (rural) appears to be rampant and out of control. Please, slow it down.

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: d54trvl@centurylink.net

Other ways to comment:

Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

E-mail your comment to us:
comp.plan@clark.wa.gov

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOCC Hearing.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM
March/April 2015

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Dyanne Kocer
Address: 17818 NE 201st ST

Open house location: ☐ March 25, Ridgefield High School, 2724 South Hillhurst Road, Ridgefield
☐ April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson

Comment:

Lend Use Plan
Research has found that plant, animal, life habitat changes markedly when the size of the habitat is reduced. (Ref: The Little Extinction) Reducing species size needs to be looked at through that lens.

What is good for an individual may not be good for the whole community and future generations. Surveying only those personally affected does not provide a total picture of community benefit.

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: dyannekocer@gmail.com

Other ways to comment:

Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

E-mail your comment to us:
comp.plan@clark.wa.gov

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOCC Hearing.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process. We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM
March/April 2015

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Karen Kumpula

Address: 30415 Nw 24th Ave La Center, WA

Open house location: ☐ March 25, Ridgefield High School, 2724 South Hillhurst Road, Ridgefield

☒ April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson

Comment: I do not want Alt #4! My property is in the 5-acre zoned area. It's one of the non-compliant 4.24 acres zones - in Alt #4 the zoning is 2.5 acres - NO! The Ag property on the west side of Nw 24th Ave goes from 20 Ag to R5. My neighbor farms!

My Mother-in-law on Munch Rd has 40 acres forestry - in Alt #4 it is zone 10 acres.

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: karenlu@ids.net

Other ways to comment:
Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

E-mail your comment to us:
cmp.plan@clark.wa.gov

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOCC Hearing. Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process. We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
April 1, 2015

To Whom It May Concern:

As a rural landowner who would like to keep my five acres as rural as possible, I can understand that other people might also like to own a piece of land that they could farm. (Yes, we do consider it farming even on 5 acres as does the Department of Agriculture regardless of how some other county officials and residents may feel.) However if all the 5 acre and larger parcels are divided, where will all the water, sewer and other services come from to support those small farms? None of the small cities have the capacity to add them to their current facilities and the city of Yacolt where all the houses have septic systems is beginning to have drinking water quality issues. With the obvious climate change issues and possible drought conditions, everyone couldn’t tap into the Public Utilities to water their gardens and farm plots and if everyone digs a well, the water table and local aquifers would definitely be overloaded.

As much as I like my small farm, I realize that large parcels must be available for industrial uses and if every current 20 to 50 acre farm is allowed to be subdivided for housing, the county isn’t gaining much in the way of jobs.

It is my desire that the county councilors reject Alternative 4.

Respectfully,

Eloyce O’Connor
Brush Prairie, WA
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM
March/April 2015

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: MARK ERICKSON

Address: 26907 NE POTSDAM MILL ROAD

Open house location: □ March 25, Ridgefield High School, 2724 South Hillhurst Road, Ridgefield
☑ April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson

Comment:

________________________________________

WE SUPPORT THE COMMISSIONERS PLAN TO IMPLEMENT OPTIONS 4 AND 4A.

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: mark.anneelisa.erickson@gmail.com

Other ways to comment:

Submit a comment on the web: www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

E-mail your comment to us: comp.plan@clark.wa.gov

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOCC Hearing.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM
March/April 2015

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Andrew Munato
Address: 25906 NE Deer Ridge Rd, Yacolt, WA 98675

Open house location: [X] April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson
☐ March 25, Ridgefield High School, 2724 South Hillhurst Road, Ridgefield

Comment:
I support option 4 and option 4A.
Smaller lot size, match neighboring parcels

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: Andrewm@trailelectric.com

Other ways to comment:
Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments
E-mail your comment to us:
comp.plan@clark.wa.gov

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOCC Hearing.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: McCutty Korpela

Address: 11846 NE 160th Street, Renton, WA 98056

Open house location: [ ] March 25, Ridgefield High School, 2724 South Hillhurst Road, Ridgefield
[ ] April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson

Comment:

We are for FARM or small lot, especially option V. 7.4A.

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: Butch.Korpela @gmail.com

Other ways to comment:

Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

E-mail your comment to us:
comp.plan@clark.wa.gov

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOCC Hearing.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM

March/April 2015

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: George Peterson

Address: 7711 NE 182nd Ave 98004

Open house location: ☐ March 25, Ridgefield High School, 2724 South Hillhurst Road, Ridgefield
☒ April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson

Comment:

In favor of smaller lots
Especially option 4 & 4 A

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: peterkanga46@hotmail.com

Other ways to comment:

Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016Update/comments

E-mail your comment to us:
comp_plan@clark.wa.gov

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOCC Hearing.

Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM
March/April 2015

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: LARRY & ALICE CHANDLER

Address: 15211 NE AHOULA DRIVE BRUSH PRAIRIE WA

Open house location: ☑ April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson
☐ March 25, Ridgefield High School, 2724 South Hillhurst Road, Ridgefield

Comment:

OUR FAMILY LIVES ON A 160 ACRE HOMESTEAD WHICH HAS BEEN IN OUR IMMEDIATE FAMILY SINCE 1896. ALL THE SURROUNDING PROPERTY IS IN 210-5 ACRE LOTS AND WITH THE GROWTH MGT PLAN WE ARE NOW IN R-40. WE PLAN ON KEEPING THE PROPERTY IN THE FAMILY BUT WOULD LIKE TO BE ABLE TO BREAK IT DOWN SMALL ENOUGH TO ALLOW OUR CHILDREN POSSIBLY LIVE ON THE HOMESTEAD. ALSO,

THANKS - ALICE CHANDLER

__________________________________________

__________________________________________

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: chandler1970@live.com

Other ways to comment:

Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

E-mail your comment to us:
cmp_plan@clark.wa.gov

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOCC Hearing.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM
March/April 2015

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: James Misner

Address: 18013 NE 159th St. Bothell WA 98011

Open house location: ☑ March 25, Ridgefield High School, 2724 South Hillhurst Road, Ridgefield
☐ April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson

Comment:

Our family owns a 160 acre homestead comprised of lots that vary from 1/2 acres to 49 acres. The property has been kept in the family for generations with organic growth. There is a desire for future family members to build and reside on the property which is R-40. Ideally, the lots would have an ability to split into 5 acre parcels to accommodate this family's desire to remain in close living proximity, as has been the case since 1896.

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: ISLANDJIM74@GMAIL.COM

Other ways to comment:
Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOCC Hearing.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM

March/April 2015

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Andy Johnston

Address: 34300 NE 241st Ave, Auburn, WA 98002

Open house location: [ ] March 25, Ridgefield High School, 2724 South Hillhurst Road, Ridgefield
[ ] April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson

Comment:

_ I support strongly bringing the county into compliance with the overlay, opening up our county to healthy growth for our children and grandchildren. Yes! for alternatives 91 & 92. _

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: Andy.johnston@gmail.com

Other ways to comment:

Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

E-mail your comment to us:
comp_plan@clark.wa.gov

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOCC Hearing.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM
March/April 2015

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Kristi Unholz

Address: 18733 NE 274th St Battle Ground WA

Open house location: No March 25, Ridgefield High School, 2724 South Hillhurst Road, Ridgefield
✓ April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson

Comment:
Alternative 4 is the best option for rural citizens. Current zoning overlays do not match existing parcel sizes and is only creating problems for citizens wishing to comply with permit projects and use their property they own. Alternative 4 would bring parcels into compliance and allow for future lots of larger parcels that are currently not allowed (and for no reason when all adjacent parcels are smaller).

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: kmu317@hotmail.com

Other ways to comment:
Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

E-mail your comment to us:
comp_plan@clark.wa.gov

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOCC Hearing.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM
March/April 2015

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Jerry Olson
Address: 222 E Evergreen Blvd

Open house location: ☐ March 25, Ridgefield High School, 2724 South Hillhurst Road, Ridgefield
☒ April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson

Comment:

I support the rural folks that added Alt 4 to the EIS.

It would benefit farm businesses in N. County, for children to be raised in a rural environment, for rural land occupations, and for resource protection. The buildings are way too large. There needs to be a better and expanded clustered ordinance. Limit resource to the best resource soils, topography, and drainage. (with small lots 1/10) New rural centers.

Rural Land Owners have been punished for 20 years.

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: J Olson@Oliveview.com

Other ways to comment:
Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

E-mail your comment to us:
comp.plan@clark.wa.gov

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOCC Hearing.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM
March/April 2015

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Steve Niemi

Address: P.O. Box 115 Battle Ground, WA 98604

Open house location: ☐ March 25, Ridgefield High School, 2724 South Hillhurst Road, Ridgefield
☑ April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson

Comment:
I support Alternative 4 and Alternative 4A

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: Steve@tradesmenelectric.com

Other ways to comment:
Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

E-mail your comment to us:
comp.plan@clark.wa.gov

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOCC Hearing.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM
March/April 2015

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: EVAN MARTICA

Address: 7215 NE 251 37 STREET BATTLE GROUND, USA

Open house location: ☑ March 25, Ridgefield High School, 2724 South Hillhurst Road, Ridgefield
☑ April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson

Comment:

I am in favor of smaller lots and flexibility for rural landowners.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PUBLIC SERVICE!

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: EVAN C NORTHERN-LS.COM

Other ways to comment:

Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

E-mail your comment to us:
comp.plan@clark.wa.gov

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOCC Hearing.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM
March/April 2015

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Jolyn Cornelius

Address: 14101 NE 144th St, Brush Prairie, WA 98606

Open house location: ☑ April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson

☐ March 25, Ridgefield High School, 2724 South Hillhurst Road, Ridgefield

Comment:

please allow us to divide our 70 acre
ag property. We prefer 1 acre parcels or a cluster.

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: jolyn.cornelius@gmail.com

Other ways to comment:
Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

E-mail your comment to us:
comp_plan@clark.wa.gov

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOCC Hearing.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM
March/April 2015

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Robert England

Address: 39907 NE 21st Ave, Woodland WA

Open house location: ☐ March 25, Ridgefield High School, 2724 South Hillhurst Road, Ridgefield
☐ April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson

Comment:

We own forest property in North West Clark County. We live within 10 min of I-5 by way of Woodland. It makes no sense to have large tracts of forest land that close to a large town like Woodland and that close to I-5. Currently, we are zone Forest 4D. We would like to see that dropped to Forest 10 acre min. Thanks.

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: rjengland62@yahoo.com

Other ways to comment:

Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

E-mail your comment to us:
comp.plan@clark.wa.gov

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOCC Hearing.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM
March/April 2015

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Erik Mattson
Address: 18002 NE 182 Ave BP 98006

Open house location: [ ] March 25, Ridgefield High School, 2724 South Hillhurst Road, Ridgefield
[ ] April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson

Comment:

Option 4 makes the most sense for landowners. Current Ag 20 is too restrictive where landowners on the east side of 182 Ave are 5ac parcels right now. There is no profitable agriculture in the Hockinson 182nd Corridor anymore. The best use and value to county is in taxable parcels. 5ac parcels should be considered not 10acs. 5ac is perfect for the 4th family that want country living for goats, chickens, a horse etc.

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: Mattsonshire @ msn.com

Other ways to comment:
Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

E-mail your comment to us:
comp.plan@clark.wa.gov

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOCC Hearing.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM
March/April 2015

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Betty Matthews
Address: 18202 NE 182nd Ave BP

Open house location: ☐ March 25, Ridgefield High School, 2724 South Hillhurst Road, Ridgefield
☑ April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson

Comment:
No one wants to buy 20 Acre or more
Most want 5 Acre or less to raise
a horse or chickens
We would like to sell a little to
fund our retirement or we might
have to let it go for taxes

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: Mathsonshire@MSN.com

Other ways to comment:
Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOCC Hearing.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM
March/April 2015

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Jeff Hodges

Address: 15218 N.E. 369th St.

Open house location: ☑ April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson
☐ March 25, Ridgefield High School, 2724 South Hillhurst Road, Ridgefield

Comment:
I have 14.44 acres currently zoned Ag 20 now confused. A very large channel/ditch splits my parcel 10 acres on one side, 10 acres on the other with a crossing for access. As I understand in Act 4 it could be split into 3-8 acre parcels and kept agriculture at the very least 2-8 acres and a 4 acre, which would benefit everyone, the county and me. This proposal only make sense.

E-mail address: hodgesjeffrey@msn.com

Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOCC Hearing.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM
March/April 2015

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: PETER T. REYES
Address: PO Box 2799 Battle Ground WA 98604

Open house location: ☑ April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson

Comment:

Will submit more comments including good points made in your ATT.

However, the issues involved require a longer time, not just input, but analysis to do it justice and right.

The times

[Signature]

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: psrfir@q.com

Other ways to comment:

Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOCC Hearing.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM
March/April 2015

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Steve Prather
Address: 37906 NE Kelly Rd, Yacolt 98675

Open house location: ☑ April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson

Comment: 

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address:______________________________________________

Other ways to comment:
Submit a comment on the web: www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments
Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

E-mail your comment to us: comp.plan@clark.wa.gov

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOCC Hearing.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM
March/April 2015

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Melissa Page / James Page

Address: 509 SE 11th St Battle Ground WA 98604

Open house location: □ March 25, Ridgefield High School, 2724 South Hillhurst Road, Ridgefield
☑ April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson

Comment:
We support Clark County Citizens United
Alternative 4. These proposed changes
would provide numerous benefits for
the families residing in those areas.

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: melthap@gmail.com

Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOCC Hearing.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM
March/April 2015

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: JANE REVESZ
Address: PO Box 2799, Battle Ground, WA 98604

Open house location: ☐ March 25, Ridgefield High School, 2724 South Hillhurst Road, Ridgefield
☒ April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson

Comment:

Alternative 4 reflects reality more than any of the others. The current non-conforming lot must is not a reliable way for either land owners or the county to fairly and efficiently run land ownership transfer.

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: pyjens@q.com

Other ways to comment:

Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

E-mail your comment to us:
comp.plan@clark.wa.gov

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOCC Hearing.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM
March/April 2015

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Quintan Tormaener

Address: 25300 NE 220th Ave., BG, WA 98004

Open house location: □ March 25, Ridgefield High School, 2724 South Hillhurst Road, Ridgefield
✓ April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson

Comment:
I support smaller lot sizes. I like what I see in Alternative 4. My largest concern is that there be lots made available for our children.

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: qtormaener@gmail.com

Other ways to comment:
Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark-wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

E-mail your comment to us:
comp.plan@clark-wa.gov

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOCC Hearing.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM
March/April 2015

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Durell Smith

Address: 19025 N.E. Ward Rd
Brush Prairie, WA 98606

Open house location: ☑ March 25, Ridgefield High School, 2724 South Hillhurst Road, Ridgefield
☑ April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson

Comment:
AG&5 or cluster would work out the best for us because the developments are coming our way and this would help in later development in that area.

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: herocake@msn.com

Other ways to comment:

Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

E-mail your comment to us:
comp.plan@clark.wa.gov

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOCC Hearing.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM

March/April 2015

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: CAROL LEVANEN - CITIZENS UNITED

Address: 17614 NE 255 ST - YACOLT, WA

Open house location: ☐ March 25, Ridgefield High School, 2724 South Hillhurst Road, Ridgefield
☒ April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson

Comment:

The rural and resource lands have been frozen since the 1994 downzone. These landowners need relief and options for their land. I support the Clark County Citizens United recommendation along with Alternative 4. I believe even more corrections need to be made to rectify the injustice to these landowners, but Alt 4 is a good start. I do not support the do nothing or very little that is displayed by Alt 1, 2 and 3.

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: CXL DENTAL @ YAHOO.COM

Other ways to comment:

Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOCC Hearing.

Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process. We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
Name: Mark Erickson

Address: 24902 NE Rotschy Mill Road, Yacolt

Open house location: □ March 25, Ridgefield High School, 2724 South Hillhurst Road, Ridgefield
□ April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson

Comment:

I encourage the board to reduce parcel sizes in the forest zones. In particular, I support smaller parcels in locations where there are already many lots in a rural area (like Rotschy and Rotschy Mill Road). I own a 10.5 acre parcel that is in FR-40. This will be a FR-10 in option 4. I support the addition of FR-5 zones in these areas. Please create an FR-5 Zone and add this to Alternative #4.

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address:

Other ways to comment:

Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

E-mail your comment to us:
comp.plan@clark.wa.gov

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOCC Hearing.

Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM
March/April 2015

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: **Anneliisa Erickson**
Address: **PO Box 532 Yacolt, WA 98675**

Open house location: □ March 25, Ridgefield High School, 2724 South Hillhurst Road, Ridgefield
☑ April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson

Comment:

- I like the alternate number #. It gives us more options in rural Clark County.

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address:

Other ways to comment:

Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

E-mail your comment to us:
comp.plan@clark.wa.gov

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOCC Hearing.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM
March/April 2015

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Dan Spicher
Address: 1010 NW 199th St.

Open house location: ☐ March 25, Ridgefield High School, 2724 South Hillhurst Road, Ridgefield
☑ April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson

Comment: I like alternative #4

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: ________________________________

Other ways to comment:

Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

E-mail your comment to us:
comp.plan@clark.wa.gov

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOCC Hearing.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
Name: Dave Ebert, Sr
Address: 24303 NE 163rd Ct BG

Open house location: ☑ April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson

Comment:

With option 1 my problem will be solved.

I have 5 acres which 2½ all around me. I would like to divide my 5 acres to 2½'s. Meeting was great, good info.

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address:

Other ways to comment:

Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOCC Hearing.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM

March/April 2015

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Dave and Valerie Larwick
Address: 16104 N.E. 259th St. B, WA 98004

Open house location: □ March 25, Ridgefield High School, 2724 South Hillhurst Road, Ridgefield
□ April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson

Comment:

We are currently zoned 20 ag - we own 80 acres on 259th St. Our neighbor to the west lives on a 40 acre site, they too would like to be zoned down to 5 acres. To our northwest side they are zoned 5 acre. To our south they are zoned 2 1/4 acre. We have PUB water and in fact have a PUB water reservoir tank on our property.

We live 2 minutes North of Big City Main Street downtown Battle Ground.

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: larwick@tds.net

Other ways to comment:

Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

E-mail your comment to us:
comp_plan@clark.wa.gov

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOCC Hearing.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM
March/April 2015

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Don Kapitanovitch

Address: 21104 NE 176th Ave - Battle Ground WA 98604

Open house location: ☑️ April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson

Comment:

We are in favor of Option 4. At present we own 1 of 4 of 5 parcels that are 5 acres. But all other properties around us are 1 and 2/4 acre parcels. If Option 4 is adopted we would like our parcel 1 zone the same as the other surrounding properties.

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: don.kapitanovitch@msn.com

Other ways to comment:
Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

E-mail your comment to us:
comp.plan@clark.wa.gov

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOCC Hearing.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM
March/April 2015

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Toni Kapitanovich
Address: 3104 NE 176th Ave, Battle Ground WA 98604

Open house location: ☐ March 25, Ridgefield High School, 2724 South Hillhurst Road, Ridgefield
☒ April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson

Comment:

1. Our goal should be to preserve rich farm land
   like the sandy loam soil in Felida. But, if the
   people want to sell to a developer, offer the
   owners reduced taxes to preserve the land in farm
   use. 2. We also need to stop building houses with
   no or minute backyards. Homes big enough for a
   family with children should have a back yard for
   the children to play in. 3. If the county or city wants
   a large parcel for industrial use, they need to
   compensate the land owner. 4. We prefer option #4.
   We would like to be zoned 1 acre or 2.5 acres like surrounding
   parcels.

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: donkapitan@msn.com

Other ways to comment:
Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

E-mail your comment to us:
comp.plan@clark.wa.gov

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 5810
Vancouver, WA 98666

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOCC Hearing.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: STEVE NYLUND

Address: 19710 NE 174th Street, Brush Prairie, WA 98616

Open house location: ☐ March 25, Ridgefield High School, 2724 South Hillhurst Road, Ridgefield
☑ April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson

Comment:

I support the Clark County Citizens United (CCCU) alternative 1 version. Having affordable agricultural homesteads is an important choice for young families. For many other folks, being able to divide property for their children is important. Their property may also be the main asset to fund their retirement.

Thank you for your work and please continue to support affordable rural lots.

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: Steve@clarkwa.com

Other ways to comment:

Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOCC Hearing.

Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process. We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM
March/April 2015

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Jon Warnke

Address: 18400 NE Erickson Rd. B.P. WA 98606

Open house location: ☒ April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson

☐ March 25, Ridgefield High School, 2724 South Hillhurst Road, Ridgefield

Comment:

I support Alt #4 100%!!

I currently own a piece of property that is Zone E40.... Alt 4 proposes it be changed to E20, I would like to see it even smaller. I also have children that own pieces that would be better if they were zoned for smaller lot sizes!

Please adopt Alt #4 or something with even smaller lots. Thank You.

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address:

Other ways to comment:

Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

E-mail your comment to us:
comp.plan@clark.wa.gov

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOC Hearing.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM
March/April 2015

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Molly Warnke + Clinton Warnke

Address: 23001 NE Dole Valley Rd, Yacolt 98675

Open house location: ☑ April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson
☐ March 25, Ridgefield High School, 2724 South Hillhurst Road, Ridgefield

Comment:

We support Alternative #4.

We currently own an R-20 lot which would change to an R-5 zoning. Neighboring lots are already 5-10 acre lots. We would benefit from Alt. 4, so we fully support it and encourage the county to implement Alt. 4.

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address:

Other ways to comment:

Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

E-mail your comment to us:
comp.plan@clark.wa.gov

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOCC Hearing.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Frank White

Address: 25209 NE 304th St, Yacolt

Open house location: ☐ March 25, Ridgefield High School, 2724 South Hillhurst Road, Ridgefield
☒ April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson

Comment:

Please adopt Alt 4 & restore some of the property rights that were taken in 1994. I purchased 70ac. that was joined 20ac. It was surrounded by 5ac. to 20ac. parcels. The 1994 taking rezoned it to a non-conforming 80ac. That was a meat axe approach that should be corrected at this opportunity.

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: firfarmer@yahoo.com

Other ways to comment:

Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

E-mail your comment to us:
comp.plan@clark.wa.gov

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOCC Hearing.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM
March/April 2015

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: GARY REAVES

Address: 38318 NE 41 5th Ave

Open house location: ☑ March 25, Ridgefield High School, 2724 South Hillhurst Road, Ridgefield
☐ April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson

Comment:

MY PROPERTY IS CURRENTLY ZONED AC-20, WE HAVE 27.65 ACRES WHICH HAD 2.25 ACRES SECTIONED AND PLIIOCO ON MY CORNER IN 1994. WE CURRENTLY HAVE 25.5; 8 1/4 ACRE LOTS IN OUR ACRE. WE PURCHASED THE PROPERTY WITH HOPE TO SELL IN 5 ACRE PARCELS FOR OUR RETIREMENT.

ACT 4 HAS IDENTIFIED AN ACRE ACROSS NE 41st AVE AS AC-5 (PROPOSED). THIS PROPERTY IS A TRUE THORN AWAY FROM US. PLEASE CONSIDER AC-5 FOR MY FAMILY'S RETIREMENT.

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:
E-mail address: GW REAVES @ TOS.NET

Other ways to comment:

Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

E-mail your comment to us:
comp_plan@clark.wa.gov

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOCC Hearing.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Walli Marie
Address: PO Box 201, Brush Prairie

Open house location:  
☐ March 25, Ridgefield High School, 2724 South Hillhurst Road, Ridgefield
☐ April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson

Comment:

She are for people. This gives the people in rural Clark Co. property right they are entitled to.

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: wmassie44@gmail.com

Other ways to comment:

Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

E-mail your comment to us:
comp.plan@clark.wa.gov

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOCC Hearing.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM
March/April 2015

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: John Hamilton & Alicia Hamilton

Address: 21205 NE 224th St, Battle Ground

Open house location: ☑ April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson

Comment:

We would like to be included in the Act 4 plan.
We are part of the Blackhawk Subdivision in Battle Ground off of 219th Street. 98% of Blackhawk is included in the Act 4 plan. Currently Blackhawk is R5, but 98% of the lots are 2½ acres. We have lot 33 & 38 that were combined to make a 5 acre lot in 1994. We liked to put our lots back into play as 2-2½ parcels. We access our property on 209th Avenue. The address is 21205 NE 224th Street, Battle Grnd. Act 4 plan cuts off at our driveway.

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: hapeesart@gmail.com

Other ways to comment:
Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

E-mail your comment to us:
comp_plan@clark.wa.gov

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOCC Hearing.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.

013085
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM
March/April 2015

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Jeff Lipka

Address: 25707 NE C.C. Lane NW, Yacolt, WA, 98677

Open house location: ☐ March 25, Ridgefield High School, 2724 South Hillhurst Road, Ridgefield
☑ April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson

Comment:
I support Alternative #4

Thanks for your help.

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address:

Other ways to comment:
Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

E-mail your comment to us:
comp.plann@clark.wa.gov

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOCC Hearing.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM
March/April 2015

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: James Hoffman

Address: 17410 NE 307th St, Yacolt, WA 98675

Open house location: ☑ April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson

Comment:

I would like to see more rural lands available for younger families. Many people that I know do not want to live in towns. Further, it is unfair what has happened to some landowners in the last GMA.

I support Alternative 4, though I wish it went further.

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: masterflamegas@msn.com

Other ways to comment:
Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

E-mail your comment to us:
comp.plan@clark.wa.gov

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOCC Hearing.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM
March/April 2015

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Derek Huegel
Address: 16504 NE 102nd Ave Bn, WA 98647

Open house location: ☑ April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson
☐ March 25, Ridgefield High School, 2724 South Hillhurst Road, Ridgefield

Comment:
Alternative 4 is definitely the way to go. If we want our children to enjoy the country as we have, we need to open up additional opportunities.

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: DHE@WOLFEND.COM

Other ways to comment:

Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

E-mail your comment to us:
comp.plan@clark.wa.gov

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOCC Hearing.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM
March/April 2015

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Lars Kysar

Address: 27110 NE Rolfsch mill Rd Tenino

Open house location: □ March 25, Ridgefield High School, 2724 South Hillhurst Road, Ridgefield
☑ April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson

Comment:
I think Alternative #4 is a good start, but I wish more could be done. As I grow older, I would love to have my children living next door, to take care of me so I do not have to go to a home.

Thank you for your time.

Lars Kysar

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address:

Other ways to comment:
Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

E-mail your comment to us:
comp_plan@clark.wa.gov

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOCC Hearing.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM
March/April 2015

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Carolyn Crain
Address: 5917 NE 44th St. Vancouver WA

Open house location: □ March 25, Ridgefield High School, 2724 South Hillhurst Road, Ridgefield
☑ April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson

Comment:
I am concerned that the existing lots need to be in compliance.
I am concerned the interconnecting infrastructure and government facilities will not keep pace with future growth.
I appreciate the land owners will have better sellability of their land. Property tax revenues will increase over time as the values rise due to higher demand.
I am appalled that the long range planning and prior commissioners did not resolve the issues of compliance in rural areas already.

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:
E-mail address: hazel.x.2@comcast.net

Other ways to comment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submit a comment on the web:</th>
<th>Submit a comment in writing:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments">www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments</a></td>
<td>Clark County Community Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comprehensive Plan Alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P.O. Box 9810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vancouver, WA 98666</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E-mail your comment to us:
comp_plan@clark.wa.gov

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 B OCC Hearing.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Richard Neimi

Address: P.O. Box 128 Battle Ground, WA 98604

Open house location: ☑ March 25, Ridgefield High School, 2724 South Hillhurst Road, Ridgefield
☑ April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson

Comment:

I support Alternative 4 and 4A.
I believe that if we don't increase the amount of buildable properties, we will drive a lot of the younger generation out of the county.

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: rich@tradesmenelectric.com

Other ways to comment:
Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

E-mail your comment to us:
comp.plan@clark.wa.gov

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOCC Hearing.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Allan MATISON

Address: 11528 NE 185 St Battle Ground

Open house location: ☐ March 25, Ridgefield High School, 2724 South Hillhurst Road, Ridgefield
☑ April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson

Comment:

The Agricultural Block West of 182nd Ave is at the moment 4200 parcels. All around it (and in that stripe) there are numerous 5 acre sections. Why is it looked at to only lower it to 160 acre (agriculture) rather than 45 acre (like all our neighbors)? Is there any way to get land adjacent to 5 acre blocks to be rezoned to 5 acre blocks?

Alternative 4 is preferred but does not go far enough. Lower AG 20 to 5 acre blocks.

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: A.MATISON@BOL.com

Other ways to comment:

Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

E-mail your comment to us:
comp.plan@clark.wa.gov

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOCC Hearing.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Alison Fulton

Address: ____________________________________________

Open house location: □ March 25, Ridgefield High School, 2724 South Hillhurst Road, Ridgefield
□ April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson

Comment:

We own 20 acres (ag-20) between NW 199th and 209th streets in Ridgefield. Alternatives 2 & 4 both propose to make this into 2-10 acre lots. We would love to have the zoning changed to 5 acres! We are surrounded by 5 acre lots.

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: ____________________________________________

Other ways to comment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submit a comment on the web:</th>
<th>Submit a comment in writing:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments">www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments</a></td>
<td>Clark County Community Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comprehensive Plan Alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P.O. Box 9810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vancouver, WA 98666</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOCC Hearing.

Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.

We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM
March/April 2015

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: WAYNE BERGERON
Address: 17416 NE 122nd Ave, Battle Ground, 98604

Open house location: ☐ March 25, Ridgefield High School, 2724 South Hillhurst Road, Ridgefield
☒ April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson

Comment:
Fai in favor of AGS

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: BERGERON@AOC.COM

Other ways to comment:
Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

E-mail your comment to us:
comp.plan@clark.wa.gov

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOCC Hearing.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM  
March/April 2015

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Krista Reaves
Address: 38315 NE 41st Ave, La Center

Open house location:  
☐ March 25, Ridgefield High School, 2724 South Hillhurst Road, Ridgefield
☒ April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson

Comment: Request 5 ac zoning. Surrounded by parcels much smaller than our own. Corner cut out of our property is 2.24 acre pieces. Neighbors to S. is 5 acre multi. 5 acre pieces in our area. Much further out of town than our property. P13. Consider A6-5

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: 

Other ways to comment:
Submit a comment on the web:  www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments
Submit a comment in writing:  Clark County Community Planning  
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives  
P.O. Box 9810  
Vancouver, WA 98666

E-mail your comment to us: comp.plan@clark.wa.gov

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOCC Hearing.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM
March/April 2015

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Al & Lois Matson

Address: 20211 NE Yale St Mt Rd Yelm WA 98575

Open house location: ☑ March 25, Ridgefield High School, 2724 South Hillhurst Road, Ridgefield
☑ April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson

Comment:
Please be generous in rezoning rural acreage/lot sizes to reflect the communities and neighborhoods around them.
Thank you!

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: matsonhome1983@hotmail.com

Other ways to comment:
Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

E-mail your comment to us:
comp.plan@clark.wa.gov

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOCC Hearing.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM
March/April 2015

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Jerry Winters
Address: 5420 Idaho St Van 98661

Open house location: ☐ March 25, Ridgefield High School, 2724 South Hillhurst Road, Ridgefield
☒ April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson

Comment:

I went policy to review Urban Holding. It’s in Ag 20 w/ Industrial overlays. Our 20 A Borders Loggers property. Holding keeps on keeping us in limbo and waiting for change. As the plans stands our Ag 20 would change to Ag 10. I hope the County adds clustering. Our 20 a is bordered with a 70 a, 2.5 A and one smaller lot. We’d rather be Ag 8 (Realty, Lt Industrial). Consider Ag 1, real small farms for the community

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: deerfeeder@juno.com

Other ways to comment:

Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

E-mail your comment to us:
comp.plan@clark.wa.gov

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOCC Hearing.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM
March/April 2015

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Claudia McIsaac

Address: 25915 NE 146th Way 98068

Open house location: ☑ April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson

Comment:

Send a wider range of alternatives out for analysis.
Alternative 4 is the same as Alternative 1 for our properties.

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address:

Other ways to comment:
Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

E-mail your comment to us:
comp_plan@clark.wa.gov

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOCC Hearing.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
March 25, 2015

Community Planning  
Clark County  
PO Box 5000  
Vancouver, WA 98666-9949

To Whom It May Concern,

We write this letter in regards to the recent correspondence we received in the mail from the Clark County Planning Committee regarding the future proposed property zoning of Clark County.

While this is and will always remain a very controversial topic, both my husband and I are pro-growth, and pro-land protection advocates at the same time. It is eminent that our population is going to grow at a continuing rapid pace. We love our land, we love being a part of growing timber and making certain our small forest remains healthy and thriving for future generations. We also need to maintain a healthy balance regarding income for our family to survive. Thus, it is necessary to establish a reasonable and responsible balance and get back lost zoning property rights of the not so distant past.

This is a new time, a new economic environment. Wouldn’t it be a good thing, if a farmer who has farmed here in Clark County for years to have the ability to break off small parcels of his/her land in their methodology? They have farmed and logically managed their own land for years; they must know how to divide without causing environmental harm. After all, most farmers are environmentalist. Have you looked at the detailed hard work surrounding you each time you drive to the north end of our County? This didn’t happen overnight, nor did this happen by itself, it’s been happening for decades.

Why is it larger land owners seem to have fewer rights in dividing land they have owned for years? We have an 80 acre tree farm, and we are zoned 20 Ag. Across the street, our neighbors are on small 1 and 2 acre lots. When you look at the map of Clark County, large farms are clumped together and are put into their own category. As for cluster developments, they have in the past clearly benefited both the land owner and the consumer wanting to live “out”.

Some will argue to never break up large farms so that people can drive to the north and enjoy the country side. I cannot argue with wanting to have this luxury, but who pays this price? Eventually, farmers will be like the dinosaurs, gone. Large zoning regulations have made it near impossible to pass on the family farm to future generations. Large, vast plots of land are difficult to afford as our population rapidly grows and expands north. If more people could own 5 and 10 acre parcels, perhaps we can build a new model of farmer. Perhaps more of us would be able to live and thrive on the land just as our forefathers did.
What if our County created a program to implement and encourage small farmers of Clark County? Hold seminars; have a coop of farmers of the past and young people who are interested in growing crops for a healthier future? Imagine our County building and supporting a small entrepreneur “farmer model”. A person can support many crops of food and materials on a five or ten acre parcel with proper management. Implement a program and assist in training and supplying access to tools to get people moving and motivated in a pro-growth, partnership with our existing farmers and beautiful land.

We support and strongly favor F-10 and AG-5 designation zoning, thus, giving back the rightful zoning ownership of the land owners in Clark County.

Respectfully,

[Signature]

Valerie and Dave Larwick

April 1, 2015

Dave and Valerie Larwick

Telephone: (360) 667-0139
Mobile: (360) 601-0721
Address: 16104 N.E. 259th St.
          Battle Ground, WA 98629
E-mail: larwick@tds.net
For the Public Record - WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT HOCKINSON HIGH SCHOOL, 16819 NE 159th STREET - BRUSH PRAIRIE, WA.

CCC WOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR SUPPORT, COMMENTS AND CONCERNS REGARDING ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES IN ALTERNATIVE 4 THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION.

Alt 4 is the only alternative offered that attempts to reverse the massive down zoning.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

☒ 1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.

☒ 2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC RURAL ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS

☒ 3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.

☒ 4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE OWNED WOODLOTS

☒ 5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/ URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS

☒ 6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND DROP THIS FORM IN THE DROP BOX FOR THE CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS OR RETURN TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC.

SIGNATURE

ADDRESS

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

COMMENTS: __________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________

013101
For the Public Record - WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT HOCKINSON HIGH SCHOOL, 16819 NE 159th STREET - BRUSH PRAIRIE, WN.

CCCW WOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR SUPPORT, COMMENTS AND CONCERNS REGARDING ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES IN ALTERNATIVE 4 THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION. Alt 4 is the only alternative offered that attempts to reverse the massive down zoning.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

✓ 1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.

✓ 2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC RURAL ZONES
   TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS

✓ 3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES
   TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.

✓ 4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES
   TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE OWNED WOODLOTS

✓ 5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/ URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS

✓ 6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND DROP THIS FORM IN THE DROP BOX FOR THE CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS OR RETURN TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC.

SIGNATURE

ADDRESS 25209 NE 100th Rd. Yacolt

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

COMMENTS: It would be great to get back what we
   taken in 1994
For the Public Record - WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT HOCKINSON HIGH SCHOOL, 16819 NE 159th STREET - BRUSH PRAIRIE, WN.

CCCW WOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR SUPPORT, COMMENTS AND CONCERNS REGARDING ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES IN ALTERNATIVE 4 THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION.
Alt 4 is the only alternative offered that attempts to reverse the massive down zoning.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

✓ 1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.
✓ 2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC RURAL ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS
✓ 3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.
✓ 4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE OWNED WOODLOTS
✓ 5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/ URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS
✓ 6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND DROP THIS FORM IN THE DROP BOX FOR THE CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS OR RETURN TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC.

SIGNATURE ____________________________

ADDRESS ______________________________

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

COMMENTS: ____________________________________

_____________________________________________

_____________________________________________
For the Public Record - WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT HOCKINSON HIGH SCHOOL, 16819 NE 159th STREET - BRUSH PRAIRIE, WN.

CCCW WOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR SUPPORT, COMMENTS AND CONCERNS REGARDING ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES IN ALTERNATIVE 4 THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION. Alt 4 is the only alternative offered that attempts to reverse the massive down zoning.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT:

☑  1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.

☐  2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC. RURAL ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS

☐  3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.

☐  4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE OWNED WOODLOTS

☐  5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/ URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS

☐  6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND DROP THIS FORM IN THE DROP BOX FOR THE CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS OR RETURN TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC.

SIGNATURE: ____________________________

ADDRESS: ________________________________

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

COMMENTS:

DO NOT LIMIT THE ANALYSIS TO ONLY ONE OPTION.
For the Public Record - WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT HOCKINSON HIGH SCHOOL, 16819 NE 159th STREET - BRUSH PRAIRIE, WN.

CCCW WOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR SUPPORT, COMMENTS AND CONCERNS REGARDING ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES IN ALTERNATIVE 4 THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION. Alt 4 is the only alternative offered that attempts to reverse the massive down zoning.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.

2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC. RURAL ZONES
   TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS

3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES
   TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.

4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES
   TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE OWNED WOODLOTS

5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/ URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS
   THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS

6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS
   TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND DROP THIS FORM IN THE DROP BOX FOR THE CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS OR RETURN TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC.

SIGNATURE

ADDRESS 2217 NE 152 AVE 6689

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

COMMENTS: ____________________________________________

                                         ____________________________________________

                                         ____________________________________________

                                         ____________________________________________

                                         ____________________________________________

                                         ____________________________________________

                                         ____________________________________________

                                         ____________________________________________
For the Public Record - WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT HOCKINSON HIGH SCHOOL, 16819 NE 159th STREET - BRUSH PRAIRIE, WN.

CCCU WOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR SUPPORT, COMMENTS AND CONCERNS REGARDING ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES IN ALTERNATIVE 4 THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION.

Alt 4 is the only alternative offered that attempts to reverse the massive down zoning.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

✓ 1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.

✓ 2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC. RURAL ZONES
   TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS

✓ 3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES
   TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.

✓ 4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES
   TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE OWNED WOODLOTS

✓ 5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/ URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS
   THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS

✓ 6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS
   TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND DROP THIS FORM IN THE DROP BOX FOR THE CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS OR RETURN TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC.

SIGNATURE

ADDRESS PO Box 645 Yacolt, WA

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

COMMENTS:
For the Public Record -  WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT HOCKINSON HIGH SCHOOL, 16819 NE 159th STREET - BRUSH PRAIRIE, WN.

CCCW WOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR SUPPORT, COMMENTS AND CONCERNS REGARDING ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES IN ALTERNATIVE 4 THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION.

Alt 4 is the only alternative offered that attempts to reverse the massive down zoning.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

✓ 1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.

✓ 2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC RURAL ZONES
   TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS

✓ 3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES
   TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.

✓ 4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES
   TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE OWNED WOODLOTS

✓ 5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/ URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS
   THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS

✓ 6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS
   TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND DROP THIS FORM IN THE DROP BOX FOR THE CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS OR RETURN TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC.

SIGNATURE ____________________________

ADDRESS 17614 NE 299th CT.
          YACOLT, WA. 98676

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

COMMENTS. ALTERNATE 4

________________________________________

________________________________________

________________________________________
For the Public Record - WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT HOCKINSON HIGH SCHOOL, 16819 NE 159th STREET - BRUSH PRAIRIE, WN.

CCCW WOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR SUPPORT, COMMENTS AND CONCERNS REGARDING ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES IN ALTERNATIVE 4 THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION. Alt 4 is the only alternative offered that attempts to reverse the massive down zoning.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.

2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC RURAL ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS

3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.

4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE OWNED WOODLOTS

5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/ URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS

6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND DROP THIS FORM IN THE DROP BOX FOR THE CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS OR RETURN TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC.

SIGNATURE

ADDRESS 8503 NE 349th St

La Center, WA 98629

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

COMMENTS:

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________
For the Public Record - WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT HOCKINSON HIGH SCHOOL, 16819 NE 159th STREET - BRUSH PRAIRIE, WN.

CCCWOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR SUPPORT, COMMENTS AND CONCERNS REGARDING ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES IN ALTERNATIVE 4 THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION. Alt 4 is the only alternative offered that attempts to reverse the massive down zoning.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

✓ 1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.
✓ 2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC. RURAL ZONES
   TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS
✓ 3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES
   TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.
✓ 4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES
   TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE OWNED WOODLOTS
✓ 5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/ URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS
   THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS
✓ 6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS
   TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND DROP THIS FORM IN THE DROP BOX FOR THE CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS OR RETURN TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC.

SIGNATURE

ADDRESS 34300 NE 241st Ave. Yacolt WA.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

COMMENTS: ________________________________________
For the Public Record -

WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT HOCKINSON HIGH SCHOOL, 16819 NE 159th STREET - BRUSH PRAIRIE, WN.

CCCW WOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR SUPPORT, COMMENTS AND CONCERNS REGARDING ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES IN ALTERNATIVE 4 THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION.
Alt 4 is the only alternative offered that attempts to reverse the massive down zoning.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

✓ 1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.

✓ 2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC. RURAL ZONES
   TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS

✓ 3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES
   TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.

✓ 4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES
   TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE OWNED WOODLOTS

  5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/ URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS
   THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS

  6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS
   TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND DROP THIS FORM IN THE DROP BOX FOR THE CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS OR RETURN TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC.

SIGNATURE

ADDRESS 4503 NE 349th St

La Center, WA 98629

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

COMMENTS: Would like to see more fairness in zoning. Our property is surrounded by
   2.5 and 5 Acre Parcels, yet we are locked into a 20 Acre zone. Would like to
   see a change to a minimum of 10 Acre zone.
For the Public Record - WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT HOCKINSON HIGH SCHOOL, 16819 NE 159th STREET - BRUSH PRAIRIE, WN.

CCCW Would Like Councilors to Know Your Support, Comments and Concerns Regarding Alternative 4 for Rural and Resource Zones

Alt 4 is the only alternative offered that attempts to reverse the massive down zoning.

Please check which options you support.

1. Rural and Resource zoning must reflect existing development patterns.
   
2. Adopt 1 AC, 2.5 AC and 5 AC Rural Zones
   To recognize and allow for smaller existing residential parcels.

3. Adopt 2.5 AC, 5 AC Agriculture Zones
   To recognize and allow for smaller and more affordable farms.

4. Adopt 5 AC, 10 AC Forest Zones
   To recognize and allow smaller more affordable private owned woodlots.

5. Remove Urban Reserve/Urban Holding Land Overlays
   That have been locked in 10 AC zoning for approximately 20 years.

6. Adopt Cluster Development Options in all Rural and Resource Lands
   To conserve prime soils while allowing for more land use and housing options.

Please sign below to include your name and address and drop this form in the drop box for the Clark County Board of Councilors or return to Clark County Citizens United, Inc.

Signature

Address

La Center, WA 98639

Thank you for your comments and support!

Comments: *No to Alternative 4 *
Growth in this County is too fast - Slow it down please.
For the Public Record - WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT HOCKINSON HIGH SCHOOL, 16819 NE 159th STREET - BRUSH PRAIRIE, WN.

CCCW WOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR SUPPORT, COMMENTS AND CONCERNS REGARDING ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES IN ALTERNATIVE 4 THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION.

Alt 4 is the only alternative offered that attempts to reverse the massive down zoning.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

✓ 1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.

✓ 2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC RURAL ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS

✓ 3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.

✓ 4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE OWNED WOODLOTS

✓ 5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/ URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS

✓ 6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND DROP THIS FORM IN THE DROP BOX FOR THE CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS OR RETURN TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC.

SIGNATURE ____________________________

ADDRESS 14214 NE 202nd AVE

Brush Prairie, WA 98606

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

COMMENTS: __________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________

013112
For the Public Record - WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT HOCKINSON HIGH SCHOOL, 16819 NE 159th STREET - BRUSH PRAIRIE, WN.

CCCW WOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR SUPPORT, COMMENTS AND CONCERNS REGARDING ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES IN ALTERNATIVE 4 THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION.

Alt 4 is the only alternative offered that attempts to reverse the massive down zoning.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

☐ 1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.

☐ 2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC. RURAL ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS

☐ 3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.

☐ 4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE OWNED WOODLOTS

☐ 5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/ URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS

☐ 6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND DROP THIS FORM IN THE DROP BOX FOR THE CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS OR RETURN TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC.

SIGNATURE: Lynne Corder
ADDRESS: 14101 N.E. 144TH ST
                               Brush Prairie, WA 98606

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

COMMENTS: We need to be able to divide our land for family & to provide for retirement. Please allow acre parcels. Government should serve the people who own the land, not control or limit our options.
For the Public Record - WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT HOCKINSON HIGH SCHOOL, 16819 NE 159th STREET - BRUSH PRAIRIE, WN.

CCCW WOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR SUPPORT, COMMENTS AND CONCERNS REGARDING ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES IN ALTERNATIVE 4 THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION.
Alt 4 is the only alternative offered that attempts to reverse the massive down zoning.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.

2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC. RURAL ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS

3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.

4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE OWNED WOODLOTS

5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/ URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS

6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND DROP THIS FORM IN THE DROP BOX FOR THE CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS OR RETURN TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC.

SIGNATURE

ADDRESS 14101 NE 144 ST

BRUSH PRAIRIE, WA 98606

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

COMMENTS: We need to divide our 20 acre parcel to 1-2.5 AC parcel to provide land for family and for retirement.
For the Public Record -

WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT HOCKINSON HIGH SCHOOL, 16819 NE 159th STREET - BRUSH PRAIRIE, WN.

CCCW WOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR SUPPORT, COMMENTS AND CONCERNS REGARDING ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

..........................................................

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES IN ALTERNATIVE 4 THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION. Alt 4 is the only alternative offered that attempts to reverse the massive down zoning.

..........................................................

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT:

✓ 1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.

✓ 2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC. RURAL ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS

✓ 3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.

✓ 4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE OWNED WOODLOTS

✓ 5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/ URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS

✓ 6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

..........................................................

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND DROP THIS FORM IN THE DROP BOX FOR THE CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS OR RETURN TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC.

SIGNATURE

ADDRESS 1307 56 22nd Ave.

BATTLE CREEK, WA 99104

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

COMMENTS: We need to provide homes for our children to live.

By limiting the supply as the older generation did - it drives up prices and left no option for our children to afford land.
For the Public Record - WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT HOCKINSON HIGH SCHOOL, 16819 NE 159th STREET - BRUSH PRAIRIE, WN.

CCCUI WOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR SUPPORT, COMMENTS AND CONCERNS REGARDING ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES IN ALTERNATIVE 4 THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION.
Alt 4 is the only alternative offered that attempts to reverse the massive down zoned.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

___ 1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.

✓ 2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC. RURAL ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS.

✓ 3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.

___ 4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE OWNED WOODLOTS.

___ 5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/ URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS.

✓ 6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS.

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND DROP THIS FORM IN THE DROP BOX FOR THE CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS OR RETURN TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC.

SIGNATURE ____________________________

ADDRESS 13505 NE 152nd AVE

BRUSH PRAIRIE WA

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

COMMENTS: WE HAVE 100 ACRES, ONLY 25% OF 5 ACRE PARCELS, NOW 20 ACRES ZONING. A LOT OF IT IS WET AND NOT FARMABLE. WE WOULD WELCOME 5 ACRES ZONING AND CLUSTER OPPORTUNITIES IN ORDER TO PROVIDE RURAL LIVING OPPORTUNITIES FOR RESIDENTS WHILE ALSO PRESERVING OPEN SPACE WITH THE REMAINDER OF THE LOT.
For the Public Record - WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT HOCKINSON HIGH SCHOOL, 16819 NE 159th STREET - BRUSH PRAIRIE, WN.

CCCWOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR SUPPORT, COMMENTS AND CONCERNS REGARDING ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES IN ALTERNATIVE 4 THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION.
Alt 4 is the only alternative offered that attempts to reverse the massive down zoning.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

___ 1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.

___ 2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC RURAL ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS

___ 3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.

X ___ 4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE OWNED WOODLOTS

___ 5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/ URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS

___ 6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND DROP THIS FORM IN THE DROP BOX FOR THE CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS OR RETURN TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC.

SIGNATURE ____________________________

ADDRESS 39907 NE 21st Ave, Woodland WA ____________________________

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

COMMENTS: We live in the northwest corner of Clark county, just 10 minutes from I-5. Having property this close to I-5 and being taxed a 40acre min is silly. It needs to be dropped to 10 acre min.
For the Public Record - WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT HOCKINSON HIGH SCHOOL, 16819 NE 159th STREET - BRUSH PRAIRIE, WN.

CCCWOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR SUPPORT, COMMENTS AND CONCERNS REGARDING ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES IN ALTERNATIVE 4 THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION.

Alt 4 is the only alternative offered that attempts to reverse the massive down zoning.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.
2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC RURAL ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS
3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.
4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE OWNED WOODLOTS
5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/ URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS
6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL: RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND DROP THIS FORM IN THE DROP BOX FOR THE CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS OR RETURN TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC.

SIGNATURE

ADDRESS 19108 NE 84 CR. VAN. 98682

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

COMMENTS: INCLUDE "GUSTAFSON" PARCEL ON 152ND AVE INTO URBAN GROWTH.
For the Public Record - WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT HOCKINSON HIGH SCHOOL, 16819 NE 159th STREET - BRUSH PRAIRIE, WN.

CCCW WOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR SUPPORT, COMMENTS AND CONCERNS REGARDING ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES IN ALTERNATIVE 4 THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-COMFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION. Alt 4 is the only alternative offered that attempts to reverse the massive down zoning.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.

2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC RURAL ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS

3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.

4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE OWNED WOODLOTS

5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/ URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS

6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND DROP THIS FORM IN THE DROP BOX FOR THE CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS OR RETURN TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC.

SIGNATURE

ADDRESS 15714 NE 244th St

BATTLE GROUND WA 98604

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

COMMENTS: These properties are owned by "us" and the taxes have been paid by "us" for many years. We as citizen property owners should have the ability with some common sense to do what we want with "our" property.
For the Public Record - WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT HOCKINSON HIGH SCHOOL, 16819 NE 159th STREET - BRUSH PRAIRIE, WN.

CCCWOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR SUPPORT, COMMENTS AND CONCERNS REGARDING ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES IN ALTERNATIVE 4 THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION.

Alt 4 is the only alternative offered that attempts to reverse the massive down zoning.

______________________________________________________________

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

☐ 1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.

☐ 2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC RURAL ZONES
   TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS

☐ 3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES
   TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.

☐ 4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES
   TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE OWNED WOODLOTS

☐ 5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/ URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS
   THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS

☐ 6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS
   TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

______________________________________________________________

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND DROP THIS FORM IN THE DROP BOX FOR THE CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS OR RETURN TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC.

SIGNATURE: KEITH Massie

ADDRESS: 37507 NE 198th Ave Yacolt, WA 98675

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

COMMENTS: I support Alternative 4A.
For the Public Record -  WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT HOCKINSON HIGH SCHOOL, 16819 NE 159th STREET - BRUSH PRAIRIE, WN.

CCCW WOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR SUPPORT, COMMENTS AND CONCERNS REGARDING ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES IN ALTERNATIVE 4 THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION. Alt 4 is the only alternative offered that attempts to reverse the massive down zoning.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT:

1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.
2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC RURAL ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS
3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.
4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE OWNED WOODLOTS
5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS
6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND DROP THIS FORM IN THE DROP BOX FOR THE CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS OR RETURN TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC.

SIGNATURE ____________________________

ADDRESS ______________________________

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

COMMENTS: ____________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________

013121
For the Public Record - WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT HOCKINSON HIGH SCHOOL, 16819 NE 159th STREET - BRUSH PRAIRIE, WN.

CCCW WOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR SUPPORT, COMMENTS AND CONCERNS REGARDING ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLAIRK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES IN ALTERNATIVE 4 THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION.
Alt 4 is the only alternative offered that attempts to reverse the massive down zoning.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

___ 1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.

___ 2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC. RURAL ZONES
   TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS

___ 3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES
   TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.

___ 4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES
   TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE OWNED WOODLOTS

___ 5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS
   THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS

___ 6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS
   TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND DROP THIS FORM IN THE DROP BOX FOR THE CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS OR RETURN TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC.

SIGNATURE

ADDRESS

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

COMMENTS:
For the Public Record -  WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT HOCKINSON HIGH SCHOOL, 16819 NE 159th STREET - BRUSH PRAIRIE, WN.

CCCW WOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR SUPPORT, COMMENTS AND CONCERNS REGARDING ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES IN ALTERNATIVE 4 THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION.
Alt 4 is the only alternative offered that attempts to reverse the massive down zoning.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

___ 1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.

___ 2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC. RURAL ZONES
   TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS

___ 3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES
   TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.

___ 4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES
   TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE OWNED WOODLOTS

___ 5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/ URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS
   THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS

X 6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS
   TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND DROP THIS FORM IN THE DROP BOX FOR THE CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS OR RETURN TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC.

SIGNATURE ______________________________

ADDRESS 18406 NE 183rd

Brush Prairie

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

COMMENTS: ____________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________
For the Public Record - WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT HOCKINSON HIGH SCHOOL, 16819 NE 159th STREET - BRUSH PRAIRIE, WN.

CCCW WOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR SUPPORT, COMMENTS AND CONCERNS REGARDING ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES IN ALTERNATIVE 4 THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION.
Alt 4 is the only alternative offered that attempts to reverse the massive down zoning.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.
2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC RURAL ZONES
   TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS
3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES
   TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.
4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES
   TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE OWNED WOODLOTS
5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/ URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS
   THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS
6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS
   TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND DROP THIS FORM IN THE DROP BOX FOR THE CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS OR RETURN TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC.

SIGNATURE

ADDRESS

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

COMMENTS

I Support Alternative 4 & 4A

I own (2) 80 ACRE & (1) 40 ACRE PARCELS OFF DRAKE VALLEY RD. THE 80 ACRE PARCELS ARE MOSTLY 20 ACRE PARCELS. OUR PROPERTY SHOULD BE ABLE TO BE REZONED. GET RID OF THE 1/4 ACRE ZONING.
For the Public Record - WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT HOCKINSON HIGH SCHOOL, 16819 NE 159th STREET - BRUSH PRAIRIE, WN.

CCCW WOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR SUPPORT, COMMENTS AND CONCERNS REGARDING ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES IN ALTERNATIVE 4 THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONGRAINFINE LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION. Alt 4 is the only alternative offered that attempts to reverse the massive down zoning.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

X. 1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.

X. 2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC RURAL ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS

X. 3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.

X. 4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE OWNED WOODLOTS

X. 5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/ URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS

X. 6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND DROP THIS FORM IN THE DROP BOX FOR THE CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS OR RETURN TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC.

SIGNATURE: George L. Peterson
ADDRESS: 22111 NE 182nd Ave
BG, WA 98604

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

COMMENTS: ____________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

013125
For the Public Record - WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT HOCKINSON HIGH SCHOOL, 16819 NE 159th STREET - BRUSH PRAIRIE, WN.

CCCU WOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR SUPPORT, COMMENTS AND CONCERNS REGARDING ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES IN ALTERNATIVE 4 THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION. Alt 4 is the only alternative offered that attempts to reverse the massive down zoning.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT:

✓ 1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.
✓ 2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC RURAL ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS
✓ 3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.
✓ 4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE OWNED WOODLOTS
✓ 5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/ URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS
✓ 6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND DROP THIS FORM IN THE DROP BOX FOR THE CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS OR RETURN TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC.

SIGNATURE

ADDRESS 16819 NE 223rd Place

BATTLE GROUND, WA 98604

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

COMMENTS: Want F-10, AC 5, Rural 1 to 2'
FOR THE PUBLIC RECORD - WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT HOCKINSON HIGH SCHOOL, 16819 NE 159th STREET - BRUSH PRAIRIE, WN.

CCCW WOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR SUPPORT, COMMENTS AND CONCERNS REGARDING ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES IN ALTERNATIVE 4 THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION. Alt 4 is the only alternative offered that attempts to reverse the massive down zoning.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.
2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC RURAL ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS
3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.
4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE OWNED WOODLOTS
5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE / URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS
6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND DROP THIS FORM IN THE DROP BOX FOR THE CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS OR RETURN TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC.

SIGNATURE: SHER SIEGWERK
ADDRESS: 16819 NE 223 CIR
PS: 98604

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

COMMENTS: WANTED FOR AGRICULTURAL RURAL 1978
For the Public Record - WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT HOCKINSON HIGH SCHOOL, 16819 NE 159th STREET - BRUSH PRAIRIE, WN.

CCCW WOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR SUPPORT, COMMENTS AND CONCERNS REGARDING ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES IN ALTERNATIVE 4 THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION. Alt 4 is the only alternative offered that attempts to reverse the massive down zoning.

-------------------

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.

2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC. RURAL ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS

3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.

4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE OWNED WOODLOTS

5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/ URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS

6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

-------------------

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND DROP THIS FORM IN THE DROP BOX FOR THE CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS OR RETURN TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC.

SIGNATURE: 

ADDRESS: 2104 NE 176TH AVE
BATTLE GROUND, WA

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

COMMENTS: We need to be able to use our land to its fullest use if we desire, and not make laws that make it impossible to sell when we die. Our land is a piece of property no one can afford.
For the Public Record -  WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT HOCKINSON HIGH SCHOOL, 16819 NE 159th STREET - BRUSH PRAIRIE, WN.

CCCW WOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR SUPPORT, COMMENTS AND CONCERNS REGARDING ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES IN ALTERNATIVE 4 THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-COMBINING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION.
Alt 4 is the only alternative offered that attempts to reverse the massive down zoning.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

☒ 1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.

☒ 2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC RURAL ZONES
   TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS

☐ 3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES
   TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.

☒ 4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES
   TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE OWNED WOODLOTS

☐ 5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/ URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS
    THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS

☒ 6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS
    TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND DROP THIS FORM IN THE DROP BOX FOR THE CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS OR RETURN TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC.

SIGNATURE: ___ Jane M. Riverz __________________________

ADDRESS:  PO Box 2799

Battle Ground, WA 98604

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

COMMENTS: _________________________________

______________________________

______________________________
For the Public Record -  WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT HOCKINSON HIGH SCHOOL, 16819 NE 159th STREET - BRUSH PRAIRIE, WN.

CCCU WOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR SUPPORT, COMMENTS AND CONCERNS REGARDING ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES IN ALTERNATIVE 4 THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION. Alt 4 is the only alternative offered that attempts to reverse the massive down zoning.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

✓ 1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.

✓ 2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC RURAL ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS

✓ 3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.

✓ 4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE OWNED WOODLOTS

✓ 5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/ URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS

✓✓ 6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND DROP THIS FORM IN THE DROP BOX FOR THE CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS OR RETURN TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC.

SIGNATURE  

ADDRESS  

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

COMMENTS: 


For the Public Record -  WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE
PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT HOCKINSON HIGH
SCHOOL, 16819 NE 159th STREET - BRUSH PRAIRIE, WN.

CCCW WOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR SUPPORT, COMMENTS AND
CONCERNS REGARDING ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED
CHANGES IN ALTERNATIVE 4 THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING
LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION.
Alt 4 is the only alternative offered that attempts to reverse the massive down zoning.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

✓ 1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.

✓ 2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC RURAL ZONES
TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS

✓ 3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES
TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.

✓ 4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES
TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE OWNED WOODLOTS

✓ 5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/ URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS
THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS

✓ 6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS
TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND DROP THIS FORM IN THE DROP BOX
FOR THE CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS OR RETURN TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC.

SIGNATURE:  Dean Pezzey  Garen Kysar
ADDRESS:  401 Clark St  YaColt WA 98675

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

COMMENTS:  In Support 4 A.  
I'm younger and would like
a lot of open options.
I also support alternative #3 annexation options.
For the Public Record -

WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT HOCKINSON HIGH SCHOOL, 16819 NE 159th STREET - BRUSH PRAIRIE, WN.

CCCW WOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR SUPPORT, COMMENTS AND CONCERNS REGARDING ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES IN ALTERNATIVE 4 THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION.

Alt 4 is the only alternative offered that attempts to reverse the massive down zoning.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

✓ 1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.

✓ 2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC. RURAL ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS

✓ 3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.

✓ 4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE OWNED WOODLOTS

✓ 5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/ URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS

✓ 6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND DROP THIS FORM IN THE DROP BOX FOR THE CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS OR RETURN TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC.

SIGNATURE: [Signature]

ADDRESS: 37560 NE 99th Ave.

YACOLT, WA 98675

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

COMMENTS: I support alternative 4A. I am a younger man and like to see options available. I also support alternative #3 annexation options.
For the Public Record - WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT HOCKINSON HIGH SCHOOL, 16819 NE 159th STREET - BRUSH PRAIRIE, WN.

CCCW WOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR SUPPORT, COMMENTS AND CONCERNS REGARDING ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES IN ALTERNATIVE 4 THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION. Alt 4 is the only alternative offered that attempts to reverse the massive down zoning.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

✓ 1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.

✓ 2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC. RURAL ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS

✓ 3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.

✓ 4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE OWNED WOODLOTS

✓ 5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS

✓ 6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND DROP THIS FORM IN THE DROP BOX FOR THE CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS OR RETURN TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC.

SIGNATURE: 

ADDRESS: 25300 NE 220th Ave

BATTLE GROUND, WA 98604

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

COMMENTS: Smaller lots I want the freedom to divide my land for the benefit of my children and parents as they age.
For the Public Record -  WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT HOCKINSON HIGH SCHOOL, 16819 NE 159th STREET - BRUSH PRAIRIE, WN.

CCC WOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR SUPPORT, COMMENTS AND CONCERNS REGARDING ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES IN ALTERNATIVE 4 THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION. Alt 4 is the only alternative offered that attempts to reverse the massive down zoning.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

___ 1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.

___ 2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC. RURAL ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS

X 3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.

✓ 4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE OWNED WOODLOTS

✓ 5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/ URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS

___ 6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND DROP THIS FORM IN THE DROP BOX FOR THE CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS OR RETURN TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC.

SIGNATURE  

ADDRESS  

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

COMMENTS:  


For the Public Record - WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT HOCKINSON HIGH SCHOOL, 16819 NE 159th STREET - BRUSH PRAIRIE, WN.

CCCW WOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR SUPPORT, COMMENTS AND CONCERNS REGARDING ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES IN ALTERNATIVE 4 THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION.

Alt 4 is the only alternative offered that attempts to reverse the massive down zoning.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

✓ 1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.

✓ 2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC RURAL ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS

✓ 3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.

✓ 4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE OWNED WOODLOTS

✗ 5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/ URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS

✓ 6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND DROP THIS FORM IN THE DROP BOX FOR THE CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS OR RETURN TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC.

SIGNATURE

ADDRESS

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

COMMENTS: ________________________________

______________________________

______________________________

______________________________
For the Public Record

WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT HOCKINSON HIGH SCHOOL, 16819 NE 159th STREET - BRUSH PRAIRIE, WN.

CCCW WOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR SUPPORT, COMMENTS AND CONCERNS REGARDING ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES.

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES IN ALTERNATIVE 4 THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION.

Alt 4 is the only alternative offered that attempts to reverse the massive down zoning.

PLease check which options you support.

✓ 1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.

✓ 2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC. RURAL ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS.

✓ 3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.

✓ 4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE OWNED WOODLOTS.

✓ 5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/ URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS.

✓ 6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS.

Please sign below to include your name and address and drop this form in the drop box for the Clark County Board of Councilors or return to Clark County Citizens United, Inc.

Signature: ____________________________
Address: 2211 NW 182nd Ave. B. A. 98634

Thank you for your comments and support!

Comments: put us into 2.5 acres not 10 acre. Alternative 4. Rural zone. We have farm so why must we pay for a fee for the intermediary when our property does not?
For the Public Record -  WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE
PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT HOCKINSON HIGH
SCHOOL, 16819 NE 159th STREET - BRUSH PRAIRIE, WN.

CCCW WOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR SUPPORT, COMMENTS AND
CONCERNS REGARDING ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED
CHANGES IN ALTERNATIVE 4 THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING
LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION.
Alt 4 is the only alternative offered that attempts to reverse the massive down zoning.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

✓ 1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.

✓ 2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC. RURAL ZONES
   TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS

✓ 3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES
   TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.

✓ 4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES
   TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE OWNED WOODLOTS

✓ 5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/ URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS
   THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS

✓ 6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS
   TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND DROP THIS FORM IN THE DROP BOX
FOR THE CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS OR RETURN TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC.

SIGNATURE: Nathan El

ADDRESS: 3500 NE 178th Ave
           Yacolt WA 98675

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

COMMENTS: Strongly in favor of allowing
larger parcels to be zoned similarly to
surrounding parcel sizes; As proposed in
conceptual alternative 4 option A
For the Public Record - WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT HOCKINSON HIGH SCHOOL, 16819 NE 159th STREET - BRUSH PRAIRIE, WN.

CCCW WOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR SUPPORT, COMMENTS AND CONCERNS REGARDING ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES IN ALTERNATIVE 4 THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-COMFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION. Alt 4 is the only alternative offered that attempts to reverse the massive down zoning.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

✓ 1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.

✓ 2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC RURAL ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS

✓ 3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.

✓ 4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE OWNED WOODLOTS

✓ 5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/ URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS

✓ 6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND DROP THIS FORM IN THE DROP BOX FOR THE CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS OR RETURN TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC.

SIGNATURE: [Signature]

ADDRESS: 2107 NW 10th Way Battle Ground

WA 98604

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

COMMENTS: I support option 4 A.
I also support Alternative #3 City
Annexation Options
For the Public Record - WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT HOCKINSON HIGH SCHOOL, 16819 NE 159th STREET - BRUSH PRAIRIE, WN.

CCCW WOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR SUPPORT, COMMENTS AND CONCERNS REGARDING ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES IN ALTERNATIVE 4 THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-COMFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION.

Alt 4 is the only alternative offered that attempts to reverse the massive down zoning.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

√ 1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.

√ 2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC RURAL ZONES
   TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS

√ 3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES
   TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.

√ 4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES
   TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE OWNED WOODLOTS

√ 5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/ URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS
   THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS

√ 6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS
   TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND DROP THIS FORM IN THE DROP BOX FOR THE CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS OR RETURN TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC.

SIGNATURE: [Signature]

ADDRESS: 16104 Vte. 259th St. B. G. WA 98029

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

COMMENTS: ___________________________ ___________________________ ___________________________
For the Public Record - WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT HOCKINSON HIGH SCHOOL, 16819 NE 159th STREET - BRUSH PRAIRIE, WN.

CCCW WOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR SUPPORT, COMMENTS AND CONCERNS REGARDING ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES IN ALTERNATIVE 4 THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION.
Alt 4 is the only alternative offered that attempts to reverse the massive down zoning.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.

✓ 2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC RURAL ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS

✓ 3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.

✓ 4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE OWNED WOODLOTS

✓ 5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/ URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS

✓ 6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND DROP THIS FORM IN THE DROP BOX FOR THE CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS OR RETURN TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC.

SIGNATURE

ADDRESS 107 W 5 St.

Washougal, WA 98671

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

COMMENTS: _____________________________________________

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________
For the Public Record - WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE
PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT HOCKINSON HIGH
SCHOOL, 16819 NE 159th STREET - BRUSH PRAIRIE, WN.

CCCU WOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR SUPPORT, COMMENTS AND
CONCERNS REGARDING ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED
CHANGES IN ALTERNATIVE 4 THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING
LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION.
Alt 4 is the only alternative offered that attempts to reverse the massive down zoning.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

✓ 1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.

✓ 2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC RURAL ZONES
   TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS

✓ 3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES
   TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.

✓ 4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES
   TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE OWNED WOODLOTS

✓ 5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/ URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS
   THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS

✓ 6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS
   TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND DROP THIS FORM IN THE DROP BOX
FOR THE CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS OR RETURN TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC.

SIGNATURE: Lola Mae Masius

ADDRESS: 2401 SE 12th St.
          Battle Ground, WA 98604

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

COMMENTS: We should give rural owners
more options for smaller lots. CCCU's
alternative 4 is the best for my 20 acres, &
at 8512 24th St. B&D. Seriously consider the
public's needs & those of us w/acreage.
WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT HOCKINSON HIGH SCHOOL, 16819 NE 159th STREET - BRUSH PRAIRIE, WN.

CCCW WOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR SUPPORT, COMMENTS AND CONCERNS REGARDING ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES IN ALTERNATIVE 4 THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-COMFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION. Alt 4 is the only alternative offered that attempts to reverse the massive down zoning.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

✓ 1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.

✓ 2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC RURAL ZONES
TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS

✓ 3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES
TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.

✓ 4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES
TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE OWNED WOODLOTS

✓ 5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/ URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS
THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS

✓ 6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS
TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND DROP THIS FORM IN THE DROP BOX FOR THE CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS OR RETURN TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC.

SIGNATURE: [Signature]
ADDRESS: 12401 SE 12th St BT 98604

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

COMMENTS: [Comments: We need many more small homes in county]
For the Public Record - WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT HOCKINSON HIGH SCHOOL, 16819 NE 159th STREET - BRUSH PRAIRIE, WN.

CCCW WOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR SUPPORT, COMMENTS AND CONCERNS REGARDING ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES IN ALTERNATIVE 4 THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION.

Alt 4 is the only alternative offered that attempts to reverse the massive down zoning.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

✓ 1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.

  2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC RURAL ZONES
     TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS

✓ 3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES
     TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.

✓ 4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES
     TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE OWNED WOODLOTS

✓ 5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE / URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS
     THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS

✓ 6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS
     TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND DROP THIS FORM IN THE DROP BOX FOR THE CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS OR RETURN TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC.

SIGNATURE

ADDRESS: PO BOX 127 Aum Brook

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

COMMENTS:
For the Public Record -  WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT HOCKINSON HIGH SCHOOL, 16819 NE 159th STREET - BRUSH PRAIRIE, WN.

CCCW WOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR SUPPORT, COMMENTS AND CONCERNS REGARDING ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES IN ALTERNATIVE 4 THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION. Alt 4 is the only alternative offered that attempts to reverse the massive down zoning.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

Y. 1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.

Y. 2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC. RURAL ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS

Y. 3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.

Y. 4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE OWNED WOODELOTS

Y. 5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/ URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS

Y. 6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND DROP THIS FORM IN THE DROP BOX FOR THE CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS OR RETURN TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC.

SIGNATURE: Fredrick A Malewski
ADDRESS: PO Box 318
           Yakima, WA 98903-0318

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

COMMENTS: I thanked all the land use planners present years ago but no body listened to us. I hope we can do better this time.
For the Public Record -  WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT HOCKINSON HIGH SCHOOL, 16819 NE 159th STREET - BRUSH PRAIRIE, WN.

CCC WOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR SUPPORT, COMMENTS AND CONCERNS REGARDING ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES IN ALTERNATIVE 4 THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION. Alt 4 is the only alternative offered that attempts to reverse the massive down zoning.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT:

✓ 1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.

✓ 2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC RURAL ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS

✓ 3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.

✓ 4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE OWNED WOODLOTS

✓ 5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/ URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS

✓ 6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND DROP THIS FORM IN THE DROP BOX FOR THE CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS OR RETURN TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC.

SIGNATURE  Beth Malnowski
ADDRESS  P.O. Box 318

JACOBS  WA  98635

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

COMMENTS:

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________
For the Public Record -

WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT HOCKINSON HIGH SCHOOL, 16819 NE 159th STREET - BRUSH PRAIRIE, WN.

CCCU WOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR SUPPORT, COMMENTS AND CONCERNS REGARDING ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES IN ALTERNATIVE 4 THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION.

Alt 4 is the only alternative offered that attempts to reverse the massive down zoning.

----------------------------------------

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

X 1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.

X 2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC RURAL ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS

X 3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.

X 4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE OWNED WOODLOTS

X 5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/ URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS

X 6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

----------------------------------------

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND DROP THIS FORM IN THE DROP BOX FOR THE CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS OR RETURN TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC.

SIGNATURE

ADDRESS 17114 NE Ford Crk. Rd. 
Bush Prairie, WA 98322

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

COMMENTS: ________________________________

________________________________________

________________________________________
For the Public Record - WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT HOCKINSON HIGH SCHOOL, 16819 NE 159th STREET - BRUSH PRAIRIE, WA.

CCCW WOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR SUPPORT, COMMENTS AND CONCERNS REGARDING ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES IN ALTERNATIVE 4 THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING lots THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION. Alt 4 is the only alternative offered that attempts to reverse the massive down zoning.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

✓ 1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.
✓ 2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC RURAL ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS
✓ 3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.
✓ 4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE OWNED WOODLOTS
✓ 5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS
✓ 6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND DROP THIS FORM IN THE DROP BOX FOR THE CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS OR RETURN TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC.

SIGNATURE ____________________________

ADDRESS 28300 ne Berry Rd. 189

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

COMMENTS: __________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________
For the Public Record: WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT HOCKINSON HIGH SCHOOL, 16819 NE 159th STREET - BRUSH PRAIRIE, WN.

CCCW WOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR SUPPORT, COMMENTS AND CONCERNS REGARDING ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES IN ALTERNATIVE 4 THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION.
Alt 4 is the only alternative offered that attempts to reverse the massive down zoning.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

___ 1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.

___ 2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC RURAL ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS

___ 3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.

___ 4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE OWNED WOODLOTS

___ 5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/ URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS

___ 6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND DROP THIS FORM IN THE DROP BOX FOR THE CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS OR RETURN TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC.

SIGNATURE: [Signature]
ADDRESS: 152 AVE NE
Battle Ground, WA 98604

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

COMMENTS: My concern if parcel sizes are decreased and these smaller lots are given the same ag/forest tax reductions who will police if these parcels are used and managed as ag/forest. Too bad we couldn’t understand the speaker, Oliver.
For the Public Record - WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT HOCKINSON HIGH SCHOOL, 16819 NE 159th STREET - BRUSH PRAIRIE, WN.

CCCW WOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR SUPPORT, COMMENTS AND CONCERNS REGARDING ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES IN ALTERNATIVE 4 THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION. Alt 4 is the only alternative offered that attempts to reverse the massive down zoning.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

___ 1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.

___ 2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC RURAL ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS

___ 3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.

___ 4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE OWNED WOODLOTS

___ 5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/ URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS

___ 6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND DROP THIS FORM IN THE DROP BOX FOR THE CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS OR RETURN TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC.

SIGNATURE __________________________
ADDRESS __________________________

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

COMMENTS: Land that is less than 10 acres that is sandwiched between 15 2.5 acre lots and 80 acres should be able to be split into 2.5 acre lots. City water.
For the Public Record - WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT HOCKINSON HIGH SCHOOL, 16819 NE 159th STREET - BRUSH PRAIRIE, WN.

CCC WOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR SUPPORT, COMMENTS AND CONCERNS REGARDING ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES IN ALTERNATIVE 4 THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION.

Alt 4 is the only alternative offered that attempts to reverse the massive down zoning.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

☐ 1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.

☒ 2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC RURAL ZONES
   TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS

☒ 3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES
   TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.

☐ 4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES
   TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE OWNED WOODLOTS

☐ 5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/ URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS
   THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS

☒ 6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS
   TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND DROP THIS FORM IN THE DROP BOX FOR THE CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS OR RETURN TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC.

SIGNATURE:

ADDRESS:

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

COMMENTS:

Req AG.5 Zoning

We are surrounded by smaller properties - corner of our land was cut out as 2 - 2 1/2 ac. properties next door & 10+ multi 5 acres parcels further from city than us
For the Public Record - WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT HOCKINSON HIGH SCHOOL, 16819 NE 159th STREET - BRUSH PRAIRIE, WN.

CCCU WOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR SUPPORT, COMMENTS AND CONCERNS REGARDING ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES IN ALTERNATIVE 4 THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION.
Alt 4 is the only alternative offered that attempts to reverse the massive down zoning.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

_ 1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.

_ 2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC. RURAL ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS

_ 3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.

_ 4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE OWNED WOODLOTS

_ 5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/ URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS

_ 6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND DROP THIS FORM IN THE DROP BOX FOR THE CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS OR RETURN TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC.

SIGNATURE ____________________________

ADDRESS 5835 NE 415 Ave
La Center WA 98629

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT! REQUEST AG 5A

COMMENTS: We own 27.85 acres currently being considered re-zoning to AG-10. They is a corner cut out of our property 2 acres to a road. Sold or prior to '94. We are surrounded by properties zoned 5 ac min and would like more options of division.
WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT HOCKINSON HIGH SCHOOL, 16819 NE 159th STREET - BRUSH PRAIRIE, WN.

CCCW WOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR SUPPORT, COMMENTS AND CONCERNS REGARDING ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES IN ALTERNATIVE 4 THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION. Alt 4 is the only alternative offered that attempts to reverse the massive down zoning.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

☐ 1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.

☐ 2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC. RURAL ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS

☐ 3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.

☐ 4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE OWNED WOODLOTS

☐ 5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/ URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS

☐ 6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

I'm not sure what this means?

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND DROP THIS FORM IN THE DROP BOX FOR THE CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS OR RETURN TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC.

SIGNATURE: John A. Hamilton
ADDRESS: 21205 NE 229th Street (P.O. Box 3074)
Battle Ground, WA 98604

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

COMMENTS: Blackhawk Estates is zoned R5 but 98% of lots are 2.5 acre lots; those lots are included in Alt 4 PLAN. However, there are 2 (5 acre parcels that were 2.5) acres but made in to 5 acre parcels in 1994 - We still have 2.5 acre parcels.

We are not included in the Alt. 4 plan. We would like to be included in our subdivision.
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CCCW WOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR SUPPORT, COMMENTS AND CONCERNS REGARDING ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES IN ALTERNATIVE 4 THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION.
Alt 4 is the only alternative offered that attempts to reverse the massive down zoning.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

✓ 1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.
✓ 2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC. RURAL ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS
✓ 3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.
✓ 4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE OWNED WOODLOTS
✓ 5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/ URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS
✓ 6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND DROP THIS FORM IN THE DROP BOX FOR THE CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS OR RETURN TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC.

SIGNATURE: James Hoffmang

ADDRESS: 17710 NE 307th St
Yacolt, WA 98675

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

COMMENTS: Thank you!
For the Public Record -   WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT HOCKINSON HIGH SCHOOL, 16819 NE 159th STREET - BRUSH PRAIRIE, WN.

CCCW would like Councilors to know your support, comments and concerns regarding Alternative 4 for rural and resource zones.

Clark County Citizens United, Inc. supports most of the proposed changes in Alternative 4 that help to rectify many non-conforming lots that resulted from the 1994 Comprehensive Plan adoption. Alt 4 is the only alternative offered that attempts to reverse the massive down zoning.

Please check which options you support.

✔  1. Rural and resource zoning must reflect existing development patterns.

✔  2. Adopt 1 AC, 2.5 AC and 5 AC. Rural zones to recognize and allow for smaller existing residential parcels.

✔  3. Adopt 2.5 AC, 5 AC agriculture zones to recognize and allow for smaller and more affordable farms.

✔  4. Adopt 5 AC, 10 AC forest zones to recognize and allow smaller more affordable private owned woodlots.

✔  5. Remove urban reserve/urban holding land overlays that have been locked in 10 AC zoning for approximately 20 years.

✔  6. Adopt cluster development options in all rural and resource lands to conserve prime soils while allowing for more land use and housing options.

Please sign below to include your name and address and drop this form in the drop box for the Clark County Board of Councilors or return to Clark County Citizens United, Inc.

Signature: Bethany Huegel

Address: 16301 NE 162nd Ave

Bellevue, WA 98004

Thank you for your comments and support!

Comments: CCCU is doing a terrific job. Their voice echoes mine.
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CCCW WOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR SUPPORT, COMMENTS AND CONCERNS REGARDING ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES.

Clark County Citizens United, Inc. supports most of the proposed changes in alternative 4 that help to rectify many non-conforming lots that resulted from the 1994 Comprehensive Plan adoption. Alt 4 is the only alternative offered that attempts to reverse the massive down zoning.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

☐ 1. Rural and resource zoning must reflect existing development patterns.

☐ 2. Adopt 1 AC, 2.5 AC and 5 AC. Rural zones to recognize and allow for smaller existing residential parcels.

☐ 3. Adopt 2.5 AC, 5 AC agriculture zones to recognize and allow for smaller and more affordable farms.

☐ 4. Adopt 5 AC, 10 AC forest zones to recognize and allow smaller more affordable private owned woodlots.

☐ 5. Remove urban reserve/urban holding land overlays that have been locked in 10 AC zoning for approximately 20 years.

☐ 6. Adopt cluster development options in all rural and resource lands to conserve prime soils while allowing for more land use and housing options.

Please sign below to include your name and address and drop this form in the drop box for the Clark County Board of Councilors or return to Clark County Citizens United, Inc.

Signature: Derek Huagel

Address: 16504 NE 102nd Ave
            Battle Ground, WA 98604

Thank you for your comments and support!

Comments: I am very supportive of matching lot sizes to the surrounding parcels. It only makes sense to keep 1 acre pieces whether 1 acre pieces etc. Thank you for taking my thoughts into consideration.
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CCCW WOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR SUPPORT, COMMENTS AND CONCERNS REGARDING ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES IN ALTERNATIVE 4 THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION.

Alt 4 is the only alternative offered that attempts to reverse the massive down zoning.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

✓ 1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.
✓ 2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC RURAL ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS
✓ 3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.
✓ 4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE OWNED WOODLOTS
✓ 5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/ URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS
✓ 6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND DROP THIS FORM IN THE DROP BOX FOR THE CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS OR RETURN TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC.

SIGNATURE ____________________________

ADDRESS: P.O. BOX 115

Battle Ground, WA 98604

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

COMMENTS: ___________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________
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For the Public Record - WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT HOCKINSON HIGH SCHOOL, 16819 NE 159th STREET - BRUSH PRAIRIE, WN.

CCCU WOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR SUPPORT, COMMENTS AND CONCERNS REGARDING ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES IN ALTERNATIVE 4 THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION. Alt 4 is the only alternative offered that attempts to reverse the massive down zoning.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT:

X 1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.
X 2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC. RURAL ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS
X 3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.
X 4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES TO RECOGNIZE AND ALLOW SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE OWNED WOODLOTS
X 5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/ URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS
X 6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND DROP THIS FORM IN THE DROP BOX FOR THE CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS OR RETURN TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC.

SIGNATURE:

ADDRESS: 12108 NE 192nd Ave

BRUSH PRAIRIE 98606

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

COMMENTS:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
To the Board of Clark County Commissioners,

: For the record, Support for Consideration of Alternative 4A

Dear Board of Commissioners,

I would like to go on record as supporting Alternative 4A proposal of the comprehensive plan update. This would allow larger parcels surrounded by smaller parcels to be considered for lot sizes similar to the surrounding parcels. (2) 20 Acre + (1) 40 Acre Parcel (Parcel #251000000)

Specifically, I own property at Dale Valley Rd, Yacolt WA (250987000), and am in favor of changing the lot size to reflect the proposed FR 10 zoning.

Thank you,

Andrew Muniz

* THIS WOULD MAKE OUR PROPERTY CLOSER TO CONFORMING TO NEIGHBORING PROPERTY. * GET RID OF SPOT ZONING.

Name

Signature

25906 NE Deer Ridge Rd, Yacolt WA 98675

Address
To the Board of Clark County Commissioners,

Re: For the record, Support for Consideration of Alternative 4A

Dear Board of Commissioners,

I would like to go on record as supporting Alternative 4A proposal of the comprehensive plan update. This would allow larger parcels surrounded by smaller parcels to be considered for lot sizes similar to the surrounding parcels.

Specifically, I own property at tax lot 12/22/23 (261004-006), and am in favor of changing the lot size to reflect the proposed __FRID__ zoning.

Thank you,

[Signature]

Name: Owen Kysar

Address: 2107 NW 10th Way, Battle Ground, WA 98604
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM
March/April 2015

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Deborah Folkerts
Address: 12816 NE 89th Ave

Open house location: □ March 25, Ridgefield High School, 2724 South Hillhurst Road, Ridgefield
☑ April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson

Comment:
I would like more information provided regarding tax consequences of plan #2 and plan #4. I do not feel that ag or forestry residents are being fully informed.

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:
E-mail address: debfolkerts@gmail.com

Other ways to comment:
Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments
Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

E-mail your comment to us:
comp.plan@clark.wa.gov

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOCC Hearing.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Dianne Kocer

Address: 17818

Open house location: □ March 25, Ridgefield High School, 2724 South Hillhurst Road, Ridgefield
☑ April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson

Comment:

Farm land and open space land is important to the health and welfare of our community. Unspoiled farm land should never be used for industrial parks. I am very much in favor of the use of industrial parks but the placement should be on land that will never be used, could never be used for food production. The Port of Vancouver and Ridgefield sites like the former Allison location on ladder, and other somewhat aging area little used strip mall should be considered where feasible those areas will never again be farm.

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: diannekmx@gmail.com

Other ways to comment:

Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

E-mail your comment to us:
comp.plan@clark.wa.gov

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOCC Hearing.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Goodwin

Address: 6614 NE 139th St

Open house location:  
☐ March 25, Ridgefield High School, 2724 South Hillhurst Road, Ridgefield  
☒ April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson

Comment:

I was a member on Cowlitz Planning Commission in 1993 and we were told my parcel would be brought into Grohe in 5-10 years max. I was down zoned from 2.5 acres to 1/10 acres, the new plan now makes me 5 acres, what is that about??!

The south of my road is R-1.75 and but I违法

But no sewer and the city says to sewer

in my lifetime if you don’t want me in city

Can I split in 1/2 lots ?? which believe

was viable at one time.

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: goodwing@gmail.com

Other ways to comment:

Submit a comment on the web:  
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

E-mail your comment to us:  
comp_plan@clark.wa.gov

Submit a comment in writing:  
Clark County Community Planning  
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives  
P.O. Box 9810  
Vancouver, WA 98666

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOCC Hearing.

Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.

We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM
March/April 2015

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Neal Blomquist
Address: 16311 N.E. 250th St. Battle Ground, WA 98604

Open house location: □ March 25, Ridgefield High School, 2724 South Hillhurst Road, Ridgefield
☑ April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson

Comment:
I like Councilor Madoves plan for future land use planning because it will open or make available more parcels of land for folks that want to live in the country.

Note: The more parcels that become available the more moderating or downward push will be on prices.

Thanks
Neal Blomquist
Ph. 687-5034

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address:________________________________________________________

Other ways to comment:
Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

E-mail your comment to us:
comp.plan@clark.wa.gov

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOCC Hearing.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
<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>Allison Fulton</td>
<td>6214 N.W. 17th St, Ridgefield, WA</td>
<td>98042</td>
<td>Fulton <a href="mailto:A6@comcast.net">A6@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>☐-YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Zimmerly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:dennisz@millerzimmerly.com">dennisz@millerzimmerly.com</a></td>
<td>☐-YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrett Hoyt</td>
<td>27412 NE 72nd Ave, Battle Ground</td>
<td>98604</td>
<td><a href="mailto:garretthoyt@gmail.com">garretthoyt@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>☐-YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelia Reynolds</td>
<td>5309 NE 73rd Ave, Battle Ground</td>
<td>98604</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Butch@Stagel20.com">Butch@Stagel20.com</a></td>
<td>☐-YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Schramm</td>
<td>1821 NE 179th St, Ridgefield, WA</td>
<td>98612</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐-YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alanie Krogstad</td>
<td>P.O. BOX 2020</td>
<td>98629</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐-YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornelia Lee</td>
<td></td>
<td>98692</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐-YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katie Gillespie</td>
<td></td>
<td>98684</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kaitin.gillespie@comcast.net">kaitin.gillespie@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>☐-YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheri Rayburn</td>
<td>3100 NE 221 Way, Redmond, WA</td>
<td>98052</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐-YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Ranges</td>
<td>17415 NE 92nd Ave, Battle Ground</td>
<td>98042</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐-YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Sullivan</td>
<td>2211 N.W. 179th St, Ridgefield, WA</td>
<td>98692</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐-YES</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>JEFF NITEN</td>
<td><a href="mailto:JEFF.NITEN@CI.RIDGEFIELD">JEFF.NITEN@CI.RIDGEFIELD</a></td>
<td>98642</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy McIntyre</td>
<td>16515 NW 41ST AV, Ridges</td>
<td>98642</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Snowchic@centurylink.net">Snowchic@centurylink.net</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daryl Wittenheimer</td>
<td>21300 NE 62ND AVE B.C.</td>
<td>98629</td>
<td><a href="mailto:WittenheimerT@MSN.com">WittenheimerT@MSN.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted Erickson</td>
<td>36116 NE 41ST AVE LAUREL</td>
<td>98642</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Ted.Intestate@t4.com">Ted.Intestate@t4.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Vandekeoo</td>
<td>4716 N.W. 16TH RIDGEFIELD</td>
<td>98642</td>
<td><a href="mailto:TVL-Berries270@aol.com">TVL-Berries270@aol.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuck Holsinger</td>
<td>P.O. BOX 1407</td>
<td>98642</td>
<td>cholsinger@pr WW.com</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Taylor</td>
<td>P.O. BOX 1537</td>
<td>98642</td>
<td>david D Taylor @ Comcast</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Ley</td>
<td>444 NW FREMONT CAMAS</td>
<td>98607</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Pilot-IPL@aol.com">Pilot-IPL@aol.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd Klein</td>
<td>32413 NE KELLY RD. YACHT</td>
<td>98675</td>
<td>todd @ renorthwest.com</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan Bestul</td>
<td>7607 NE 299TH ST</td>
<td>98604</td>
<td><a href="mailto:BJBestul@Juno.com">BJBestul@Juno.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda Smeller</td>
<td>PO BOX 9 WOODLAND, WA</td>
<td>98644</td>
<td><a href="mailto:SmellerK@ci.woodland.wa">SmellerK@ci.woodland.wa</a></td>
<td></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>Wendy Levanen</td>
<td>24209 NE 53rd Ave</td>
<td>98664</td>
<td><a href="mailto:wlevanen@hotmail.com">wlevanen@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pam Kampe</td>
<td>4413 N 169th St</td>
<td>98642</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Pam_krose_1549@msn.com">Pam_krose_1549@msn.com</a></td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Sasse</td>
<td>P.O. Box 483 Yacolt</td>
<td>98675</td>
<td><a href="mailto:donsasse@gmail.com">donsasse@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al &amp; Lois Matson</td>
<td>20211 NE Yacolt Mt Rd</td>
<td>98675</td>
<td><a href="mailto:matsonhome1983@hotmail.com">matsonhome1983@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DJ Melroy</td>
<td>707 SE Scott St</td>
<td>98642</td>
<td><a href="mailto:DJ_Melroy@Aol.com">DJ_Melroy@Aol.com</a></td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Harmon</td>
<td>5001 NW 189th St</td>
<td>98642</td>
<td></td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darren Weitz</td>
<td>658 N 32nd Ave</td>
<td>98642</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Darren_Weitz@Clark.wa.com">Darren_Weitz@Clark.wa.com</a></td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick Lykess</td>
<td>8007 NE 51st Ave</td>
<td>98642</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ricklykess11@msn.com">ricklykess11@msn.com</a></td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cammie Hoffman</td>
<td>17410 NE 30th St</td>
<td>98675</td>
<td>camhoff@<a href="mailto:4@hotmail.com">4@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Decke</td>
<td>215 W 4th St Ste 209</td>
<td>98660</td>
<td><a href="mailto:edecke@jetplanning.net">edecke@jetplanning.net</a></td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Jeffries</td>
<td>P.O. Box 1120</td>
<td>98642</td>
<td><a href="mailto:msJeffries7@msn.com">msJeffries7@msn.com</a></td>
<td>☑ YES</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>Jim Malinowski</td>
<td>P.O. Box 127 Amby 98601</td>
<td>98601</td>
<td><a href="mailto:j.malinowski@ieee.org">j.malinowski@ieee.org</a></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Netzer</td>
<td>6208 N.W. 196th St.</td>
<td>98647</td>
<td><a href="mailto:netz44@comcast.net">netz44@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Lavenen</td>
<td>17614 NE 299th St. Yacolt, Wash.</td>
<td>98675</td>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Grimm</td>
<td>17407 NW 61st Ave Ridgefield, WA</td>
<td>98642</td>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Haymaker</td>
<td>2170 S 26th Ave Ridgefield</td>
<td>98642</td>
<td><a href="mailto:thaymaker@comcast.net">thaymaker@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Day</td>
<td>111 5th St. GALLETTO Ridgefield</td>
<td>98642</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dayelso@comcast.net">dayelso@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Grant</td>
<td>26716 NE 96th Ct. Battle Ground, WA</td>
<td>98604</td>
<td><a href="mailto:margaretg.grant@9mail.com">margaretg.grant@9mail.com</a></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick + Thelma Murphy</td>
<td>3069 NW 166th St Ridgefield, WA</td>
<td>98642</td>
<td>STRIPEDPANDORA &amp; HOTMAIL.COM</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis + Gail Nutter</td>
<td>1509 NW 339th St LA Center</td>
<td>98629</td>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam Kluka</td>
<td>7021 NW Pliedt Strunk St Camas, WA 98607</td>
<td>98607</td>
<td><a href="mailto:a.kluka@bhsnhs.com">a.kluka@bhsnhs.com</a></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Keltz</td>
<td>Clark County</td>
<td></td>
<td>Clark County</td>
<td>NO</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>DAVE WESTON</td>
<td>9600NE 126th Ave Suite 2520</td>
<td>98032</td>
<td>DAVEW@A KS-ENGI.COM</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Hughes</td>
<td>PO Box 458 Ridgefield</td>
<td>98642</td>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel MacGinn</td>
<td>19503 NW 41st Av Ridgefield</td>
<td>98642</td>
<td><a href="mailto:joelm@peoplepc.com">joelm@peoplepc.com</a></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Zimmer</td>
<td>1311 NW 2nd Ave, Apt 25 1300</td>
<td>98055</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Kathleenzimmer28@yahoo.com">Kathleenzimmer28@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARVIN GERIN</td>
<td>2115 NE 10th Ave</td>
<td>98012</td>
<td><a href="mailto:MDGERIN@YAHOO.COM">MDGERIN@YAHOO.COM</a></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troy Uskoski</td>
<td>26011 NE Deer Ridge Rd</td>
<td>98675</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tuskoski@hotmail.com">tuskoski@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tina Pichioni</td>
<td>313 NW 88 St</td>
<td>98065</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Tina.maria4@gmail.com">Tina.maria4@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Dudley</td>
<td>1717 N Falcon Ridgefield</td>
<td>98642</td>
<td><a href="mailto:chrisrushdudley@yahoo.com">chrisrushdudley@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverly Jones</td>
<td>412 NW 279th St</td>
<td>98642</td>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Toscana</td>
<td>702 NE 199th St</td>
<td>98642</td>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Yoshin</td>
<td>20716 NE 10th Av</td>
<td>98012</td>
<td><a href="mailto:newyoshin@hotmail.com">newyoshin@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td>NO</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>Red Warren</td>
<td>6806 N. 58th St Vanc</td>
<td>98661</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pauline Warren</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Rykow</td>
<td>26706 NE Rotschy Mill Rd Yakut</td>
<td>98675</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John R. Awall</td>
<td>26706 NE Rotschy Mill Rd Yakut</td>
<td>98675</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tischbein</td>
<td>1119 NW 131st Way Apt A</td>
<td>98685</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEATHER Tischbein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Consloe</td>
<td>1195 N 1st W</td>
<td>98647</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consloe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savvy Schutz</td>
<td>1606</td>
<td>98675</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerald Jones</td>
<td>412 N W, 27965</td>
<td>98675</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Manuf</td>
<td>City of Camas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinah Levaun</td>
<td>16701 NE 223rd Cir.</td>
<td>98604</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malo Levaun</td>
<td>Same as above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan South</td>
<td>20540 NE Allworth Rd</td>
<td>98609</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan Touppe</td>
<td>8908 SW Crawford Farm 2010</td>
<td>98609</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>Irina Needleman</td>
<td>3011 S. 25th St. Ridgefield, WA 98642</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy Greene</td>
<td>28401 NE 2nd Ave. Ridgefield, WA 98642</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Stope</td>
<td>2085 S. 20th Ave. Ridgefield, WA 98642</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leah Higgins</td>
<td>17410 NE 29th St. Yacolt, WA 98675</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathan Elk</td>
<td>28000 NE 170th Ave. Yacolt, WA 98675</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bianca Barson</td>
<td>2211 NW Coyote Ridge La Center, WA 98629</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave &amp; Alea Beck</td>
<td>8909 NE 223rd Circle BG 98604</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent Landerman</td>
<td>PO Box 38 Ridgefield, WA 98642</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Kromming</td>
<td>19514 NE 20th Ave. Ridgefield, WA 98642</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Harry</td>
<td>18305 NE 50th Ave. 98686</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitch Krugman</td>
<td>1701 C St. Hudson, WA 98671</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee Wells</td>
<td>1288 S. 45th Ave. 98642</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>Virgil Williams</td>
<td>303 Carriage Rd</td>
<td>98642</td>
<td><a href="mailto:eric@vpmrxx.com">eric@vpmrxx.com</a></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Cordova</td>
<td>30718 NW 10TH CT</td>
<td>98642</td>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Dewitz</td>
<td>1801 NW 97th Ave</td>
<td>98642</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Peter.dewitz@Gmail.com">Peter.dewitz@Gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Val Alexandru</td>
<td>2411 NW Coyote Ridge Rd</td>
<td>98642</td>
<td><a href="mailto:coyotridge@TDS.NET">coyotridge@TDS.NET</a></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy Matz</td>
<td>4801 N 10TH St</td>
<td>98642</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Juma.Tee@gmail.com">Juma.Tee@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaylord Thomas</td>
<td>27510 NE Rotschy Rd</td>
<td>98675</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Weber</td>
<td>19111 NW 67th Ave</td>
<td>98642</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ConfluenceWinery@aol.com">ConfluenceWinery@aol.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Lanhead</td>
<td>214 N NW 62X</td>
<td>98642</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Maid</td>
<td>10601 NW 32X</td>
<td>98642</td>
<td><a href="mailto:JimMaid@m1foster.com">JimMaid@m1foster.com</a></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Levens</td>
<td>20700 NE 10th Ave</td>
<td>98642</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nutmomma1@comcast.net">nutmomma1@comcast.net</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mana Salazar</td>
<td>P.O. Box 20Y</td>
<td>98642</td>
<td><a href="mailto:builduamerica.Salazar@gmail.com">builduamerica.Salazar@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>NO</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>Virgil Williams</td>
<td>2722 NE 170th St</td>
<td>98642</td>
<td>JRGWILL @ MSN.COM</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reeter Kase</td>
<td>6880 NE 175th St</td>
<td>98642</td>
<td>JRG@ MCI.COM</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audrey Miller</td>
<td>2505 Grant St</td>
<td>98660</td>
<td><a href="mailto:audreyanna.miller89@gmail.com">audreyanna.miller89@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Beall</td>
<td>312 Rieves Dr</td>
<td>98645</td>
<td>karen_beall @ comcast.net</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Irm</td>
<td>1915 NE 42nd Ct</td>
<td>98642</td>
<td>irwin36 @ msn.com</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred Pickering</td>
<td>21546 NE Luci</td>
<td>98675</td>
<td>fredp @ yacolt . com</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stacey Ripter</td>
<td>P.O. Box 149</td>
<td>98642</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dobbinsfarms@gmail.com">dobbinsfarms@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quint Powell</td>
<td>1715 NE coke Rd</td>
<td>98604</td>
<td>Chippie creek@gmai</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herb Kannon</td>
<td>31211 NE Kelly Rd</td>
<td>98675</td>
<td>hjkennon @ msn.com</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Scherer</td>
<td>806 NW 121st St</td>
<td>98685</td>
<td>LarryScherer @ AOL.COM</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Stephens</td>
<td>22500 NE WH Garner Rd</td>
<td>98675</td>
<td></td>
<td>NO</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>Bill Kimbale</td>
<td>129 Pond Ave.</td>
<td>98617</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derek Kysar</td>
<td>PO Box 178 Yakima</td>
<td>98675</td>
<td>Derek K@northwestabintra</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Earnst</td>
<td>10105 NE 180th Cir.</td>
<td>98064</td>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Schlatter</td>
<td>16716 NW 63rd Ave. Ridgefield, WA.</td>
<td>98642</td>
<td>SCHLATTER <a href="mailto:200505@COMCAST.NET">200505@COMCAST.NET</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Pincusen</td>
<td>30101 NE 150th Ave.</td>
<td>98029</td>
<td><a href="mailto:spincusen3@comcast.net">spincusen3@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Delquist</td>
<td>150 NE 1st Lane Columbia, WA</td>
<td>98611</td>
<td><a href="mailto:s.delquist@gmail.com">s.delquist@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls in Hawaii</td>
<td>328 12th Ave.</td>
<td>98639</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ahiivale@me.com">ahiivale@me.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don McIsaac</td>
<td>25415 NE 146th W.</td>
<td>98606</td>
<td><a href="mailto:donald.mcisaac@msn.com">donald.mcisaac@msn.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Rasmussen</td>
<td>PO Box 803 La Center, WA.</td>
<td>98629</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>Peter Sullivan</td>
<td>34817 NE 250 AVE</td>
<td>98629</td>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pete Small</td>
<td>PO Box 1415, Ridgefield</td>
<td>98642</td>
<td><a href="mailto:p_small@hotmail.com">p_small@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Levine</td>
<td>24205 NE 13th Ave</td>
<td>98604</td>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell Rotschy</td>
<td>Vancouver, WA 98665</td>
<td>98665</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cornellr@rotschyrinc.com">cornellr@rotschyrinc.com</a></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Steward</td>
<td>2300 Pioneer Street,</td>
<td>98642</td>
<td><a href="mailto:stewart@stewartridgefield.com">stewart@stewartridgefield.com</a></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Shuman</td>
<td>PO Box 98 Ridgefield</td>
<td>98642</td>
<td><a href="mailto:f_shuman@mac.com">f_shuman@mac.com</a></td>
<td>NO</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>Kathy Stephenson</td>
<td>22500 NE Wh Garner Rd</td>
<td>98675</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Reisback</td>
<td>PO Box 339</td>
<td>98642</td>
<td><a href="mailto:reisicks@comcast.net">reisicks@comcast.net</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To: Board of County Commissioners of Clark County  
County Community Planning Staff  
From: Friends of Clark County  
For the Record: Open House at Ridgefield, 3/25/15

Friends of Clark County is a 501 (C) (3) with a “smart growth” mission. We are “watch-dogs” who are concerned about violations of both GMP process and GMA laws. These can have large financial consequences to the County.

We worry about procedural flaws in the process for forming the Clark County’s Comprehensive Growth Management Plan (CGMP or Comprehensive Plan). Most of them involve Alternative 4, called a “Rural Alternative”, but which we call a “Suburban Sprawl Alternative”.

One councilor seems to have taken over the process, making a “wish list” alternative. This seems to have been built from asking individuals who testify and come to outreach meetings “What can I do for you to solve your problem or make things better”? Development of the Alternatives is usually accomplished within the executive branch of government. The co-option by the legislative branch is far out of the usual process.

Secondly, only one "special interest group" (CCCU, Clark County Citizens United) has been included at the table for discussion and it has been treated as the only representatives of the rural community. The agricultural community has been ignored. Further, we (FOCC) have asked to be at the table as representatives of financial and process concerns. We are supporting staff recommendations and disagree with the reductions in minimum lot sizes. The agricultural community sees the decrease in agricultural lot sizes as destructive to the future of agriculture, especially in the increased cost of farmland. (See the 3/3/15 BOCC hearing for lots of input from our farmers and fans of local foods).

Further, the 4th alternative is not yet fixed and defined well enough to do an EIS. It must predict the # of potential new residences to inform the basis for an EIS. It needs a staff report that includes # of parcels, # built, # possible new houses. Exactly how “executive action” will add parcels to prevent “spot zoning”. It needs sums of acres for each category plus overall total, and a list of possible legal problems as presented at the last open house.

The GMA required (past tense) a well-defined Alternative 4 at least 10 days before the first public open house. The public open houses are March 25 and April 1. The last inadequate version was issued on 3/20/15. Thus, this Alternative 4 is already out of compliance with the GMA, which is currently Washington State Law.
1. How will you provide the services and infrastructure in the rural area under Alternative 4?

2. Have Alternatives been reviewed and recommended by Planning or attorneys to determine best approach and recommendations?

3. For all cities, especially Battle Ground, Ridgefield and LaCenter, creating the smaller agriculture zones around the perimeters of the cities will break up large parcels of land that future employers will need to create jobs. Specifically at the Ridgefield I-5 Junction, our solid businesses are there in large part because of big farms, under single ownership, and were brought into Ridgefield’s urban area. For future expansion, employers have been and are still looking for these large parcels next to the city’s infrastructure and urban growth area. The large parcels surrounding the cities are few in quantity, making the situation worse. If you make smaller plots and zoning, then the cities will be hemmed in. There will be less ability to support future businesses and employers beyond what is already in place within the urban growth area. JOBS, JOBS, JOBS. Don’t break up the land to sacrifice the large adjacent agriculture acreage.

4. For the Alternative 4, and those rural (non-agricultural) parcels to be re-zoned, there might be no new lots created, but there are also no new rights created. There’s no clear benefit that we can see for the landowners the County is targeting. Danger of future rezones of other rural parcels, creating more, and smaller, lots will surround the City, kill redevelopment potential, and tax our collective services without compensating for them to move more people to the rural areas where there are not currently services to support them. Ridgefield is aggressively pursuing options and paths to support more people and employers with the services needed.
I own acreage in the unincorporated area.

The fourth option is a potential disaster for our county. Suggesting that it does little more than bring currently legal, non-compliant properties into the zoning limits is disingenuous at best. These lots are already presumed legal. The owners of them face no penalties. Backers of the fourth option pretend that there is a grave problem when non exists.

Clearly, the fourth option is a device that would allow the development of rural properties into McMansion suburbs.

If the fourth option is included for review, will it require a more comprehensive EIS than if the county stuck with option One and made no changes?

Who will pay for the more comprehensive EIS?

Who will pay for the inevitable lawsuits and years of appeals? I will certainly help fight it, for one.

Option One is the most settled in the courts and would presumably cost the County the least money and time. It also has the benefit of maintaining the rural heritage of Clark County, maintaining valuable forest and agricultural land, as well as not adding appreciably to traffic, septic and water quality problems.

Please use option one, with no changes,
Chris Rush Dudley
1717 N Falcon
Ridgefield, WA 98642
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM
March/April 2015

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Karen Beall

Address: 312 Riverview Dr, Ridgefield

Open house location: ✗ March 25, Ridgefield High School, 2724 South Hillhurst Road, Ridgefield
   ☐ April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson

Comment:
1. Why is Alt 4 being pushed above the other, better studied, alternatives? This did not feel like an open forum, but instead, like Alt 4 was pre-determined by the moderators, plus too many people care only about their "lot".
2. This country will be "California'd" if Alt 4 is chosen, eliminating R-10 & 20 for small plots, eliminating A6 & 20 for homes & small forest areas. We need farms, good forests, not just How's
3. I'm sure this is a waste of my time, as I know what David Madore wants.

David Madore gets.

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: karen_beall@comcast.net

Other ways to comment:
Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

E-mail your comment to us:
comp.plan@clark.wa.gov

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOC C Hearing.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
Here are some comments I hope you will consider:

The underlying value, here, is to balance property owners’ rights with the interests of the community at large, while providing environmental protection and some consideration for Regional and State interests.

That said, I believe that large parcels along I-5 and 205 (especially near interchanges and potential interchanges), and along other major transportation corridors, must be preserved with large parcel zoning (20 acres or more) to permit acquisition by light industry, except where smaller retail opportunities make sense. This creates jobs, decreases commutes, and adds to the local economy. Zoning should permit small retail ("Mom and Pop") operations in rural areas to provide essential services, but should otherwise discourage small parcel zoning and subdivisions, except in urban areas and in case-by-case situations adjacent to areas already subdivided.

From what I could tell from attending the Ridgefield H.S. open house, Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 seem to be consistent with my opinions. I perceived Alternatives 2 and 3 to be more a matter of city/county housekeeping, and found them acceptable. Alternative 4 seemed to go too far toward breaking up larger parcels to the detriment of light industrial opportunities along transportation corridors (i.e., jobs), impacting the environment (too much development in rural areas causing more hard-scape/loss of habitat), and basically putting one of the greatest things about living in Clark County, it's rural charm and beauty, at risk.

A separate, but related comment is this: Clark County is evolving into a tourist destination area, not only because of its bucolic atmosphere and scenery, but because of the burgeoning wine industry. It is, or will be, a defined viticultural area. As such, it will be advantageous from an economic and enjoyment of living standpoint for the county to allow, even encourage, vineyard development by protecting larger parcels in rural areas before they are swallowed up by development.

Thank you for considering my comments,

Pete Small
P.O. Box 1415
Ridgefield, WA 98642
(360) 887-3277
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM

March/April 2015

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Kathleen Zimmer

Address: 13717 NW 2nd Ave. Apt 45 → Vancouver, WA

Open house location: ☑ March 25, Ridgefield High School, 2724 South Hillhurst Road, Ridgefield
☐ April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson

Comment:

Very well organized—one gentleman was super-knowledgeable (Gordy Euter). Good interested crowd! Please keep me apprised.

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: kathleenzimmer28@yahoo.com

Other ways to comment:

Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

E-mail your comment to us:
comp.plan@clark.wa.gov

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOCC Hearing.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM
March/April 2015

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Donald G. Holsinger

Address: 21510 NW 21st Place Ridgefield WA 98642

Open house location: ☑ March 25, Ridgefield High School, 2724 South Hillhurst Road, Ridgefield
☐ April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson

Comment:

Alternate #4 provides much deserved relief from overly restrictive land use policy. I believe all parcels designated under alternate #4 (or 5 acres or more) should be allowed to customary divide these lots without unreasonably costly conditions.

Also believe reserve designation on properties around NE 10th Ave & 219th Street should be addressed by blending current and properly zoning property for immediate developments.

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: DG.Holsinger.LLC@gmail.com

Other ways to comment:

Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2015update/comments

E-mail your comment to us:
comp.plans@clark.wa.gov

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOCC Hearing.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM
March/April 2015

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Wendy Lemon

Address: 2409 NE 53rd Ave, Battle Ground 98604

Open house location: ☑ March 25, Ridgefield High School, 2724 South Hillhurst Road, Ridgefield
☐ April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson

Comment:

I would like to propose changing Alt. 4 to include 2400 NE 53rd Ave, B6, to change from 5 acre to 51/2 acre lots, 34401 NE Kelly Rd to change to 5 acre lots, and our property adjacent to the City of Yacolt, to change from 20 acre to 1 acre lots. The Yacolt property touches City limits and it seems unreasonable to have a 20 acre lot that close to City limits. I believe lot sizes should be 10 acres or less in all of Clark County.

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: wlevenen@hotmail.com

Other ways to comment:
Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

E-mail your comment to us:
comp_plan@clark.wa.gov

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOC Hearing.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.

"Comprehensive Plan Alternative comments in subject line"
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM
March/April 2015

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Scott Levanen
Address: 24209 NE 53rd Ave, Battle Ground 98604

Open house location: ☑ March 25, Ridgefield High School, 2724 South Hillhurst Road, Ridgefield
☐ April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson

Comment:

I support Alternative 9A for private landowner rights to subdivide properties to smaller lot sizes.

Personal interests include these properties:
- 24209 NE 53rd Ave. Bdr
- 39407 NE Kelly Rd, Yacolt

Our property adjacent to City limits that is zoned R20 acres.

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address:

Other ways to comment:
Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

E-mail your comment to us:
comp_plan@clark.wa.gov

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOCC Hearing.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM
March/April 2015

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Albert J. Matson
Address: 20311 NE Yacolt Mttn Rd Yacolt WA 98675

Open house location: ☐ March 25, Ridgefield High School, 2724 South Hillhurst Road, Ridgefield
☐ April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson

Comment:

I am writing regarding properties zoned FR-80. I own tax parcels 23027000 & 230302000, 2 40’s to make 1 FR-80 bldg site. Around me are smaller lots, I’d like the opportunity to divide to at least 10 acre parcels.

I am in support of Alternative 4A at this juncture.

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: Al@sierraconcretefoundations.com

Other ways to comment:
Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

E-mail your comment to us:
comp.plan@clark.wa.gov

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOCC Hearing.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM
March/April 2015

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Troy L. Uskoski

Address: 26011 NE Deer Ridge Rd Yacolt WA 98675

Open house location: ☐ March 25, Ridgefield High School, 2724 South Hillhurst Road, Ridgefield
☐ April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson

Comment:

My neighbors and I own large parcels adjacent to R-5 zoning. Originally we proposed changing our FR80 zone to R-5. Realizing that the state won't allow this drastic of a change, we are hoping that we could be rezoned to the proposed minimum sized FR lot (FR-10) to more closely match our R-5 neighbors

Troy Uskoski Parcel #: 267189000
Jay Vroman Parcel #: 267197000
Michael Tapani Parcel #: 986029713

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: tuskoski@hotmail.com

Other ways to comment:
Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments
Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

E-mail your comment to us:
comp.plan@clark.wa.gov

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOCC Hearing.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM
March/April 2015

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Donald McIsaac

Address: 28915 NE 145th St 9806

Open house location: ☐ March 25, Ridgefield High School, 2724 South Hillhurst Road, Ridgefield
☐ April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson

Comment:

________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: ____________________________________________

Other ways to comment:
Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

E-mail your comment to us:
comp.plan@clark.wa.gov

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOCC Hearing.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: 

Address: 21546 NE Lucia Falls

Open house location: □ March 25, Ridgefield High School, 2724 South Hillhurst Road, Ridgefield
□ April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson

Comment:

#4 still has a lot of spot zoning and a lot of non-conforming lot. I would like to see 90% of the lot conforming.

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: fredp@yacolt.com

Other ways to comment:

Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

E-mail your comment to us:
cmp-plan@clark.wa.gov

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOCC Hearing.

Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Dan Kromminga

Address: 19519 NE 26th Ave Ridgefield, WA 98642

Open house location: ☑ March 25, Ridgefield High School, 2724 South Hillhurst Road, Ridgefield
☐ April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson

Comment:

we own 80 Acres of property that is presently zoned Ag-20. The Alternative 4 proposal will zone 14 Ag-10, I feel this is not small enough as our property is bordered on 2 sides by 20 acre zones and 1 acre parcels on the 3rd with lake river bottom on the 4th. I feel our property needs to reflect the rural character of those around it, which would be R-2yr zoned. Our property also has two public water to it. I am in favor of Alternative 4 but it needs to be more generous.

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: 

Other ways to comment:

Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOCC Hearing.

Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process. We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM
March/April 2015

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Adam KLUKA

Address: 7221 NW FRIEGAL STRUNK ST. CAMAS WA 98607

Open house location: □ March 25, Ridgefield High School, 2724 South Hillhurst Road, Ridgefield
□ April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson

Comment:

I AGREE WITH ALT. 4: TO CORRECT FISHS IN LEGAL LOTS

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address:

Other ways to comment:

Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016-update/comments

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

E-mail your comment to us:
comp.plan@clark.wa.gov

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOCC Hearing.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM
March/April 2015

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Ted & Della Erickson
Address: 36115 NE 41st AVE - LAUNFTER

Open house location: ☑ March 25, Ridgefield High School, 2724 South Hillhurst Road, Ridgefield
☐ April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson

Comment:

I Support Alternative #4
I would like to see a more aggressive approach making (AB 20) to 5 ACREs

Thank you.

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address:

Other ways to comment:
Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments
E-mail your comment to us:
comp.plan@clark.wa.gov

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOCC Hearing.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Pauline Warren

Address: 6800 NE 58th St, Vancouver, WA 98661

Open house location: ☑ March 25, Ridgefield High School, 2724 South Hillhurst Road, Ridgefield
☐ April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson

Comment:

A support Alternative 4 - which best coincides with reputable rural character and predominant lot sizes as stated in your material. This makes the most sense, and recognizes the present realities where many smaller family farms are becoming common.

Many thanks for your efforts. It's hard to distinguish some colors or understand some designations. More clarity would be helpful.

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: pauline.wred@wa.net.com

Other ways to comment:

Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

E-mail your comment to us:
comp.plan@clark.wa.gov

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOCC Hearing.

Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM
March/April 2015

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Gary Lawhead
Address: 21414 NW 67th Ave Ridgefield, WA 98642

Open house location: ☑ March 25, Ridgefield High School, 2724 South Hillhurst Road, Ridgefield
☐ April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson

Comment:

Support the continued efforts to provide Rural/Ag Landowners with flexibility on their property for division for children and/or sale.
Prefer AS-20 to AS-5

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: GCLawhead@msn.com

Other ways to comment:

Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

E-mail your comment to us:
comp.plan@clark.wa.gov

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOCC Hearing.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM

March/April 2015

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: R.J. WAREN

Address: 6800 N. E. 58TH ST VANC

Open house location: ☑ March 25, Ridgefield High School, 2724 South Hillhurst Road, Ridgefield
  ☐ April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson

Comment:

Support Alternative #4

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address:____________________________________________________________

Other ways to comment:

Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

E-mail your comment to us:
comp.plan@clark.wa.gov

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOCC Hearing.

Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.

We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM
March/April 2015

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Tom Haymaker

Address: 2170 S 26th Ave

Open house location:  ☑  March 25, Ridgefield High School, 2724 South Hillhurst Road, Ridgefield
              □  April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson

Comment:

Alternative 4 seems to be a reasonable approach to allow those who own land to manage it as they see fit. It would also have an added benefit of providing more housing alternatives which will help with low and affordable housing.

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: 

Other ways to comment:

Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

E-mail your comment to us:
comp.plan@clark.wa.gov

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOCC Hearing.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM
March/April 2015

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Sheila Reynolds (Ali over Butch Reynolds - Shari Reynolds)

Address: 5304 NE 233rd St Battle Ground WA. 98604

Open house location: ☑ March 25, Ridgefield High School, 2724 South Hillhurst Road, Ridgefield
☐ April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson

Comment:

We live on a 5 acre parcel off of 50th with 2.5 acre parcels behind us in a block (from Comprehensive Plan thy before and after) It is our wish to be able to sub-divide to 2.5 acre parcels as our neighbors did. We are on the boarder essentially of Ridgefield and Rural Battle Ground. We still wish to stay rural but have the ability to split the parcel.

Many thanks Sheila Reynolds

P.S. While you are planning - can you "study" the rural center in Woodside, CA. complete with horse trails, Robert's Market, Banks and small "Rural" Businesses.

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: Sheila@StageVsNow.com

Other ways to comment:

Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

E-mail your comment to us:
comp.plan@clark.wa.gov

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOCC Hearing.

Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.

We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM
March/April 2015

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Herbert Kennon

Address: 31211 NE Kelly Rd, Yacolt, WA 98675

Open house location: ☑ March 25, Ridgefield High School, 2724 South Hillhurst Road, Ridgefield
☐ April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson

Comment:

I support adoption of Update 6, Alternative #4.
It's time to recognize the value of residing in a rural area.

Herbert Kennon

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address:

Other ways to comment:
Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments
Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOCC Hearing.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM

March/April 2015

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Judy Kennon

Address: 31211 NE Kelly Rd, Yacolt, WA 98675

Open house location: ☒ March 25, Ridgefield High School, 2724 South Hillhurst Road, Ridgefield
☐ April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson

Comment:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: hjkennon@msn.com

Other ways to comment:

Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

E-mail your comment to us:
comp_plan@clark.wa.gov

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOCC Hearing.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM
March/April 2015

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Vandrin Shedd
Address: 101 NE 219 St

Open house location: ☑ March 25, Ridgefield High School, 2724 South Hillhurst Road, Ridgefield
☐ April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson

Comment:

Also we have acreage @ 18206 NE 398 St tank that is currently 2A Forest, we would appreciate changing to 10 with clusters because we want to give it to our 3 children and keep in the forest, part selling it later.

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: VSheedal@gmail.com

Other ways to comment:

Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOCC Hearing.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM
March/April 2015

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Alison Fulton

Address: __________________________________________

Open house location: ☐ March 25, Ridgefield High School, 2724 South Hillhurst Road, Ridgefield
☐ April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson

Comment:

We own 20 acres (ag-20 currently) between N.W. 199th St. & N.W. 204th Circle & N.W. 61st Ave. in Ridgefield. Both alternative 2 & 4 propose to change us to ag-10. We appreciate the proposed changes but would really like to see 5 acre lot sizes. Currently we are surrounded by 5 acre parcels on two sides. Our 20 acres sits completely unused because it is too big to take care of. We have heard from many people that would love to see the same change.

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: __________________________________________

Other ways to comment:

Submit a comment on the web: www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

E-mail your comment to us: comp.plan@clark.wa.gov

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOCC Hearing.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process. We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Jim Malinowski
Address: PO Box 127

Open house location: ☑ March 25, Ridgefield High School, 2724 South Hillhurst Road, Ridgefield
☐ April 1, Hockinson High School, 16819 NE 159th Street, Hockinson

Comment:

The county should reverse the massive downtown in 1995. The current Comp Plan clearly violates the CMA.

The new plan should eliminate most of the non-conforming lots. Alternative 4 is the best of a poor set of options.

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: _______________________

Other ways to comment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submit a comment on the web:</th>
<th>Submit a comment in writing:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments">www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments</a></td>
<td>Clark County Community Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail your comment to us:</td>
<td>Comprehensive Plan Alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:comp.plan@clark.wa.gov">comp.plan@clark.wa.gov</a></td>
<td>P.O. Box 9810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vancouver, WA 98665</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments must be received by April 9, 2014 to be presented at the April 14 BOCC Hearing.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
O'Donnell, Mary Beth

From: Mark Jeffries <msjeffries7@msn.com>

Sent: Thursday, March 26, 2015 11:27 AM

To: Cnty 2016 Comp Plan

Cc: Mark Jeffries; Bonnie Jeffries; pat jeffries; mike jeffries; Matt Jeffries; Kathleen Jeffries; mary miller; timj

Subject: Alternative 4 on the comp plan.

To whom it may concern.

Attended the comp plan meeting last night at Ridgefield High school.

Was very impressed with Alternative 4. That is my preferred preference Of all the plans shown.

It cleans up the zoning map & is a win win for all.

I vote approve alternative 4 as presented.

Mark Jeffries.
Bonnie Jeffries.
Sent from my iPad
O'Donnell, Mary Beth

From: Greg Weber <confluencewinery@aol.com>  
Sent: Thursday, March 26, 2015 2:19 PM  
To: Madore, David; McCauley, Mark; Cnty 2016 Comp Plan  
Subject: Plan 4 support

Commissioner Madore and Staff,
Thank you for the presentation last night, it’s clear to me that plan 4 is the best initial proposed plan to serve the rural property owners in this county. I do support plan 3 that addresses to expansion of the smaller city UGB's and would like to see that in addition to plan 4, though see a need to enhance and look more closely at some of the parcels in plan 4. My parcel is a R-10 remainder parcel that is 21plus acres in size. It was clustered in 1990 as a 20 acre AG piece that was later changed by the AG remand to R-10 in 1997. There is a 20 acre parcel directly to the south (our address is 19111 NW 67 Ave) that is on the plan 4 proposal to be moved to R-1. Our parcel is slated to be R-5. The difference is our parcel has PUD water to our site, the parcel to the south does not (it is also a AG 20 remainder that was changed to R-10). This is not consistent. In addition, it is critical that the potential for developable space within a parcel be considered in applying the proper zone. For example, my parcel as many large parcels around me have several acres in wildlife area and buffer space that will never be developed, only the part of my parcel surrounded by existing 1 acre parcels is my developable space. This would make the most sense.

In addition, my parcel being divided nearly a century ago should not be restricted for another unforeseeable time frame that would make it 40-50 years total between development, with services available!! That is unacceptable, we need to enhance plan 4.

David, thanks for your time on the phone this morning, it is nice to see this important issue being addressed and corrected.

Greg Weber  
Owner  
Confluence Vineyards and Winery  
Direct: 360-887-2343  
Cell: 360-608-1135

Sent from my iPad
Dear Mr. Madore,

I want to thank you for taking the time to talk with me last night at the open house. I’m the one that mentioned that I was told that your Dad attends our church. I’m writing you today to express my feelings that while Alternative 4 is a great improvement over the other alternatives and will help fix the problem we’ve had for the last 20 years of our property being held hostage, it needs to be more generous.

We own 80 acres at the corner of NW Kreiger Rd and NW 192nd St. As we discussed last night our property is presently zoned Ag-20 and apparently with alternative 4 would become Ag-10, but our property is bordered on two sides by land that is zoned Rural-2.5 and on a third side by homes on one acre lots. The fourth side is bordered by Kreiger Rd and then slopes down to the Lake River bottoms. Our property also has Clark PUD public water running along it on 192nd St. I feel our property should be zoned in a manner that represents the character of those around it.

The property as stated above is 80 acres but only about half of it is useable because the other half is made up of canyon and high quality wetlands. So there will always be about 40 acres of open space. The fact that this land is zoned for agriculture is not a good representation of the state of agriculture in this county as we used to know it. Farming is no longer a viable enterprise. Proof of this is that we rent this land to a farmer for agricultural purposes, but due to the profitability of the business the most he is willing to pay is $2000.00 per year which basically covers our costs. So you can see agriculture is no longer a thriving business here in Clark Co. as also evidenced by all the farms that used to be here and no longer exist. Another problem we have had to deal with is complaints from neighbors of our property about normal farming practices that our renter has to use to produce his crop, such as spraying herbicides, working at night, noise etc.

One question I have or need clarification on, is about the Cluster Development program for Ag. lands. It is my understanding that this program is to be reinstated again after 20 years with all the different alternatives, which would mean that will definitely be an option again come June, 2016. I would like a response back clarifying this for me please. If that becomes an option, then our neighbor is Confluence Winery and Greg mentioned about the possibility of any useable space being left from that program being used as part of a winery overlay.

Thank you for your time and consideration of this matter. Look forward to your response concerning the Cluster Development program.

Sincerely,

Jan Kromminga
Kromminga Family Limited Partnership
Thank you for considering this input from the open meeting at Ridgefield High School on the CMP alternatives. We would like you to continue with a fourth alternative that provides land-use flexibility in rural areas, with particular emphasis on adding additional landowner relief from existing zoning restrictions on F-40 areas in the Hockinson area, beyond F-20. A reasonable range of alternatives for analysis should include more F-10 designations.
O'Donnell, Mary Beth

From: DARYL TINA VEITENHEIMER <veitenheimert@msn.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 26, 2015 9:30 AM
To: Cnty 2016 Comp Plan
Subject: 2016 comp growth mang plan

I am writing in behalf I'm my mom and dad that live at 21300 ne 67 th ave in dollars corner. In 1994 they where able to make a 5 acre plot for my handy cap brother. Just after that the county with no apparent reason changed it to 20 acre minimum. Now that mom and dad are in their mid 80 s and dad in a care facility that cost mom $ 6000 a month out of pocket. I would hope that the county will take into consideration the impact that has been put on us and other people that have invested there life to prepare them for this time in their life. Back in 1964 when they bought this 52 acre of land they hope to sub divide it for times like this. If I am correct being at the meeting at Ridgefield High school and looking at option 4 that would allow us to make 5 acres parcels would ease the unknown for my parents fear of having to sell the whole farm to help with the cost of getting old. Thanks Daryl Veitenheimer

Tina/Daryl Veitenheimer
WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT RIDGEFIELD HIGH SCHOOL, 2630 SOUTH HILLHURST ROAD, RIDGEFIELD, WA. 98642

CCCWOULD LIKECOUNCILORSTOKNOWYOUCOMMENTSSREGARDING
CHANGESPROPOSEDINALTERNATIVE4FORRURALANDRESOURCEZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES TO THESE AREAS THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

✓ 1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.

✓ 2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC RURAL ZONES 
TO REFLECT SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS

✓ 3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES 
TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.

✓ 4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES 
TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE AND FAMILY OWNED WOODLOTS

✓ 5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/ URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS 
THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS

✓ 6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS 
TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND RETURN THIS FORM TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. OR CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS

SIGNATURE

ADDRESS 32812 NE 102nd Ave LaCenter WA 98629

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

OTHER COMMENTS: We would like to zone our property from R20 to R5 acres.

I also like the Cluster idea.
WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT RIDGEFIELD HIGH SCHOOL, 2630 SOUTH HILLHURST ROAD, RIDGEFIELD, WA. 98642

CCCWOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR COMMENTS REGARDING CHANGES PROPOSED IN ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES TO THESE AREAS THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

___ 1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.

   A 2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC RURAL ZONES TO REFLECT SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS

   A 3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.

___ 4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE AND FAMILY OWNED WOODLOTS

   R 5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/ URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS

   Y 6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND RETURN THIS FORM TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. OR CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS

SIGNATURE

ADDRESS

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

OTHER COMMENTS

___________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________
WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT RIDGEFIELD HIGH SCHOOL, 2630 SOUTH HILLYHURST ROAD, RIDGEFIELD, WA. 98642

CCCWOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR COMMENTS REGARDING CHANGES PROPOSED IN ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES TO THESE AREAS THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

☑ 1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.

☐ 2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC. RURAL ZONES TO REFLECT SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS

☑ 3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.

☑ 4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE AND FAMILY OWNED WOODLOTS

☐ 5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/ URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS

☑ 6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND RETURN THIS FORM TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. OR CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS

SIGNATURE: Kathy Stephens

ADDRESS: 22500 NE, 141H Garner Rd

Yacolt 98675

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

OTHER COMMENTS: Would like to see forest zones reduced to 5 ac. - rural zones to 2.5 ac. and/or clusters. Please extend yacolt city limits.
WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN
HOUSE AT RIDGEFIELD HIGH SCHOOL, 2630 SOUTH HILLHURST
ROAD, RIDGEFIELD, WA. 98642

CCCWOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR COMMENTS REGARDING
CHANGES PROPOSED IN ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED
CHANGES TO THESE AREAS THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING
LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

X 1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.

X 2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC. RURAL ZONES
   TO REFLECT SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS

X 3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES
   TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.

X 4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES
   TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE AND FAMILY OWNED WOODLOTS

X 5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/ URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS
   THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS

X 6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS
   TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND RETURN THIS FORM TO CLARK
COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. OR CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS

SIGNATURE ____________________________

ADDRESS ________________________________

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

OTHER COMMENTS ________________________________

Help The Farmers so they don't
have to sell The whole Farm if they have
a bad year.
WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT RIDGEFIELD HIGH SCHOOL, 2630 SOUTH HILLHURST ROAD, RIDGEFIELD, WA. 98642

CCCWOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR COMMENTS REGARDING CHANGES PROPOSED IN ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES TO THESE AREAS THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

✓ 1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.
✓ 2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC. RURAL ZONES TO REFLECT SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS
✓ 3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.
✓ 4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE AND FAMILY OWNED WOODLOTS
✓ 5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/ URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS
✓ 6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND RETURN THIS FORM TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. OR CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS

SIGNATURE: ____________________________
ADDRESS: 26011 NE Deer Ridge Rd
Yacolt WA 98675 Parcel #: 267189000

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

OTHER COMMENTS: ____________________________

__________________________
WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT RIDGEFIELD HIGH SCHOOL, 2630 SOUTH HILLHURST ROAD, RIDGEFIELD, WA. 98642

CCCU WOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR COMMENTS REGARDING CHANGES PROPOSED IN ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES TO THESE AREAS THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

✓ 1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.

✓ 2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC. RURAL ZONES TO REFLECT SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS

✓ 3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.

✓ 4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE AND FAMILY OWNED WOODLOTS

✓ 5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/ URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS

✓ 6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND RETURN THIS FORM TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. OR CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS

SIGNATURE: 

ADDRESS: PO Box 127, Arlou

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

OTHER Comments: Alternative 4 is a step in the right direction. Should do more uptowning
WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT RIDGEFIELD HIGH SCHOOL, 2630 SOUTH HILLHURST ROAD, RIDGEFIELD, WA. 98642

CCCW WOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR COMMENTS REGARDING CHANGES PROPOSED IN ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES TO THESE AREAS THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

✓ 1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.

✓ 2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC. RURAL ZONES TO REFLECT SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS

✓ 3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.

✓ 4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE AND FAMILY OWNED WOODLOTS

✓ 5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/ URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS

✓ 6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND RETURN THIS FORM TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. OR CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS

SIGNATURE: David Kangas
ADDRESS: 17415 NE 92 Ave Battle Ground wa 98604

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

OTHER COMMENTS: Am wondering why urban growth stops on my north boundary of 10 acres. The natural woodlots should have been 1/2 section lines. The 1/4 section line is my south boundary zone. 2.5 acres at present. I support #4.

(meadow Glade)
WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT RIDGEFIELD HIGH SCHOOL, 2630 SOUTH HILLHURST ROAD, RIDGEFIELD, WA. 98642

CCC WOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR COMMENTS REGARDING CHANGES PROPOSED IN ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES TO THESE AREAS THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.

2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC RURAL ZONES TO REFLECT SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS

3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.

4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE AND FAMILY OWNED WOODLOTS

5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/ URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS

6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND RETURN THIS FORM TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. OR CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS

SIGNATURE

ADDRESS

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

OTHER COMMENTS

Please consider updating to Alternative # 4A
WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT RIDGEFIELD HIGH SCHOOL, 2630 SOUTH HILLHURST ROAD, RIDGEFIELD, WA. 98642

CCCWOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR COMMENTS REGARDING CHANGES PROPOSED IN ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES TO THESE AREAS THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

X 1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.

X 2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC. RURAL ZONES TO REFLECT SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS

X 3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.

X 4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE AND FAMILY OWNED WOODLOTS

X 5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/ URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS

X 6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND RETURN THIS FORM TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. OR CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS

SIGNATURE

ADDRESS

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

OTHER COMMENTS: WE WOULD LIKE ZONING TO CHANGE 1 TO 5 ACRES
WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT RIDGEFIELD HIGH SCHOOL, 2630 SOUTH HILLHURST ROAD, RIDGEFIELD, WA. 98642

CCCWOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR COMMENTS REGARDING CHANGES PROPOSED IN ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES TO THESE AREAS THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.

2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC. RURAL ZONES TO REFLECT SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS

3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.

4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE AND FAMILY OWNED WOODLOTS 6 Acre would be better than 10

5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/ URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS

6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND RETURN THIS FORM TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. OR CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS

SIGNATURE

ADDRESS 21546 NE LUCIA FALLS YACOLO

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

OTHER COMMENTS

__________________________________________
WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT RIDGEFIELD HIGH SCHOOL, 2630 SOUTH HILLHURST ROAD, RIDGEFIELD, WA. 98642

CCCW WOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR COMMENTS REGARDING CHANGES PROPOSED IN ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES TO THESE AREAS THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.

2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC. RURAL ZONES TO REFLECT SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS

3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.

4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE AND FAMILY OWNED WOODLOTS

5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/ URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS

6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND RETURN THIS FORM TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. OR CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS

SIGNATURE

ADDRESS

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

OTHER COMMENTS
WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT RIDGEFIELD HIGH SCHOOL, 2630 SOUTH HILLHURST ROAD, RIDGEFIELD, WA. 98642

CCCWOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR COMMENTS REGARDING CHANGES PROPOSED IN ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES TO THESE AREAS THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

☑ 1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.

☑ 2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC. RURAL ZONES TO REFLECT SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS

☑ 3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.

☑ 4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE AND FAMILY OWNED WOODLOTS

☑ 5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/ URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS

☑ 6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND RETURN THIS FORM TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. OR CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS

SIGNATURE ____________________________

ADDRESS 17614 NE 295 ST

Yucait, WA. 98675

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

OTHER COMMENTS: We support the 6th item above & be included. Pic alt 4.
WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT RIDGEFIELD HIGH SCHOOL, 2630 SOUTH HILLHURST ROAD, RIDGEFIELD, WA. 98642

CCCWOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR COMMENTS REGARDING CHANGES PROPOSED IN ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES TO THESE AREAS THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.

2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC RURAL ZONES TO REFLECT SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS

3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.

4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE AND FAMILY OWNED WOODLOTS

5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/ URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS

6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND RETURN THIS FORM TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. OR CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS

SIGNATURE

ADDRESS 20211 NE Yacolt M+ Rd

Yacolt WA 98675

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

OTHER COMMENTS: It's time to fix the mess made in 1994. Our 80 is bordered by 5th & 10th. Thank you!
WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT RIDGEFIELD HIGH SCHOOL, 2630 SOUTH HILLHURST ROAD, RIDGEFIELD, WA. 98642

CCCWOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR COMMENTS REGARDING CHANGES PROPOSED IN ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES TO THESE AREAS THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

✓ 1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.
✓ 2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC RURAL ZONES TO REFLECT SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS
✓ 3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.
✓ 4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE AND FAMILY OWNED WOODLOTS
✓ 5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/ URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS
✓ 6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND RETURN THIS FORM TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. OR CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS

SIGNATURE ____________________________

ADDRESS 20311 NE Yacolt Mtn Rd

Yacolt WA 98675

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

OTHER COMMENTS __________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________

013221
WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT RIDGEFIELD HIGH SCHOOL, 2630 SOUTH HILLHURST ROAD, RIDGEFIELD, WA. 98642

CCCW WOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR COMMENTS REGARDING CHANGES PROPOSED IN ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES TO THESE AREAS THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

☒ 1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.

☒ 2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC. RURAL ZONES TO REFLECT SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS

☒ 3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.

☒ 4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE AND FAMILY OWNED WOODLOTS

☒ 5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/ URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS

☒ 6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND RETURN THIS FORM TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. OR CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS

SIGNATURE: [Signature]

ADDRESS: [Address]

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

OTHER COMMENTS: Please extend Vacoh city limits
WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT RIDGEFIELD HIGH SCHOOL, 2630 SOUTH HILLHURST ROAD, RIDGEFIELD, WA. 98642

CCC WOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR COMMENTS REGARDING CHANGES PROPOSED IN ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES TO THESE AREAS THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

✓ 1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.

✓ 2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC. RURAL ZONES
   TO REFLECT SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS

✓ 3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES
   TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.

✓ 4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES
   TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE AND FAMILY OWNED WOODLOTS

✓ 5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/ URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS
   THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS

✓ 6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS
   TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND RETURN THIS FORM TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. OR CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS

SIGNATURE: ________________________________

ADDRESS: 17614 NE 299th St.

                                                Ridgefield, WA. 98675

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

OTHER COMMENTS: ____________________________________________

                             ____________________________________________
                             ____________________________________________
                             ____________________________________________
WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT RIDGEFIELD HIGH SCHOOL, 2630 SOUTH HILLHURST ROAD, RIDGEFIELD, WA. 98642

CCC U WOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR COMMENTS REGARDING CHANGES PROPOSED IN ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES TO THESE AREAS THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.

2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC. RURAL ZONES TO REFLECT SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS

3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.

4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE AND FAMILY OWNED WOODLOTS

5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/ URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS

6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND RETURN THIS FORM TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. OR CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS

SIGNATURE

ADDRESS 17410 NE 307TH ST.

VANCOUVER, WA 98685

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

OTHER COMMENTS

________________________________________

________________________________________
WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT RIDGEFIELD HIGH SCHOOL, 2630 SOUTH HILLHURST ROAD, RIDGEFIELD, WA. 98642

CCCW WOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR COMMENTS REGARDING CHANGES PROPOSED IN ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES TO THESE AREAS THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

✓ 1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.

✓ 2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC. RURAL ZONES TO REFLECT SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS

✓ 3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.

✓ 4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE AND FAMILY OWNED WOODLOTS

✓ 5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/ URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS

✓ 6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND RETURN THIS FORM TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. OR CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS

SIGNATURE

ADDRESS 3676 40 NE Roosky Mill Rd

ThAnk yOu fOr YoUr CoMments ANd sUpport!

OTHER COMMENTS: we want our 3.77 to be put into 5Ac. like it use to be.
WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN
HOUSE AT RIDGEFIELD HIGH SCHOOL, 2630 SOUTH HILLHURST
ROAD, RIDGEFIELD, WA. 98642

CCCW WOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR COMMENTS REGARDING
CHANGES PROPOSED IN ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED
CHANGES TO THESE AREAS THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING
LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

☐ 1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.

☐ 2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC. RURAL ZONES
   TO REFLECT SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS

☐ 3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES
   TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.

☐ 4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES
   TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE AND FAMILY OWNED WOODLOTS

☐ 5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/ URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS
   THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS

☐ 6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS
   TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND RETURN THIS FORM TO CLARK
COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. OR CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS

SIGNATURE: _____________________________

ADDRESS: 16109 NE 238 Cir, R.G., WA. 98604

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

OTHER COMMENTS:

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________
WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT RIDGEFIELD HIGH SCHOOL, 2630 SOUTH HILLHURST ROAD, RIDGEFIELD, WA. 98642

CCCWOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR COMMENTS REGARDING CHANGES PROPOSED IN ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES TO THESE AREAS THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

✓ 1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.

✓ 2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC. RURAL ZONES TO REFLECT SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS

✓ 3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.

✓ 4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE AND FAMILY OWNED WOODLOTS

✓ 5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/ URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS

✓ 6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND RETURN THIS FORM TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. OR CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS

SIGNATURE: [Signature]

ADDRESS: [217 NE 10 St, Ridgefield, WA]

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

OTHER COMMENTS:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

013227
WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT RIDGEFIELD HIGH SCHOOL, 2630 SOUTH HILLHURST ROAD, RIDGEFIELD, WA. 98642

CCCU WOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR COMMENTS REGARDING CHANGES PROPOSED IN ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES TO THESE AREAS THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

✓ 1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.

✓ 2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC. RURAL ZONES TO REFLECT SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS

✓ 3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.

✓ 4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE AND FAMILY OWNED WOODLOTS

✓ 5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/ URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS

✓ 6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND RETURN THIS FORM TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. OR CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS

SIGNATURE  

ADDRESS  

Ridgfield, WA 98642

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

OTHER COMMENTS
WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT RIDGEFIELD HIGH SCHOOL, 2630 SOUTH HILLHURST ROAD, RIDGEFIELD, WA. 98642

CCCW WOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR COMMENTS REGARDING CHANGES PROPOSED IN ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES TO THESE AREAS THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

✓ 1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.

✓ 2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC. RURAL ZONES TO REFLECT SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS

✓ 3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.

✓ 4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE AND FAMILY OWNED WOODLOTS

✓ 5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/ URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS

✓ 6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND RETURN THIS FORM TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. OR CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS

SIGNATURE ________________________________

ADDRESS 39202 NE Rotschy Rd

Yacolt, WA 98675

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

OTHER COMMENTS ________________________________

______________________________________________

______________________________________________
WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT RIDGEFIELD HIGH SCHOOL, 2630 SOUTH HILLHURST ROAD, RIDGEFIELD, WA. 98642

CCCWOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR COMMENTS REGARDING CHANGES PROPOSED IN ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES TO THESE AREAS THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

☑ 1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.

☑ 2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC. RURAL ZONES TO REFLECT SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS

☑ 3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.

☑ 4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE AND FAMILY OWNED WOODLOTS

☑ 5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS

☑ 6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND RETURN THIS FORM TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. OR CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS

SIGNATURE __________

ADDRESS __________________________

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

OTHER COMMENTS __________________________

______________________________

______________________________

______________________________
WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT RIDGEFIELD HIGH SCHOOL, 2630 SOUTH HILLHURST ROAD, RIDGEFIELD, WA. 98642

CCCU WOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR COMMENTS REGARDING CHANGES PROPOSED IN ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES TO THESE AREAS THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

✓ 1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.

✓ 2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC. RURAL ZONES
   TO REFLECT SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS

✓ 3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES
   TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.

  4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES
     TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE AND FAMILY OWNED WOODLOTS

✓ 5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/ URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS
     THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS

✓ 6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS
     TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND RETURN THIS FORM TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. OR CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS

SIGNATURE

ADDRESS 29503 NW 4TH AV

RIDGEFIELD, WA

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

OTHER COMMENTS

__________________________________________

__________________________________________

__________________________________________

__________________________________________

__________________________________________
WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT RIDGEFIELD HIGH SCHOOL, 2630 SOUTH HILLHURST ROAD, RIDGEFIELD, WA. 98642

CCCWOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR COMMENTS REGARDING CHANGES PROPOSED IN ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES TO THESE AREAS THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

✓ 1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.
✓ 2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC. RURAL ZONES TO REFLECT SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS
✓ 3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.
✓ 4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE AND FAMILY OWNED WOODLOTS
✓ 5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/ URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS
✓ 6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND RETURN THIS FORM TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. OR CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS

Signature: [Signature]
Address: 16909 NE 223rd Cir, Battle Ground, WA 98604

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

OTHER COMMENTS: We appreciate whatever you can do to help us use even a cluster on our property for home site.
WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT RIDGEFIELD HIGH SCHOOL, 2630 SOUTH HILLHURST ROAD, RIDGEFIELD, WA. 98642

CCCU WOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR COMMENTS REGARDING CHANGES PROPOSED IN ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES TO THESE AREAS THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

✔ 1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.

✔ 2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC. RURAL ZONES TO REFLECT SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS

✔ 3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.

✔ 4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE AND FAMILY OWNED WOODLOTS

✔ 5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS

✔ 6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND RETURN THIS FORM TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. OR CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS

SIGNATURE

ADDRESS: 26706 N E Rotachy Mill Rd

Yacolt, Wash. 98675

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

OTHER COMMENTS

________________________________________

________________________________________

________________________________________

________________________________________

________________________________________
WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT RIDGEFIELD HIGH SCHOOL, 2630 SOUTH HILLHURST ROAD, RIDGEFIELD, WA. 98642

CCCU WOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR COMMENTS REGARDING CHANGES PROPOSED IN ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES TO THESE AREAS THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

☑ 1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.

☑ 2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC RURAL ZONES TO REFLECT SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS

☑ 3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.

☑ 4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE AND FAMILY OWNED WOODLOTS

☑ 5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/ URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS

☑ 6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND RETURN THIS FORM TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. OR CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS

SIGNATURE

ADDRESS

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

OTHER COMMENTS

________________________________________

________________________________________
WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN
HOUSE AT RIDGEFIELD HIGH SCHOOL, 2630 SOUTH HILLHURST
ROAD, RIDGEFIELD, WA. 98642

CCCWOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR COMMENTS REGARDING
CHANGES PROPOSED IN ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED
CHANGES TO THESE AREAS THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING
LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.

2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC RURAL ZONES
   TO REFLECT SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS

3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES
   TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.

4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES
   TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE AND FAMILY OWNED WOODLOTS

5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/ URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS
   THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS

6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS
   TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND RETURN THIS FORM TO CLARK
COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. OR CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS

SIGNATURE

ADDRESS

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

OTHER COMMENTS

Regular need smaller lot sizes

My family cannot make a living in Clark County

Farming 40 acres
WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT RIDGEFIELD HIGH SCHOOL, 2630 SOUTH HILLHURST ROAD, RIDGEFIELD, WA. 98642

CCCWOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR COMMENTS REGARDING CHANGES PROPOSED IN ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES TO THESE AREAS THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

✓ 1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.

✓ 2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC RURAL ZONES TO REFLECT SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS

✓ 3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.

✓ 4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE AND FAMILY OWNED WOODLOTS

✓ 5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/ URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS

✓ 6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND RETURN THIS FORM TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. OR CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS

SIGNATURE ____________________________

ADDRESS

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

OTHER COMMENTS ____________________________________________

__________________________________________

__________________________________________

__________________________________________
WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT RIDGEFIELD HIGH SCHOOL, 2630 SOUTH HILLHURST ROAD, RIDGEFIELD, WA. 98642

CCCWOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR COMMENTS REGARDING CHANGES PROPOSED IN ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES TO THESE AREAS THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

___ 1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.

✓  2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC RURAL ZONES
   TO REFLECT SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS

___ 3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES
   TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.

✓  4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES
   TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE AND FAMILY OWNED WOODLOTS

___ 5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/ URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS
   THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS

✓  6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS
   TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND RETURN THIS FORM TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. OR CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS

SIGNATURE: [Signature]

ADDRESS: 5001 NW 187TH ST, RIDGEFIELD WA. 98642

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

OTHER COMMENTS: Concerns for traffic over loads

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________
WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT RIDGEFIELD HIGH SCHOOL, 2630 SOUTH HILLHURST ROAD, RIDGEFIELD, WA. 98642

CCC WOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR COMMENTS REGARDING CHANGES PROPOSED IN ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES TO THESE AREAS THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.

2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC RURAL ZONES
   TO REFLECT SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS

3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES
   TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.

4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES
   TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE AND FAMILY OWNED WOODLOTS

5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS
   THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS

6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS
   TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND RETURN THIS FORM TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. OR CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS

SIGNATURE

ADDRESS

Thank you for your comments and support!

OTHER COMMENTS

What happens if lots of smaller lots appear or built on

And the traffic runs amok?
WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT RIDGEFIELD HIGH SCHOOL, 2630 SOUTH HILLHURST ROAD, RIDGEFIELD, WA. 98642

CCCW WOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR COMMENTS REGARDING CHANGES PROPOSED IN ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES TO THESE AREAS THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.

2. ADOPT 1 AC. 2.5 AC AND 5 AC. RURAL ZONES TO REFLECT SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS

3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.

4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE AND FAMILY OWNED WOODLOTS

5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/ URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS

6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND RETURN THIS FORM TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. OR CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS

SIGNATURE

ADDRESS

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

OTHER COMMENTS
WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT RIDGEFIELD HIGH SCHOOL, 2630 SOUTH HILLHURST ROAD, RIDGEFIELD, WA. 98642

CCCU WOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR COMMENTS REGARDING CHANGES PROPOSED IN ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES TO THESE AREAS THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

✓ 1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.

✓ 2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC RURAL ZONES TO REFLECT SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS

✓ 3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.

✓ 4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE AND FAMILY OWNED WOODLOTS

✓ 5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/ URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS

✓ 6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND RETURN THIS FORM TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. OR CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS

SIGNATURE ____________________________

ADDRESS 19117 NW 67 Ave

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

OTHER COMMENTS

My parcel has surrounding 1 ac site from previous cluster, we should be able to redefine as resource and possibly should be R-1 or R-2.5 for our current lot.
WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT RIDGEFIELD HIGH SCHOOL, 2630 SOUTH HILLHURST ROAD, RIDGEFIELD, WA. 98642

CCCWOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR COMMENTS REGARDING CHANGES PROPOSED IN ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES TO THESE AREAS THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

X 1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.
X 2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC. RURAL ZONES TO REFLECT SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS
X 3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.
X 4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE AND FAMILY OWNED WOODLOTS
X 5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/ URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS
X 6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND RETURN THIS FORM TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. OR CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS

SIGNATURE

ADDRESS 19519 NE 20th AVE
RIDGEFIELD, WA 98642

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

OTHER COMMENTS: I own an 80 Acre piece of property that is presently zoned A6 20. It is bordered on 2 sides by proposed rural 2 1/2 acres lots and on the 3rd side by farm lots. I feel our piece needs to reflect the smaller parcels around us.
WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT RIDGEFIELD HIGH SCHOOL, 2630 SOUTH HILLHURST ROAD, RIDGEFIELD, WA. 98642

CCCWOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR COMMENTS REGARDING CHANGES PROPOSED IN ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES TO THESE AREAS THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.

2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC. RURAL ZONES TO REFLECT SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS

3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.

4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE AND FAMILY OWNED WOODLOTS

5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/ URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS

6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND RETURN THIS FORM TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. OR CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS

SIGNATURE

ADDRESS 7609 NE 299th St, Battle Ground, WA

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

OTHER COMMENTS I CURRENTLY LIVE IN A 6.20 ZONING AREA I AM SURROUNDED ON ALL SIDES BY 5 AC. PARCELS I HAVE 25 ACRES THAT I FEEL SHOULD BE ABLE TO DIVIDE TO 5 AC. CONSIDERING THE EXISTING RURAL CHARACTER. YOUR CURRENT ALTERNATIVE 4 PROPOSES A CHANGE TO 10 ACRES. I REALIZE THAT YOUR MAP IS IN EARLY STAGES OF
WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT RIDGEFIELD HIGH SCHOOL, 2630 SOUTH HILLHURST ROAD, RIDGEFIELD, WA. 98642

CCCWOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR COMMENTS REGARDING CHANGES PROPOSED IN ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES TO THESE AREAS THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

☑️ 1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.

☒ 2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC. RURAL ZONES TO REFLECT SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS

☒ 3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.

☒ 4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE AND FAMILY OWNED WOODLOTS

☒ 5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS

☒ 6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND RETURN THIS FORM TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. OR CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS

SIGNATURE

ADDRESS 6208 NW 196th St

Ridgefield, WA 98642

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

OTHER COMMENTS

________________________________________

________________________________________

________________________________________

________________________________________

________________________________________

________________________________________

________________________________________

________________________________________
WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT RIDGEFIELD HIGH SCHOOL, 2630 SOUTH HILLHURST ROAD, RIDGEFIELD, WA. 98642

CCCU WOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR COMMENTS REGARDING CHANGES PROPOSED IN ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES TO THESE AREAS THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-COMFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

☑ 1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.

☑ 2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC. RURAL ZONES TO REFLECT SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS

☑ 3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.

☑ 4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE AND FAMILY OWNED WOODLOTS

☑ 5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/ URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS

☑ 6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND RETURN THIS FORM TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. OR CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS

SIGNATURE

ADDRESS

24209 NE 53rd Ave

Battle Ground, WA 98604

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

OTHER COMMENTS: We would like to change all 4a to include

24209 NE 53rd Ave to change from 5 acre to 3 1/2 lots per acre

34407 NE Kelly Rd to change from 20ac to 5ac lots

and our property in yore is adjacent to city limits to change from 20 acre to 1 acre lots. If support all of the options listed, all lot sizes should be 1 acres
WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT RIDGEFIELD HIGH SCHOOL, 2630 SOUTH HILLHURST ROAD, RIDGEFIELD, WA. 98642

CCCWOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR COMMENTS REGARDING CHANGES PROPOSED IN ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES TO THESE AREAS THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

☐ 1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.

☐ 2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC RURAL ZONES TO REFLECT SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS

☐ 3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.

☐ 4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE AND FAMILY OWNED WOODLOTS

☐ 5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS

☐ 6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND RETURN THIS FORM TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. OR CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS

SIGNATURE

ADDRESS 24209 NE 53rd Ave Battle Ground 98604

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

OTHER COMMENTS I SUPPORT ALL OF THE ABOVE.

Alternative 4 includes 24209 NE 53rd Ave change from 5 acre to 25- acre lot, 34407 NE Kelly Rd from zone to 1 acre. Property adjacent to Vacaville city limits to be added to Vacaville city limits. Private property owners should be able to have lots sizes of 10 acres or less.
WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT RIDGEFIELD HIGH SCHOOL, 2630 SOUTH HILLHURST ROAD, RIDGEFIELD, WA. 98642

CCCW WOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR COMMENTS REGARDING CHANGES PROPOSED IN ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES TO THESE AREAS THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

X 1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.

X 2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC RURAL ZONES TO REFLECT SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS

X 3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.

X 4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE AND FAMILY OWNED WOODLOTS

X 5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/ URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS

X 6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND RETURN THIS FORM TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. OR CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS

SIGNATURE

ADDRESS 3750 E 188TH AVE. YAKIMA, WA 98902

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

OTHER COMMENTS: I am in support of 6 options
WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT RIDGEFIELD HIGH SCHOOL, 2630 SOUTH HILLHURST ROAD, RIDGEFIELD, WA. 98642

**CCCU WOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR COMMENTS REGARDING CHANGES PROPOSED IN ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES**

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES TO THESE AREAS THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.

2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC. RURAL ZONES TO REFLECT SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS

3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.

4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE AND FAMILY OWNED WOODLOTS

5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/ URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS

6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND RETURN THIS FORM TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. OR CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS

SIGNATURE

[Signature]

ADDRESS

20320 NE Allworth Rd

Bellevue, WA 98004

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

OTHER COMMENTS

I support it.

For rural property owners I would like to be 2.5 or 5 acres as I own 220 acres behind me.
To the Board of Clark County Commissioners,

March 25, 2015

Re: For the record, Support for Consideration of Alternative 4A

Dear Board of Commissioners,

I would like to go on record as supporting Alternative 4A proposal of the comprehensive plan update. This would allow larger parcels surrounded by smaller parcels to be considered for lot sizes similar to the surrounding parcels.

Specifically, I own property at 39202 NE Rotschy Rd __________, and am in favor of changing the lot size to reflect __________ __________ zoning.

Thank you,

Don Sasse

Name

Don Wause

Signature

39202 NE Rotschy Rd Yacolt WA 98675

Address
WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT RIDGEFIELD HIGH SCHOOL, 2630 SOUTH HILLHURST ROAD, RIDGEFIELD, WA. 98642

RECEIVED APR - 8 2015

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES TO THESE AREAS THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

✓ 1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.

✓ 2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC. RURAL ZONES TO REFLECT SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS

✓ 3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.

✓ 4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE AND FAMILY OWNED WOODLOTS

✓ 5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/ URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS

✓ 6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND RETURN THIS FORM TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. OR CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS

SIGNATURE

ADDRESS

YACOLT WA 98675

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

OTHER COMMENTS

HELP THE YOUNG BOYS BUY LAND. WE CAN BUY IT ONCE AT ONCE.
WELCOME TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2016 UPDATE OPEN HOUSE AT RIDGEFIELD HIGH SCHOOL, 2630 SOUTH HILLHURST ROAD, RIDGEFIELD, WA. 98642

RECEIVED APR. 8 2016

CCCW WOULD LIKE COUNCILORS TO KNOW YOUR COMMENTS REGARDING CHANGES PROPOSED IN ALTERNATIVE 4 FOR RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONES

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. SUPPORTS MOST OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES TO THESE AREAS THAT HELP TO RECTIFY MANY NON-CONFORMING LOTS THAT RESULTED FROM THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADOPTION.

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OPTIONS YOU SUPPORT.

✓ 1. RURAL AND RESOURCE ZONING MUST REFLECT EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.

✓ 2. ADOPT 1 AC, 2.5 AC AND 5 AC. RURAL ZONES TO REFLECT SMALLER EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PARCELS

✓ 3. ADOPT 2.5 AC, 5 AC AGRICULTURE ZONES TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER AND MORE AFFORDABLE FARMS.

✓ 4. ADOPT 5 AC, 10 AC FOREST ZONES TO ALLOW FOR SMALLER MORE AFFORDABLE PRIVATE AND FAMILY OWNED WOODLOTS

✓ 5. REMOVE URBAN RESERVE/ URBAN HOLDING LAND OVERLAYS THAT HAVE BEEN LOCKED IN 10 AC ZONING FOR APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS

✓ 6. ADOPT CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS IN ALL RURAL AND RESOURCE LANDS TO CONSERVE PRIME SOILS WHILE ALLOWING FOR MORE LAND USE AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PLEASE SIGN BELOW TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS AND RETURN THIS FORM TO CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC. OR CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNCILORS

SIGNATURE: [Signature]

ADDRESS: P.O. BOX 372 BATTLEGROUND WA 98604

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS AND SUPPORT!

OTHER COMMENTS: 

________________________________________

________________________________________

________________________________________

________________________________________

________________________________________

013250
To the Board of Clark County Commissioners,

March 25, 2015

Re: For the record, Support for Consideration of Alternative 4A

Dear Board of Commissioners,

I would like to go on record as supporting Alternative 4A proposal of the comprehensive plan update. This would allow larger parcels surrounded by smaller parcels to be considered for lot sizes similar to the surrounding parcels.

Specifically, I own property at SE 5 - Sec 23 T5 N R3 E1/2, and am in favor of changing the lot size to reflect the proposed FR A zoning.

Thank you,

Ian Kysar

John Russell + Sisko Kysar

Name

2670 NE 4th Schuy Mill Rd

Signature

Vacant 100 98 75

Address
To the Board of Clark County Commissioners,

March 25, 2015

Re: For the record, Support for Consideration of Alternative 4A

Dear Board of Commissioners,

I would like to go on record as supporting Alternative 4A proposal of the comprehensive plan update. This would allow larger parcels surrounded by smaller parcels to be considered for lot sizes similar to the surrounding parcels.

Specifically, I own property at Rotschy Rd and Rotschy Mill Rd and am in favor of changing the lot size to reflect the proposed FR 5 zoning.

Thank you,

__________________________
Russell Kysar

__________________________
Signature

__________________________
Name

__________________________
Address
To the Board of Clark County Commissioners,

March 25, 2015

Re: For the record, Support for Consideration of Alternative 4A

Dear Board of Commissioners,

I would like to go on record as supporting Alternative 4A proposal of the comprehensive plan update. This would allow larger parcels surrounded by smaller parcels to be considered for lot sizes similar to the surrounding parcels.

Specifically, I own property at 32413 N.E. Kelly Rd. Yacolt, Wa., and am in favor of changing the lot size to reflect the proposed 10 acre lot zoning.

Thank you,

[Todd Klein]

Signature


Address
March 25, 2015

To the Board of Clark County Commissioners,

Re: For the record, Support for Consideration of Alternative 4A

Dear Board of Commissioners,

I would like to go on record as supporting Alternative 4A proposal of the comprehensive plan update. This would allow larger parcels surrounded by smaller parcels to be considered for lot sizes similar to the surrounding parcels.

Specifically, I own tax parcel # 230480-000 in the Yacolt Mountain area, and am in favor of changing the lot size to reflect FR10 zoning. Our property and a few others are proposed to be spot zoned on the original alternative 4 as FR40, which does not come close to undo-ing the wrong created when the zoning was changed from 5 acre lots prior to 1994. We all would like to be zoned similarly to those properties north and South of us which are proposed as FR10. There are many technical justifications supporting this, including the now present public water at the property, as well as good county road access, etc. We also are surrounded on the south and west sides by 5 acre residential zoning. We understand that it may be difficult to get to 5 acre zoning, but as a second alternative, we wish to be included in the FR10 zoned areas.

Thank you,

Nathan Ek
35006 NE 178th Ave.
Yacolt, WA 98675
March 25, 2015

To the Board of Clark County Commissioners,

Re: For the record, Support for Consideration of Alternative 4A

Dear Board of Commissioners,

I would like to go on record as supporting Alternative 4A proposal of the comprehensive plan update. This would allow larger parcels surrounded by smaller parcels to be considered for lot sizes similar to the surrounding parcels.

Specifically, I own tax parcel # 230276000 and tax parcel # 230302000, and am in favor of changing the lot size to reflect FR10 zoning. Our property and a few others (Nathan Ek, and James Mattila) are proposed to be spot zoned on the original alternative 4 as FR40, which does not come close to undo-ing the wrong created when the zoning was changed from 5 acre minimums prior to 1994. We all would like to be zoned similarly to those properties north and south of us which are proposed as FR10.

Thank you,

[Signature]

1 Matson
20211 NE Yacolt Mountain Rd.
Yacolt, WA 98675
(360) 904-6941
To the Board of Clark County Commissioners,

March 25, 2015

Re: For the record, Support for Consideration of Alternative 4A

Dear Board of Commissioners,

I would like to go on record as supporting Alternative 4A proposal of the comprehensive plan update. This would allow larger parcels surrounded by smaller parcels to be considered for lot sizes similar to the surrounding parcels.

Specifically, I own property at Parcel # 267189000, and am in favor of changing the lot size to reflect the proposed FR-1 (N) zoning.

Thank you,

Troy L. Uskoski

26011 NE Deer Ridge Rd, Yacolt WA 98675
March 25, 2015

To the Board of Clark County Commissioners,

Re: For the record, Support for Consideration of Alternative 4A

Dear Board of Commissioners,

I would like to go on record as supporting Alternative 4A proposal of the comprehensive plan update. This would allow larger parcels surrounded by smaller parcels to be considered for lot sizes similar to the surrounding parcels.

Specifically, I own tax parcel # 230276000 and tax parcel # 230302000, and am in favor of changing the lot size to reflect FR10 zoning. Our property and a few others (Nathan Ek, and James Mattila) are proposed to be spot zoned on the original alternative 4 as FR40, which does not come close to undo-ing the wrong created when the zoning was changed from 5 acre minimums prior to 1994. We all would like to be zoned similarly to those properties north and south of us which are proposed as FR10.

Thank you,

Lois Matson
40211 NE Yacolt Mountain Rd.
Yacolt, WA 98675
(360) 904-6941
March 25, 2015

To the Board of Clark County Commissioners,

Re: For the record, Support for Consideration of Alternative 4A

Dear Board of Commissioners,

We would like to go on record as supporting the Alternative 4A proposal of the comprehensive plan update.

Specifically, we own tax parcel #s 2378430000, 2378470000, and 2378450000 and are in favor of changing the lot size to reflect FR20 zoning. Our property and a few others are proposed to be spot zoned on the original alternative 4 as FR80, which does not come close to undo-ing the wrong created when the zoning was changed from smaller lots prior to 1994. We would like to be zoned as FR20.

Thank you,

[Signature]

Cornell Rotschy, President
Synergy Resources, LLC

9210 NE 62nd Ave
Vancouver, WA 98665

360-334-3100
March 25, 2015

To the Board of Clark County Commissioners,

Re: For the record, Support for Consideration of Alternative 4A

Dear Board of Commissioners,

I would like to go on record as supporting Alternative 4A proposal of the comprehensive plan update. This would allow larger parcels surrounded by smaller parcels to be considered for lot sizes similar to the surrounding parcels.

Specifically, we are involved with tax parcel # 140846000, which is currently zoned R-10 and we are in favor of changing the lot size to reflect R-5 zoning. Additionally, we are involved with tax parcel # 140643000 which is currently zoned FR-80 and we are in favor of changing the lot size to reflect FR-20 zoning.

Thank you,

[Signature]

Cornell Rotschy, Vice President
Rotschy, Inc.
^210 NE 62nd Ave
Vancouver, WA 98665

360-334-3100
Comment submitted by Lisa Irwin and Tim Roddy

We have lived at 19115 NE 42nd Ct. for close to 25 years and have watched areas adjacent to our neighborhood, especially to the south and west, develop into smaller parcels, either higher density or 1/2-2.5 acres. As we age, we want the ability to sub-divide our property into a smaller parcels, 1 or 2.5 acres so that we can stay in our community while downsizing into a smaller, one level home. This property is part of our retirement and we never imagined that 25 years later as the North County developed we would still be considered rural 10 acres zoning, or even five acres, zoning which is inconsistent within our same 20 block radius and of land use adjacent (south, west and even north) of our area.

With growth around Legacy Salmon Creek hospital and WSU-V and major road and utility expansion to the north, south, and west, it seems more prudent to zone our neighborhood at 1 to 2.5 acres. We are highly opposed having our property zoned as we have been since 1987 when most of the houses in our neighborhood were built on five acre parcels, `NOT 10. Most of us built our homes on one section of our property with the concept that we would be able to sub-divide for the purpose of land valuation, or as in our , to build a smaller one level home.

We would very much appreciate your consideration of re-zoning our area to reflect the North County growth needs and our desire to use our property in a way that will allow us to stay in our community.
Public Comment
SEPA Alternatives
10/14/14 – 11/18/14
I. ISSUES:

Clallam County appeals from a Western Washington Growth Management Board determination that the Clallam County Comprehensive Plan and the Carlsborg Urban Growth Areas and its Capital Facilities Plan are noncompliant with the Growth Management Act of the State of Washington.

II. GENERAL FRAMEWORK:

At one time the axiom was that "a man's home is his castle." People who owned real property could do with it what they pleased. In the earlier part of the 20th century concerns began to arise that one's free exercise of property rights often unfairly impacted the neighbors. Gradually the concept of land use planning and zoning spread across the country. The State of Washington has been through various planning enabling acts which ultimately led to land use rules and regulations which varied greatly from city to city and county to county.

The Washington Legislature enacted the Growth Management Act (GMA) in 1990 stating it was intended to combat "uncoordinated and unplanned growth" and was to promote cooperation among local governments and citizens in Comprehensive land use planning. RCW 36.70A.101. The GMA was enacted largely "in response to public concerns about rapid population growth and increasing development pressures in the state, especially in the Puget Sound region." King County v. CPSOMHB, 142 W. 2d 543, 546, 14 P.3d 133 (2000).

The Growth Management Act provides a "framework" of goals and requirements to guide local governments, who have "the ultimate burden and responsibility for planning." RCW 36.70A.1201. The Growth Management Act requires counties to develop a comprehensive plan "which is to set out the generalized coordinated land use policy statement" of the county's governing body. RCW 36.70A.030(4). Among other things the Comprehensive Plan must designate Urban Growth Areas (UGA's) "within which urban growth shall be encouraged and outside of which growth can occur only if it is not urban in nature." RCW 36.70A.110(1). The Comprehensive Plan also must include a rural element that provides for a variety of rural densities. RCW 36.70A.070(5)(b)(C)(2004). The GMA recognizes regional differences and allows counties to consider local circumstances when designating rural areas.
delineated so long as the local government creates a written record explaining how the
rural element harmonizes the GMA requirements and goals (see former RCW
36.70A.020(1)(a)).

Great deference is to be accorded the local government’s decisions that are
"consistent with the requirements and goals" of the GMA (RCW 36.70A.320(1)). The
GMA’s goals include encouraging development in urban areas and reducing rural
sprawl. RCW 36.70A.020(1), (2).

The Legislature identified 13 planning goals in the GMA, but expressly refrained
from imposing upon local jurisdictions any order or priority amongst these goals. RCW

Pursuant to the Growth Management Act the State has created Growth Management
Hearing Boards to determine whether or not county comprehensive plans or
development regulations are in compliance with the requirements of the act itself. The
GMA provides that a Hearing Board “shall find compliance unless it determines the
action by the state agency, county or city is clearly erroneous in view of the entire record
before the Board and in light of the goals and requirements of this chapter.” RCW
36.70A.320(3). The Legislature sets a standard in RCW 36.70A.320(1) for granting
local entities the deference intended:

"In recognition of the broad range of discretion that may
be exercised by counties and cities consistent with the
requirements of this chapter, the Legislature intends for
the boards to grant deference to counties and cities in how
they plan for growth consistent with the requirements and
goals of this chapter. Local Comprehensive Plans and
development regulations require counties and cities to
balance priorities and options for action in full
consideration of local circumstances. The Legislature
finds that while this chapter requires local planning to
take place within a framework of State goals and
requirements, the ultimate burden and responsibility for
planning, harmonizing the planning goals of this chapter,
and implementing a county’s or city’s future, rests with
that community."

"To find an action ‘clearly erroneous,’ the Board must have a "firm and definite
conviction that a mistake has been committed.” Thurston County v. W. Wash. Growth

Growth Mgmt. Hearing Bd., 157 Wn. 2d 488, 497, 139 P.3d 106 (2006)).

III. STANDARD OF REVIEW:

The Washington Administrative Procedures Act governs judicial review of
challenges to Growth Board actions. Quadrant v. Central Puget Sound Management
Growth Board, 154 Wn. 2d 224 (2005) at 233. Under the APA the burden of
demonstrating the invalidity of agency action is upon the party who asserts invalidity.

RCW 34.05.570(1)(a).
The statute sets forth nine grounds for relief from an agency decision. In the County's "Corrected Opening Brief" the County asserts five grounds as its basis of appeal. They are as follows:

(b) The order is outside the statutory authority or jurisdiction of the agency conferred by any provision of law;
(c) The agency has engaged in unlawful procedure or decision-making process, or has failed to follow a prescribed procedure;
(d) The agency has erroneously interpreted or applied the law;
(e) The order is not supported by evidence that is substantial when viewed in light of the whole record before the court, which includes the agency record for judicial review, supplemented by any additional evidence received by the court under this chapter; [or]
(f) The order is arbitrary or capricious. (RCW 34.05.570(3)).

The Court's have noted that the GMA is to be strictly construed because it was controversial legislation. See Thurston County v. WWGMBH, 164 Wn. 2d 329 (2008) and Spokane County v. City of Spokane, 148 Wn. App. 120 (2009).

A reviewing court reviews errors of law de novo under the APA pursuant to RCW 34.05.570(3)(g).

"Substantial evidence" is defined as "a sufficient quantity of evidence to persuade a fair-minded person of the truth or correctness of the order." RCW 34.05.570(3)(e). See City of Redmond v. Central Puget Sound Growth Management Board, 116 Wn. App. 48 (2003).

IV. PROCEDURAL HISTORY:

The Growth Management Act requires counties to review their designated Urban Growth Areas every ten years. It also requires that the County Comprehensive Plan be reviewed every seven years. Whatcom County conducted its update reviews from 2004 through 2007. On August 18, 2007, the Board of Whatcom County Commissioners enacted Resolution No. 77 entitled "Affirming that Whatcom County has reviewed and updated its Countywide Comprehensive Plan, Regional Plans, and Development Regulations to ensure continued compliance with Growth Management Act Standards and Policies." Some portions of the countywide Comprehensive Plan were amended from the prior plan. On the same day the Board of Whatcom County Commissioners enacted Ordinance 826 to add a section to the Comprehensive Plan dealing with "limited areas of more intensive rural development" (LAMIRDS) a new designation permitted under the Growth Management Act.

Furthermore, and others, filed a Petition for Review to the Western Washington Growth Management Hearings Board (WWGMBH) asserting that the County's enactments left numerous areas of the County's Comprehensive Plan and development regulations noncompliant with the Growth Management Act.
On April 23, 2006, the Growth Management Hearings Board issued its Final Decision and Order finding that in certain respects the rural densities adopted by Chelan County were noncompliant with the Growth Management Act and that in certain respects the Carlsborg UGA was also noncompliant with the GMA. There were other issues raised to the Board, but before this Court are only those two general issues.

Regarding Carlsborg, the Board noted that Carlsborg was an unincorporated UGA in a rural county. Futurewise had charged that the most egregious violation as regards the Carlsborg UGA was the lack of sewer and any plan for building sewers in the future. The Board found that the Carlsborg UGA and particularly Chelan County Code Section 33.20 which permitted urban uses within the Carlsborg UGA prior to the advent of sewers was noncompliant with RCW 36.70A.070(3) and RCW 36.70A 110(3) and substantially interfered with RCW 36.70A.020(1)(2), and (12). Final Decision and Order pages 79 and 80.

The provisions of the County Code relating to Carlsborg, and the Capital Facilities Plan relating to Carlsborg had been adopted by the County prior to the current review and no appeal had been taken from the initial adoption of those plans. The County chose not to amend the Carlsborg Urban Growth Area nor its Carlsborg Capital Facilities Plan as a part of the update and review which took place from 2004 to 2007. The County alleges that the Board had no jurisdiction to require the County to make changes at this time as the applicable appeal period ran years previously.

Futurewise argued that Chelan County’s rural zoning districts which allowed densities of up to one residence (1/4a) per 2.4 acre violated the Growth Management Act mandate because the density was not rural in nature. The Board, at page 63 of its opinion, noted as a basis for its decision, “The existing rural landscape supports a finding that the rural character of Chelan County is a rural density of 1/4a/5 acres.” The Board then found that “by authorizing densities that do not reflect the existing landscape or economy of the area, the County has failed to maintain the traditional rural lifestyle of the residents of Chelan County as required by the GMA.” Final Decision and Order, supra, at page 63.

V. CARLSBORG JURISDICTIONAL ISSUES:

Paragraph 15 of Resolution No. 77 noted: “In connection with this update, Chelan County has performed a ten year review of its six Urban Growth Areas (UGAs) and has updated its UGA capacity analysis to include the most recent (2002) OFM county population projections for growth and in consideration of it’s updated linear projections…”

Under paragraph 20A, relating to Comprehensive Plan elements, the County noted:

“As part of this update process, Chelan County has performed its ten year review of its six designated Urban Growth Areas (UGA’s): Sequim UGA, Carlsborg UGA, Port Angeles UGA, Joyce UGA, Chelan Bay/Sitka UGA, and Porte UGA. As part of the review, the County considered whether the UGA’s have sufficient land and densities to permit the urban growth that is projected to
occur in the county for the succeeding 20 year period (2005-2025) in accordance with RCW 36.70A.110(2) and 36.70A.130(3)." The County then determined that the county has experienced population growth which has been accommodated by its comprehensive plan without requiring major amendment and that "the County's UGA's include adequate capacity to urban growth for the next 20 years..."

The resolution cites a report entitled Clallam County's Urban Growth Area Analysis and Ten Year Review of May 2007.

Paragraph 20C of the resolution states in part:

"In 2000, the County adopted Ordinance 702, enacting a specific Capital Facilities Plan for the Carlsborg Urban Growth Area, which had been designated to resolve a GMA petition filed by the City of Sequim with the WWQMB. The CFP is a 20-year plan with a 5-year financing element for construction and maintenance of the County's Capital Facilities.

In paragraph 21 relating to Urban Growth Areas the County noted in part:

"In 1995 and in subsequent years the County designated UGA's that were intended to accommodate 20-year population projections. The County has performed its UGA update analysis as summarized in findings 20A and 20B of this resolution. In 2004, the Planning Commission recommended completion of the 10-year UGA review for the County's six UGA's to ensure GMA compliance. Based upon its review, the County determined that no revisions to existing UGA's are required to accommodate the projected 20-year growth and that it's UGA's comply with the GMA. Permitted densities allowed within each of the County's UGA's are evaluated in the UGA report."

The resolution goes on to specifically indicate urban density issues which have been raised in this proceeding.

The first issue which the Hearing Board must decide is whether or not the Western Washington Growth Management Hearings Board had jurisdiction to hear an appeal to the County's determination in Resolution No. 77 to neither enlarge nor reduce the Carlsborg Urban Growth Area, and the County's decision not to modify the Capital Facilities Plan which applies to that Urban Growth Area, and to not revisit allowable densities within the Carlsborg UGA.

At page 85 of the final decision and order the Board noted:

"Thus the question is: May the Board review the County's UGA's, reviewed pursuant to RCW 36.70A.130(3), even though the County determined not to amend those UGA's?"

RCW 36.70A.130(3) states in part, at sub paragraph (1)(a):

"Each Comprehensive Land Use Plan and development regulations shall be subject to continuing review and evaluation by the county or city that adopted them. A county or city shall take legislative action to review and, if need, revise its Comprehensive Land Use Plan and development regulations to ensure the plan and regulations comply with the requirements of this chapter according to the time period specified in subsection (4) of this section..."

Subsection 4 requires Clallam County to act on or before December 1, 2004, and every seven years thereafter.

Clallam County alleges that the Hearing Board lacks jurisdiction to rule that the Carlsborg Capital Facilities Plan fails to comply with the Growth Management Act (GMA). Clallam County states the CFP was adopted in 2000 and no appeal was timely filed. Therefore existing plans and regulations have been deemed compliant with the
GMA. Clallam County cites the Supreme Court’s ruling in *Thurston County v. WVECD*, 164 Wn. 2d 329, 190 P. 3d 38 (2008) as authority. That case was decided after the Board’s decision in this matter.

In *Thurston County* the Court said:

"We hold that a party may challenge a county’s failure to revise aspects of a Comprehensive Plan that are directly affected by new or recently amended GMA provisions if a petition is filed within 60 days after publication of the County’s 7-year update. A party may challenge a county’s revisions or failures to revise its UGA designations when there is a change in the population projection, if a petition is filed within 60 days after publication of the county’s 10-year update." *Thurston County*, supra, at page 336.

Later in the opinion the Court rephrased the question as follows:

"When a Comprehensive Plan is updated either every seven years in accordance with former RCW 36.70A.130(1)(a) or when UGA’s are reviewed every ten years in accordance with former RCW 36.70A.130(3), does a GMEB have jurisdiction to review the entire Comprehensive Plan?" *Thurston County*, supra, at page 342.

The Court in answering that question held: at page 343:

"A party may challenge a county’s failure to revise aspects of a Comprehensive Plan which are directly affected by new or recently amended GMA provisions following a seven year update."

Futuressive, who was the appellant in the *Thurston County* case argued that it should have been able to challenge all aspects of a Comprehensive Plan following a seven year update regardless of whether a Comprehensive Plan was revised. The Supreme Court disagreed noting that the statute did not explicitly define which aspects of a Comprehensive Plan must be updated nor delineate the scope of challenges that might be brought against a Comprehensive Plan. The Court noted:

"The GMA clearly does not require a county to re-examine a new Comprehensive Plan every seven years. It simply mandates a county review and, if needed, revise its Comprehensive Land Use Plan and development regulations."

The Court stated “we refuse to imply such an onerous requirement in the absence of an explicit GMA provision to the contrary.” *Thurston County*, supra, at page 344. The Court then went on to state:

"We hold a party may challenge a county’s failure to revise a Comprehensive Plan only with respect to those provisions that are directly affected by new or recently amended GMA provisions, meaning those provisions related to mandatory elements of the comprehensive plan that have been adopted or substantively amended since the previous Comprehensive Plan was adopted or updated, following a seven year update. This rule provides a means to ensure a Comprehensive Plan complies with recent GMA amendments, recognizes the original plan was legally deemed compliant with the GMA, and preserves some degree of finality." *Thurston County*, supra, at page 344. (emphasis added)

Clallam County argues that the only pertinent GMA amendment that would enable an update challenge was “solely to add park and recreation facilities to the Capital Facilities Plan requirement.”

The Board found that the Capital Facilities Plan as it related to park and recreational facilities was compliant with the GMA. Futuressive also notes that the new statute added the requirement for park and recreation facilities consideration and required that be included in the Capital Facilities Plan element. Futurewise notes and argues in its opening brief at page 9: “In fact, none of Futuressive’s specific challenges at the Board was the CFP provision for parks and recreation facilities. Thus the
amendment to the CFP, pursuant to Thurston County, gave Futurewise standing to
challenge (and the Board jurisdiction to hear a challenge to) the CFP, in toto."

The language in Thurston County cannot be read that broad. It specifically
limits the challenge to those "provisions related to mandatory elements of a
Comprehensive Plan that had been adopted or substantially amended since the previous
Comprehensive Plan was adopted or updated..." Neither the language of the Thurston
County opinion nor logical inferences from that language, would allow a challenge to a
Comprehensive Plan "in toto" as argued by Futurewise. In fact, the Thurston County
Court went on to note that their ruling created "no 'open season' for challenges
previously decided or time barred." Thurston County, supra, at page 344.

Accordingly, this court finds that the challenges beyond the scope of new GMA
legislation mandating changes to the Carlberg Capital Facilities Plan are not justified
related to a county's failure to review a Comprehensive Plan on a periodic review.

The Thurston County case, however, also notes a second basis upon which a
challenge may be made following a county's periodic update. At page 347 the Thurston
County Court noted:

"A party may challenge a county's failure to revise its UGA designations during
a ten year update only if the OPM population projection for the county changed." The
Court noted: "If the Urban Growth Projection changes, a county must revise its
Comprehensive Plan." Former RCW 36.70A.130(3). "If the county fails to revise its
plan, a party may challenge whether the UGA accommodates the most recent OPM
population projection."

The language seems somewhat inconsistent at first blush with the court's earlier
ruling relating to the Comprehensive Plan update. Here, however, it is the UGA
designation which is required to be reviewed rather than the comprehensive plan in full.

The Court noted that a Comprehensive Plan must designate a UGA "within
which urban growth shall be encouraged and outside of which growth can occur only if
it is not urban in nature." RCW 36.70A.110(1).

In Futurewise's responsive brief it argues at page 9: "The County completely
fails to address (or even mention) the other key holding in Thurston County, which is
that 'a party may challenge a county's revisions or failures to revise its UGA
designations when there is a change in the population projection, if a petition is filed
within 60 days after publication of the county's ten-year update.'" Thurston County,
supra, at page 336.

Futurewise then states:

"Thus as a jurisdictional question, the Board had the
to hear a challenge to the County's revisions or
to failure to revise its UGA. As a consequence of the
County having undertaken a UGA revision, the County
was also obliged to update its Capital Facilities and
Transportations Plans. As a result, the Board properly
reviewed the County's changes to the Carlberg UGA and
properly addressed the noncompliant portions of the
related CFP both because the CFP provisions of the GMA
had been amended and because the CFP was a necessary
component of the UGA update. Each of these
circumstances independently created jurisdiction for the
Board." Futurewise responsive brief, pages 9 and 10.

The Thurston County case, however, indicates that what is to be reviewed are
the designations of UGA's. The issue is whether or not the UGA accommodates the
most recent OPM population projections. The County resolution states that its UGA's
are sufficient to meet the OPM changing population projections for the next 20 years as
is required. That is what an Urban Growth Area designation does. That decision could
be challenged. The specifics of the application of specific Facilities Plan elements or
Comprehensive Plan elements previously approved is not within the scope of a review
of the appropriate designation of land as an UGA. To hold otherwise would simply negate the holding of the Supreme Court in *Thornton County* as it relates to challenges to Comprehensive Plan and development regulations issues. Clearly the Supreme Court did not intend that result nor would logic or the rational given for the Court’s decision as to Comprehensive Plan Reviews warrant such an inconsistent finding as to UGA designations.

Here, the record discloses as to the Carlsborg UGA, that the County did not change the designation of the UGA, nor did the County change its Comprehensive Plan or Capital Facilities Plan in any manner which would have impacted the existing Carlsborg UGA plans as to the issues raised on appeal. Accordingly the only basis upon which an appeal could be granted would be whether the County should have modified the size of the Carlsborg UGA, or, that in light of the GMA requirements to add recreation and park facilities and other such newly legislated considerations, the County was incorrect in the manner in which it either did or did not handle that new requirement. The parks and similar new GMA issues were raised and decided and have not been appealed. Accordingly this Court and the WWGMBH are without authority to hear other challenges to the previously adopted Carlsborg UGA and Capital Facilities Plan. The Growth Management Hearings Board determination that it had authority to do so, and their subsequent finding that the plan was not in compliance with the GMA are reversed.

VI. RURAL DENSITIES ISSUES:

The argument may be appropriately framed as follows: The Growth Management Hearings Board and Futurewise argue that densities allowing a dwelling unit on parcels less than 5 acres are not rural densities and therefore do not conform to the Growth Management Act’s policies and principles and are therefore noncompliant.

Since the statute requires the County’s determination that such uses are rural in character to be deemed correct unless clearly erroneous, the standard of review for this court is to determine whether or not the Growth Management Hearings Board committed an error at law, or whether there is substantial evidence to support its finding that the County was clearly erroneous in finding that 2.4 acre parcels could constitute rural character density within Clallam County.

This particular issue is analyzed and discussed in the Final Decision and Order beginning at page 53 of the opinion. The issue is phrased as:

"Whether the County’s failure to prohibit maximum rural densities of less than one dwelling unit per 5 acres outside of limited areas of more intensive rural development (Landlots) in Section 20 (a), and failure to review and revise the Comprehensive Plan and development regulations to eliminate rural densities of less than one dwelling unit per 5 acres outside of limited areas of more intensive rural development (Landlots) violates RCW 36.90A.020 ... ."

The Court notes that densities of 5 acres and two and a half acres constitute geometric divisions of land of these sizes only by virtue of land having initially been surveyed and platted in sections generations ago. The determination of a section and therefore the divisions of a section are mathematical calculations unrelated to
topography, utility of the land to any particular use, environmental concerns, or population density by any measure based on scientific, socioeconomic, cultural or other grounds. They are arbitrary numbers generated arbitrarily from an arbitrary standard created hundreds of years previously. They are, however, the densities at issue. In part, this is because those designations of parcel sizes are what have been used for the division and subdivision and sale of land well before planning and zoning laws came into being and which division standards continue to exist to the present time. the decision of the Western Washington Growth Management Hearing Board limits the question of rural density designations to those geometric considerations. No one is arguing, for example, that the best available science would result in a rural density being 3.872 acres in size as opposed to 5 or 2.5 which are the generally used acreages for the divisions and sale of sections of land.

The record reflects that the County, prior to the Growth Management Act, had adopted a Comprehensive Plan and zoning which created patterns of land use and division within the County. These have been downsized since 1995 and otherwise retained under the GMA according to the County. (See the 2006 Draft Rural Lands Report at page 1, number 6.) At page 65 of the Final Decision and Order the Board analyzed the rural density issue and found as follows:

"The Board finds that Pierce County has adequately demonstrated that the rural character of Chelan County, specifically its rural landscape and farm-based economy, is dominated by lots of greater than 5 acres in size. With such a large percentage of the County's existing land use pattern at a parcel size of 5.81 acres and farms within the County averaging 25 acres, the existing rural landscape supports a finding that the rural character of Chelan County is a rural density of 1 dwell acre.

"The Board recognizes the GMA mandate for Chelan County to provide for a variety of rural densities and permits its discretion in making planning decisions. However, the densities the County selects must be rural in nature. The importance of rural lands and their character is specific, looking to land use patterns for establishing rural character and seeking to foster traditional rural lifestyles and economies that a County has historically provided. By authorizing densities that do not reflect the existing landscape or economy of the area, the County has failed to maintain the rural lifestyles of the residents of Chelan County as required by the GMA."

RCW 36.70A.020 sets forth the "planning goals" of the Growth Management Act. In listing the goals the statute states:

"The following goals are not listed in order of priority and shall be used exclusively for the purpose of guiding the development of comprehensive plans and development regulations." The 13 goals listed may be summarized as:

1. To encourage development in urban areas where adequate public facilities and services exist or can be provided in an efficient manner.
2. To reduce sprawl.
3. Transportation considerations.
4. To encourage the availability of affordable housing and to promote a variety of residential densities and housing types and to preserve existing housing stock.
5. Encourage development which specifically is to promote economic opportunity for all citizens and encourage growth in areas experiencing insufficient economic growth within the capacity of the state's natural resources, public services and public facilities.

6. Property rights preservation.

7. Permit issues.

8. Natural resources industries are to be encouraged.

9. Open space and recreation is to be retained and enhanced.

10. The environment is to be protected.

11. Citizen participation and coordination is encouraged.

12. Public facilities and services ensure that services necessary to support development shall be adequate at the time the development is available for occupancy without decreasing service levels below locally established minimum standards.

13. Historic preservation is encouraged.

The GMA discusses rural lands extensively. In RCW 36.70A.011 the Legislature noted that the Act was intended to recognize the importance of rural lands and rural character to Washington's economy, it's people, and its environment, while respecting regional differences. The final paragraph of that section of the Act reads:

"Finally, the Legislature finds that in defining its rural element under RCW 36.70A.070(5), a county should foster land use patterns and develop a local vision of rural character that will: Help preserve rural based economies and traditional rural lifestyles; encourage the economic prosperity of rural residents; foster opportunities for small scale, rural based employment and self-employment; permit the operation of rural based agricultural, commercial, recreational, and tourist businesses that are consistent with existing and planned land use patterns; be compatible with the use of the land by wildlife and for fish and wildlife habitat; foster the private stewardship of the land and preservation of open space; and enhance the rural sense of community and quality of life."

RCW 36.70A.070(5) states: "Rural element. Counties shall include a rural element including lands that are not designated for urban growth, agriculture, forest, or mineral resources." Thereafter the Legislature sets forth provisions which shall apply to the rural element. Part of the provisions of RCW 70A.070 in subsection (4)(v) require that a county adopt measures to minimize and contain the existing areas of more intensive rural development. In many respects the position of the parties is predicated upon the Growth Management Act requiring the County to plan in accordance with its existing land uses and character on the date upon which the County adopted a Comprehensive Plan under the Growth Management Act.

In its existing Comprehensive Plan Clallam County has adopted a definition of "rural character", which incorporates the standards set forth in the Growth Management Act and includes some additional detail. Furthermore argues that it's the County's own Comprehensive Plan, previously approved and found to be compliant with the GMA, that precludes the County from adopting a 2.4 acre density as rural. The Clallam County Comprehensive Plan provides:
"Rural character" means the existing and preferred patterns of land use and development established for lands designated as rural areas or lands under this comprehensive plan. Rural characteristics include, but are not limited to: (a) Open fields and woodlots interspersed with homesteads and service by small rural commercial clusters; and (b) low residential densities, small-scale agriculture, woodland forestry, wildlife habitat, clean water, clean air, outdoor recreation, and low traffic volumes; and (c) Areas in which open space, the natural landscape, and vegetation predominate over the built environment; and (d) Lifestyles and economies common to areas designated as rural areas and lands under this Plan; and (e) Visual landscapes that are traditionally found in areas designated rural areas and lands under this Plan; and (f) Areas that are compatible with the use of the land by wildlife and for fish and wildlife habitat; and (g) Areas that reduce the inappropriate conversion of undeveloped land into sprawling, low-density development; and (h) Areas that generally do not require the extension of urban governmental services; and (i) Areas that are consistent with the protection of natural surface water flows and groundwater and surface water recharge and discharge areas. (See CCC 31.02.050(31).)

Futuewise argues that under the County Plan, to be of rural character, property must meet all nine of the listed characteristics and that lots of 2.4 acres per dwelling unit cannot meet all nine rural characteristics listed in the County's own Comprehensive Plan and therefore are not rural.

Essentially, the argument as to density is as follows: Futuewise and the Growth Management Hearings Board argue that unless lots are 5 acres or greater, they cannot meet the rural character test to be rural densities. The County argues that having some lots planned for 2.4 acres within the County's rural areas, still meets the Growth Management intent to preserve the rural character in Chelan County and the GMA directive to have varying densities within rural lands.

The debate as to the minimum lot sizes for rural lands is not unique to Chelan County. In the Thurston County case, the Court ultimately remanded the matter so that the regional Growth Management Hearings Board could determine whether it was clearly erroneous for Thurston County to include densities greater than one dwelling unit per 5 acres in its rural element and whether County adequately provided for a variety of rural densities by the use of innovative zoning techniques.

The Thurston County Court noted that "since 1995, GMBHs have utilized bright line standards to distinguish between urban and rural densities." The Board had considered densities of not more than one dwelling unit per 5 acres to be rural. The Thurston County Court, at page 358 went on to note "the GMBH, as a quasi-judicial agency, lacks the power to make bright line rules regarding maximum rural densities." Citing Viking Properties, supra, at page 129-30. The Thurston County Court thereafter at page 359 stated: "We hold a GMBH may not use a bright line rule to delimit between urban and rural densities, nor may it subject certain densities to increased scrutiny."

The Court noted:

"The Legislature did not specifically define what constitutes a rural density. Instead, it provided local
The Board noted that the County had eight rural zoning districts outside of
LAMIRDS, with approximately 52% of all parcels within those zones being greater than
4.81 acres. The Board then noted that “more than half of the County’s rural land is
comprised of parcels greater than 4.81 acres each.” Final Decision and Order page 61.
At page 63 the Board then noted that:

“The rural character of Clallam County, specifically its
visual landscape and farm-based economy, is dominated
by lots of greater than 5 acres in size. With such a large
percentage of the County’s existing land use pattern at a
parcel size of 4.81 acres and farms within the county
averaging 25 acres, the existing rural landscape supports a
finding that the rural character of Clallam County is a
rural density of 1 dwelling.

The Board went on to state “by authorizing densities that do not reflect the
existing landscape or economy of the area, the County has failed to maintain the
traditional rural lifestyle of the residents of Clallam County as required by the GMA.”
The GMA doesn’t elsewhere state that its purpose is to “maintain traditional rural
lifestyles”, rather, it addresses uses of land and defines rural land use characteristics.

If approximately 54% of the County’s rural lands are parcels of 5 acres or larger,
that necessarily means that 46% of the County’s rural areas are parcels of less than 5
acres. At page 10 of the Rural Lands Report the County noted the following:

“Only 9.2% of the County’s lands are held in rural
designations, with 1.7% of those to be designated as
laminare, leaving 7.1% (sic) the County’s lands in true
rural densities, ranging from 1 dwelling per 2.4 acres to 1
dwelling per 20 acres. Areas of the County where
parcels were designated at densities of 1 dwelling per 2.4 acres had
already occurred by 1994 under prior rural designations,
were designated for in-fill development at that density
(2% of the County). In areas of the County where such
parcelization was not yet prevalent by 1995, but where
prior rural designations created legitimate property
expectations among landowners, were (sic) designated to
allow clustered development at densities of 1 dwelling per
2.4 acres, with a base density of 1 dwelling per 5 acres or
1 dwelling per 10 acres, depending upon the existing
surrounding circumstances. The total area of the County
providing for these cluster density incentives involves
1.4% of the County. The remaining rural lands were
designed at densities ranging from 1 dwelling per 4.8
acres to 1 dwelling per 20 acres.*

The County also chose to divide itself into four planning regions based upon
unique characteristics. These include a Sequim area designation, a Port Angeles area
designation, a Forks area designation, and a designation of the property lying between
Port Angeles and Forks (the Strait Planning Region). In each of these designations
reasons for allowing 2.4 acres dwelling units in a rural zone were individually
discussed. As noted in the report, in the Sequim planning area 84% of the rural area
under the County’s enacted Comprehensive Plan is zoned at density of one dwelling
per 4.8% acres or less. In the Port Angeles planning region the report notes: “In
addition, excluding LAMIRDS, the PAPR’s rural designations are consistent with
maintaining an average rural density of 1 unit per 5 acres, but in a manner that
accommodates a variety of lot sizes on the ground.” In the area between Port Angeles
and Forks, more than 80% of the rural area is zoned at 1 dwelling per 4.8 acres or more.
Finally in the western planning region of Forks, the rural lands report notes that over
95% of the rural area is zoned at densities of 1 dwelling unit per 4.8 acres or less.

The County notes at page 15 “all rural zone designations prescribe allowed,
conditional, and prohibited land uses as well as density, lot sizes, width to depth ratios,
setbacks, and development restrictions which are consistent with the stated purposes of
the respective zoning designations.” Beginning at page 22 the County outlines its
rural lands report its analysis of each of the rural characteristics and how it applies to the
County’s proposed Comprehensive Plan rural designations. The Rural Lands Report’s
review of the GMA rural characteristics and its discussion of their application to each of
the four planning regions adopted by the County is neither simplistic nor formulaic.
The question therefore is whether or not, in allowing for rural zoning designations of
one dwelling unit per 2.4 acres or greater in some rural zones, when viewed from a
totality of circumstances standpoint as required by the GMA, the County clearly got it
wrong. (i.e. was “clearly erroneous.”)

The Western Washington Growth Management Hearings Board says the County
got it wrong because, with 54% of the County’s rural lands presently being 5 acres or
larger, provisions to allow rural designations of less than that would not “preserve” the
rural character of the county. In the Putremie’s responsive brief, page 19, it notes that
within Clallam County in areas zoned R2 and RW2 25.3% of the rural land is presently

The largest percentage of the land in each of the locations is in commercial forest and similar open space designations.

Under the GMA lands which are not natural resource lands, agricultural lands, forest lands, mineral resource lands of long-term significance, or LAMs or urban growth areas, are defined as "rural areas".

The Thurston County case and the GMA note that natural resource lands and agricultural land are not part of the county's rural element and are not to be considered in meeting the requirement of having a variety of rural densities within the meaning of the Growth Management Act. Clallam County, however, indicates that the fact of the extensive resource and open space areas within the county adjacent to rural lands allows such adjacent areas to be considered a factor in determining appropriate rural density in light of the high percentage of the county which cannot be developed. Clallam County argues it is unique among counties in the sense of having massive forest resource and other open land within its boundaries.

The County's analysis and argument in support of its allowance of some rural densities of 1/4 to 2.4 acres, includes reciting the goals which are listed among the 13 goals of the GMA. It is important to note again that these goals are not prioritized and one is not necessarily more important than another. Clallam County has concluded that it can meet the goals of the Growth Management Act, and comply with the definitions
of rural character by having a portion of its rural lands with a density of one dwelling unit per 2.4 acres.

The Growth Management Act was intended to reduce rural sprawl and to promote urban growth in areas where efficient provision of public services to a larger population could be made. However, had the Legislature merely intended that all rural tracts would be five acres or larger they could have said so. They chose not to say that.

RCW 36.70A.110(1), as previously noted, requires that in areas outside of urban growth areas (UGA’s) “growth can occur only if it is not urban in nature.”

RCW 36.70A.030(18) defines “urban growth” as “growth that makes intensive use of land for the location of buildings, structures and impermeable surfaces to such a degree as to be incompatible with the primary use of land for the production of food, other agricultural products, or fiber, or the extraction of mineral resources, rural uses, rural development, and natural resource lands designated pursuant to RCW 36.70A.170. A pattern of more intensive rural development, as provided in RCW 36.70A.070(3)(b) is not urban growth. When allowed to spread over wide areas, urban growth typically requires urban governmental services. “Characterized by urban growth” refers to land having urban growth located on it, or to land located in relationship to an area with urban growth on it as to be appropriate for urban growth.”

RCW 36.70A.070(5) refers to the definition of urban growth, relates to LAMRDS.

RCW 36.70A.070(5) discusses considerations for the rural element of comprehensive plans. It states that counties are to include a rural element which includes lands that are not designated for urban growth, agriculture, forest, or mineral resources. Subsection (A) states in part: “because circumstances vary from county to county, in establishing patterns of rural densities and uses, a county may consider local circumstances, but shall develop a written record explaining how the rural element harmonizes the planning goals in RCW 36.70A.020 and meets the requirements of this chapter.”

Subsection (B) states in part:

“The rural element shall permit rural development, forestry, and agriculture in rural areas. The rural element shall provide for a variety of rural densities, uses, essential public facilities, and rural governmental services needed to serve the permitted densities and uses. To achieve a variety of rural densities and uses, counties may provide for clustering, density transfer, design guidelines, conservation easements, and other innovative techniques that will accommodate appropriate rural densities and uses that are not characterized by urban growth and that are consistent with rural character.”

In Subsection (C) the rural element is required to include measures that will contain or otherwise control rural development; assure visual compatibility of rural development with the surrounding rural area; reduce inappropriate conversion of undeveloped land into sprawling, low density development in the rural area; protect critical areas and surface and groundwater resources; and protect against conflicts with the use of agricultural, forest, and mineral resource lands designated under the GMA.
In Quadrant Corporation v. State Growth Management Hearings Board, 154 Wash. 2d 224, 110 P. 4d 132 (2005), the Court stated at page 240: “Considering the discretion afforded counties to plan, 'in full consideration of local circumstances,' RCW 36.70A.3201, King County's decision to consider vested application and development rights to determine that the Bear Creek area 'already [was] characterized by urban growth' was not a clearly erroneous application of the GMA."

In Diel vs. Mason County, 94 Wash. App. 645, 972 P.2d 543 (1999) the Court noted that the broad discretion allowed to local governments under the GMA to draft comprehensive plans and development regulations tailored to local circumstances was nonetheless limited by the requirement that the final plans and regulations be consistent with the mandates and goals of the act. In Diel, the Court was concerned that the rational for the Mason County's determinations was not evident in the record and that the County had not pointed to a place in the record where its justifications for its Comprehensive Plan and regulations were made. Here, Clallam County prepared the “December 2006 draft Clallam County Rural Lands Report” which is specifically designed to convey the rational behind its determinations.

The Court has reviewed the rural lands report prepared by Clallam County in support of its Comprehensive Plan and land use designations. As noted, it is neither simplistic nor formulaic. The County, using the Growth Management Act as its guide, and factual and historical data particular to Clallam County, has adopted a comprehensive scheme and explained the rationale behind the plan. As it relates to rural densities of one dwelling unit per 2.4 acres the plan is justified on a number of bases.

The County has divided itself into four sub regions for planning purposes and discusses the factual reasons for the regionalization and the different land use planning issues raised for each region based on number of factors as diverse as average population age, economic downturns, and vested rights. It strikes this Court that that is exactly the type of planning the GMA envisioned.

To the contrary the WWCMBB's literally “one size fits all” approach to rural density seems contrary to the act and would even seem to give rise to constitutional taking and due process concerns if that were what the GMA actually stood for.

Under RCW 36.70A.320(3), the review is to be upon the entire record before the County. The decision of the Board relates only to densities and discusses in little or no detail the other goals of the GMA as they might apply to the County's rural density designations.

In the Viking Properties case, supra, the Court noted the 13 nonprioritized goals of the GMA. At page 127 that Court noted that to elevate the goal of density to the detriment of other important GMA goals would violate the Legislature's express statement that the goals are non-prioritized.
The Growth Management Hearing Boards have been criticized for attempting to legislate a five acre minimum parcel size in rural areas of the state. (See Viking Properties, supra, at page 120) Clearly that is contrary to the concept of the GMA which strives to allow local jurisdictions to make locally appropriate land use plans. Clallam County notes that the ultimate impact of its plans would be to place rural land within the county in designations which result in an average parcel size of approximately five acres. Some parcels would be allowed only larger than that and some smaller, but none smaller than 2.4 acres, except in innovative zoning areas such as cluster zones and the like. The Court also notes that in connection with the Carlsborg issue, the Board found that allowing lots larger than 4 dwelling units per acre could not be considered urban. A 2.4 acre lot is ten times less dense than what the Growth Management Hearing Board in this case found to constitute the minimum density for urban use. The act states that growth is to be discouraged outside of GMA's and is to occur "only if it is not urban in nature" RCW 36.78.001 (1). A permitted density ten times less dense than the lowest "urban" density seems to meet such a standard.

Therefore, the last issue is whether or not such lot sizes can never conform to the "rural characteristics" requirements.

In Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary, 1981, by G & C Merriam Co., has many definitions of "character". The one that appears to fit the best is "one of the attributes or features that make up and distinguish the individual."

No doubt each of the rural lands characteristics are important in assessing whether the land is rural or not. In the Rural Lands Report, the County discusses each of the characteristics listed and concludes that parcel designations of 2.4 acres, coupled together with other innovative zoning restrictions and considerations, and together with the totality of the unique circumstances found in and throughout Clallam County, meet each of the characteristics listed.

One suspects that the WVGHB, while attempting not to say so, still believes and accordingly ruled that a bright line 5 acre minimum density in rural areas is required under the GMA. Nothing in the act directly supports such a conclusion. Here, to the contrary, a great deal of analysis of circumstances and other factors has led Clallam County to conclude that a rural area in Clallam County may include some parcels of less than five acres and still be considered rural. This court finds that there is not substantial evidence in the record by which a court could find that the County's decision was clearly erroneous in that regard. Accordingly, the order of the Growth Management Hearing Board finding the County's Comprehensive Plan to be noncompliant as it relates to the R2 and RW2 zones is reversed.

DATED this 26th day of June, 2009.

Respectfully submitted,

KEN WILLIAMS
JUDGE
APPENDIX B

BEFORE THE WESTERN WASHINGTON GROWTH MANAGEMENT HEARINGS BOARD

DRY CREEK COALITION and FUTUREWISE, Petitioners,

v.

CLALLAM COUNTY, Respondent.

CASE NO. 07-2-0018c

COMPLIANCE ORDER
(LAMIRDs and RURAL LANDS)

This matter came before the Board on September 17, 2009 for a Compliance Hearing following the submittal of two Clallam County Compliance Reports, one for Limited Areas of More Intensive Rural Development (LAMIRDs) and the other dealing with rural lands. These Compliance Reports describe the actions Clallam County (the "County") has taken in response to the Board's April 23, 2008 Final Decision and Order (FDO) as modified by the January 30, 2009 Compliance Order and subsequent Orders on Reconsideration.

The Board conducted a telephonic compliance hearing. Dry Creek Coalition (DCC) was represented by Gerald Storer. Futurewise was represented by Robert Beasley. Clallam County was represented by Doug Jensen. With Mr. Jensen were John Miller, Director of Community Development for Clallam County and Steve Gray, County Planning Director. Board Members Nina Carter, William Roehl and James McNamara were present, with Mr. McNamara presiding.

1. LAMIRDs

2. April 23, 2008 Final Decision and Order.
4. June 9, 2009 Order on Motion for Reconsideration; February 20, 2009 Order on Motion for Reconsideration.

COMPLIANCE ORDER (LAMIRDs and Rural Lands)
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In April 2008, this Board found twenty of the County's LAMIRDS failed to comply with the
GMA. In response, the County removed four LAMIRDS and adjusted the logical outer
boundaries (LOBs) on the remaining sixteen. Despite this, in the Board's January 30, 2009
Order Finding Noncompliance, the Board found that the County remained noncompliant with
GMA requirements relating to four remaining LAMIRDS. The Board also found the County
noncompliant in its use of the phrase "prior to" July 1, 1990 in its development regulations
as the relevant timeframe for the purposes of evaluating existing areas and uses under
RCW 38.70A.070(5)(b)(v). In order to address the remaining LAMIRD compliance orders, the County, on June 23,

Based on the original holdings of the Board set forth in the April 2008 FDO and the January
2008 Compliance Order, the compliance issues currently before the Board are:
1. The phrase "the uses that existed in the areas prior to or as of July 1, 1990 ..." was clearly erroneous. [Conclusion of Law E-G];
2. Inclusion of the southeastern portion of the Drya-West LAMIRD [aka Drya-Stabourn] was clearly erroneous. [Conclusion of Law I];
3. Inclusion of the 10 acre Northwestern portion of the Mesa & Ring site and the Peninsula Timber Company property [within the Laird's Corner-East LAMIRD], were clearly erroneous. [Conclusion of Law P and Q];
4. Inclusion of the Port Angeles Gun Club property in the Deer Park LAMIRD was clearly erroneous. [Conclusion of Law T]; and
5. The Lake Farm LAMIRD remained non-compliant. [Conclusion of Law U].

In response, the County took the following actions:
1. With regard to the County's use of the phrase "the uses that existed in the areas prior
to or as of July 1, 1990 ...", which the Board had not considered with RCW
38.70A.070(5)(v), the County changed its Code language to reference "an existing
area or existing use that was in existence: (A) On July 1, 1990 ..." All "prior to"
language and the phrase "prior to or" were deleted throughout the relevant County's
codes sections to be consistent with the GMA statutory language.
2. The Drya-West LAMIRD (the western section) was amended to exclude the
remainder of the eastern highway frontage parcel and the Comprehensive Plan Land
Use and Zoning Map for this location updated from Rural Commercial (RC) to Rural
Low (RL). The County notes that the 1990 aerial photograph of the Laird's Corner-East LAMIRD
showed built environment existing on Peninsula Timber Short Plat Parcel "A" consisting of buildings used for commercial activities justifying its inclusion in the
Laids' Corner LAMIRD. Peninsula Timber Short Plat Parcel "B" was used for wood
products wholesaling from 1970 to 1993. The County amended the Laird's Corner
East LAMIRD to exclude the Peninsula Timber Short Plat Parcel "B" and Crown
Pacific Survey Parcel "A" and retain these portions from Rural Limited Commercial
(RLC) to RCC. The Peninsula Timber Short Plat Parcel "A" was retained as part of
the LAMIRD.
4. The Deer Park LAMIRD was amended to exclude the Port Angeles Gun Club
property and the Comprehensive Plan Land Use and Zoning Map for this location
was updated from Rural Commercial (RC) to Rural Low (RL).
5. The County initially considered reduction of the entire Lake Farm LAMIRD but received additional information from landowners and the Public Utility District (PUD) regarding the installation of public infrastructure as of July 1, 1990. Based on this new information, the County redraw the LAMIRD boundaries to reflect the extent to which the PUD water maine were installed and existed to service individual lots as of July 1, 1990.10

Both Petitioners Dry Creek Coalition and Futureswede have filed responses to the County’s LAMIRD compliance report in which they state that they do not object to a finding of compliance with respect to the LAMIRD issues. However, Futureswede raised objections to the new Solmar and Marine Drive LAMIRDs as too broadly drawn.14

As to the Marine Drive LAMIRD, the County pointed out that those parcels included within this LAMIRD to which Futureswede objected were removed from the LAMIRD. The Board finds no clear error in the Marine Drive LAMIRD.

With regard to the Solmar LAMIRD, Futureswede objected to larger parcels along Highway 101 that were not developed in 1990 and are not developed now. These four “larger parcels” range in size from 1.7 to 2.6 acres and, as they cannot be further divided given the underlying zoning, are consistent with the proposed maximum density of 1du/2.4 acre for this area. The County has chosen to use Highway 101 as the southern border of the Logical Outer Boundary (LOB) for this LAMIRD. This is consistent with RCW 36.70A.070(3)(b).

The Board does not find that the County was clearly erroneous in establishing the LOB for the Solmar LAMIRD.

Conclusive: Based on the Board’s review of the County’s compliance efforts with regard to LAMIRDs, the Board concludes that the County has achieved compliance with the GMA as to those portions of the County’s adoption found noncompliant in the January 2008 Compliance Order, Conclusions of Law E-G, L, Q, T and U. These revisions remove the basis for a finding of noncompliance from these LAMIRDs and the code sections in question. In addition, the Board finds that Petitioner has not shown the County’s actions in establishing the Marine Drive or Solmar LAMIRDs to be clearly erroneous.

2. Rural Lands

In the Board’s April 23, 2008 FDO, the Board found that such a large portion of the County’s existing land use pattern characterized by a parcel size of 4.81 acres, zoning that...
authorized lower densities failed to maintain the County’s traditional rural lifestyles. The
Board wrote that:

...[The rural character of Clallam County, specifically its visual landscape and
farm-based economy, is dominated by lots of greater than five acres in size. With
such a large percentage of the County’s existing land use pattern at a parcel size
of 4.81 acres and farms within the County averaging 25 acres, the existing rural
landscape supports a finding that the rural character of Clallam County is a rural
density of 1 du/8 acre.

The Board recognizes the GMA mandate for Clallam County to provide for a
variety of rural densities and permits the discretion in making planning decisions.
However, the densities the County selects must be rural in nature. The
importance of rural lands and their character is specific, looking to land use
patterns that establish rural character and seeking to preserve traditional rural
lifestyles and economies that a County has historically provided. By authorizing
densities that do not reflect the existing landscape or economy of the area, the
County has failed to maintain the traditional rural lifestyles of the residents of
Clallam County as required by the GMA.

...the Board finds that the following rural zoning district within Clallam County
violates RCW 36.70A.110, 36.70A.020(1) and, 36.70A.020(2) because these zoning
districts permit urban, not rural, densities outside of an urban growth area:

CCC 33.10.030 R2 zone: Permits 1 du/2.4 acres
CCC 33.10.035 RW2 zone: Permits 1 du/2.4 acres

Thus, the Board found that the R2 and RW2 zones effectively permitted urban, not rural,
densities outside of an urban growth area.

In order to achieve compliance, the County first enacted Interim Rural Low (IRL) zoning in
place of the invalid R2 and RW2 zones. Then, with the adoption of Resolution No. 87, 2009
FDO at 63-64. This portion of the Board’s FDO also found the County’s R1 and RW1 zones non-compliant.
However, these areas were addressed by the Board in its January 2009 Compliance Order which noted that
Clallam County had provided clarification that R1/RW1 lands were confined to LAMIRDs zones within the
various planning regions identified by Fmowatine and the R1/RW1 lands were removed or converted to the
constrained LAMIRDs were removed under this rural zoning. Compliance Order, at 60-61.

the newly adopted NCO provision addresses neighborhoods which are already
substantially developed and characterized by densities greater than the underlying
maximum NC zone density of 1 dwelling unit per 5 acres. As described in the County’s
Rural Land Policy 4.0, this is allowed “at a density consistent with the substantial residential
development already existing” and that “will be consistent with the visual compatibility of
rural development with the surrounding rural area”. In order to qualify for a NCO
development, the surrounding neighborhood character must demonstrate that at least 70% of parcels within 500 of the property boundary are developed with an average lot size of less than 5 acres. [24] Developed lots located within LAMIRDs and urban growth areas are not included in calculating the average lot density. [25]

The County has also adopted a provision to allow clustering in the NC zone under the provisions of the Neighborhood Conservation Cluster (NCC). The stated intent of the NCC provision is "to encourage creative site designs of subdivisions to encourage keeping larger, contiguous rural lots and open space tracts, retain features of rural character associated with the land to be divided, and reduce the area of rural lands used for roads, utilities, driveways, and other previous surfaces." [26]

As described by the County, while the NCC review looks at the surrounding neighborhood to ensure that future divisions of a subject parcel will be consistent and compatible with an existing rural neighborhood, an NCC review examines the specified rural parcel to ensure that any division of that parcel maximizes the retention of a larger lot acreage and the preservation of open space. [27] Landowners who preserve open space by clustering receive density bonuses and reduced infrastructure costs. CCC 33.10.016 (10) provides for a maximum residential density of 1 dwelling unit per 2.4 acres and requires that a minimum of 70% of the gross acreage of the NCC development be retained as a large rural lot, set aside under a permanent open-space easement, or set aside as permanent open space owned and maintained by a homeowners' association.

While Futurewise acknowledges that "whether a particular density is rural in nature is a question of fact based on the specific circumstances of each case," it nonetheless maintains that a density of 1 dwelling unit per 2.4 acres is "characterized by urban growth," and inconsistent with the density otherwise allowed in the rural zones. However, if it is agreed that the determination of rural density is based on the specific circumstances of each case, it is not appropriate to disallow a 1du/2.4 acre density out-of-hand, but instead to apply the density, if at all, where it is consistent with existing rural development. In fact, there are areas in Chelan County where a density of 1du/2.4 acre can be consistent with a rural environment, when appropriately limited in a manner such as the County now provides.

In fact, this is the approach the County has taken. In the case of the NCC, densities of 1du/2.4 acre may be applied only where this density is "consistent with the developed neighborhood character and uses." [28] Under the NCC provisions, the stated intent is to "encourage keeping larger, contiguous rural lots and open space tracts, retain features of rural character associated with the land to be divided, and reduce the area of rural lands used for roads, utilities, driveways, and other impervious surfaces." [29] In both cases, consistency with the existing rural development is the goal. Both techniques, therefore, address the flaw the Board previously found in the R2 and R2W zones — that they authorized densities that did not reflect the existing landscape of the area.

Dry Creek Coalition (DCC) notes that it does not object to the meaning of some of the R2 lands to R5 (Batelle) and RWS (Western Center 2 Neighborhood) [30] but it does object to the creation of the NCC overlay and the NCC options in the NC zone. [31] DCC argues that these allow urban growth outside urban areas and, therefore, discourage urban development in rural areas. DCC acknowledges that ROW 35.70A.070 (5)(b) encourages clustering, density transfer, design guidelines, conservation easements and other innovative techniques that will accommodate appropriate rural densities, but maintains that these

---

[25] Id.
[26] CCC 33.10.016(10).
[29] COMPLIANCE ORDER (LAMIRDS and RURAL LANDS) Growth Management Hearings Board 315 P. 2nd Street, Suite 200 Olympia, Washington 98501-0585 Phone: 360-902-3232 Fax: 360-904-5075
[31] DCC 33.10.016(10).
[32] DCC Objections at 3.
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techniques "cannot be used to increase density to a level that is inconsistent with the
maximum density of 1 du/5 acres." \[1\]

To be clear, while this Board found that the rural character of Clallam County is a rural
character of 1 du/5 acre, the Board has not held that no variation from that density is allowed
under any circumstances. In fact, the clear language of the GMA, which requires "a variety
of rural densities," would not permit such a holding. Instead, the Board found that the
rural landscape and farm-based economy of the County was dominated by lots of greater
than five acres in size and that, by authorizing densities "that do not reflect the existing
landscape or economy of the area, the County has failed to maintain the traditional rural
lifestyle of the residents of Clallam County."\[2\] With either the NCC or the NCO technique,
the base density in the NC zone is maintained at no greater than 1 du/5 acres.

RCW 36.70A.070(5) provides that the rural element of a plan shall provide for a variety of
rural densities through techniques that "are consistent with rural character." The County's
NCO provision recognizes that, in Clallam County, there are areas where the pattern of rural
development has occurred at densities below the average of 4.8 acres and limits the
application of this overlay to areas so as to allow "intensity of density consistent with the
substantial residential development already existing."\[3\] In those areas where, as required
by the County, 70% of the parcels within a neighborhood boundary of 500 feet are already
developed at higher densities and contain mature infrastructure and services, it cannot be
said that densities of 1 dwelling unit/2.4 acres are inconsistent with rural character of that
area. In addition, because of the NC overlay is limited to neighborhoods that have already been substantially developed, this will not lead to the "inappropriate

\[1\] Id. at 4.
\[2\] EDO at 89.
\[3\] RCW 36.70A.070(5).
\[4\] EDO at 85.
\[5\] EDO at 85.
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\[1\] Id. at 10, 11, 14.
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conversion of undeveloped lands into sprawling, low-density development as DCC
suggests. In addition, as the County noted, the NCO and NCC address the rural character
of existing NC neighborhoods and some NC parcels within a limited number of previously
unchallenged and formerly GMA compliant R2 and RW2 areas, which were built out
between the mid-1990's and the entry of the FDO.\[6\] NC parcels and parcels in other rural
areas characterized by larger lot sizes would not qualify for NCO, and must meet the
County's site limitations, site development criteria and open space requirements.

The County also points out that the former R2/RW2 zones comprise less than 25% of the
County's total rural acreage. The proposed NC zone lands account for only 2% of the
County's total acreage.\[7\] Thus, the risk of "inappropriate conversion of undeveloped lands
into sprawling, low-density development" is more imagined than real.

As to the hypothetical posed by DCC in which the NCO overlay would be applied to a
cluster of 16 half acre developed residential lots within 500 feet of an undeveloped ten acre
parcel, and 13 five acre developed residential lots, resulting in densities of 1 du/2.4 acre,
even though only 9 of the surrounding acres have higher density development, the Board
need not rely on such hypotheticals but can instead defer to the County's assertion that
clusters of one-half acre lots in this amount are presently contained in LAMIRDS or UGAs,
which are specifically excluded from the calculations of the average lot size for determining
an NC overlay density. The County points out that there are no clusters within 500 feet of any proposed NC zone.

Conclusion: By eliminating the use of the R2 and RW2 zones the County has removed the
basis for finding that these zones substantially interfere with Goals 1 and 2 of the GMA. The
NCO and NCC provisions of the County Comprehensive Plan and development regulations

\[6\] Id. at 5.
\[7\] Id. at 6, 7.
contain adequate provisions to protect the existing rural landscape in those areas where
they will be permitted.

ORDER
Based on the foregoing, the Board finds that the County has achieved compliance with the
GMA as to those portions of the County's adoption found noncompliant in Conclusions of
Law E-G, L, Q, T and U of the FDO. These revisions remove the basis for a finding of
noncompliance from these LAMIRDs and invalidity from the code sections in question. In
addition the Board finds that Petitioner has not shown the County's actions in establishing
the Marine Drive or Solmar LAMIRDs to be clearly erroneous.
The Board rescinds its finding of invalidity as to lands formerly zoned R2 and RW2 and finds
that the Petitioners have not demonstrated that the provisions of the Clatsop County
Comprehensive Plan and development regulations authorizing the NCC and NCO zones
are clearly erroneous.

SO ORDERED this 3rd day of November, 2008.

James McCaffery, Board Member

William Roehl, Board Member

Nina Carter, Board Member

Pursuant to RCW 36.70A.300 this is a final order of the Board.

Reconsideration. Pursuant to WAC 242-02-832, you have ten (10) days from the date of
mailing of this Order to file a petition for reconsideration. The original and three
copies of a motion for reconsideration, together with any argument in support
thereof, should be filed with the Board by mailing, faxing, or otherwise delivering
the original and three copies of the motion for reconsideration directly to the Board, with
a copy to all other parties of record. Either means actual receipt of the document at
the Board office, RCW 34.05.010(2), WAC 242-02-830, and WAC 242-02-330. The filing
of a motion for reconsideration is not a prerequisite for filing a petition for judicial
review.

Judicial Review. Any party aggrieved by a final decision of the Board may appeal
the decision to superior court as provided by RCW 36.70A.300(3). Proceedings for
judicial review may be instituted by filing a petition in superior court according to the
procedures specified in chapter 54.66 RCW, Part V, Judicial Review and Civil
Enforcement. The petition for judicial review of this Order shall be filed with the
appropriate court and served on the Board, the Office of the Attorney General, and all
parties within thirty days after service of the final order, as provided in RCW
34.05.642. Service on the Board may be accomplished in person or by mail, but
service on the Board means actual receipt of the document at the Board office within
thirty days after service of the final order. A petition for judicial review may not be
served on the Board by fax or by electronic mail.

Service. This Order was served on you the day it was deposited in the United States
mail. RCW 34.05.010(10).
DECLARATION OF SERVICE
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Dear Commissioners,

It is clear to Clark County Citizens United, Inc. that county planning staff is delaying any meaningful interpretation of the common process and testimony regarding the rural lands in the 2016 update of the Comprehensive Plan. When presenting the results of a scoping for the SEIS, staff only referenced limited comments submitted into the record from the public, which came from four poorly attended meetings. These meetings were located in the urban areas of the county, and did not include rural areas. The scoping references did not include ongoing testimony from CCCU, which represents approximately 6000 rural and resource landowners, from 1994 to today, nor did it consider the past public record of hundreds of landowners begging the commissioners to not place their 2.5 and 5 acre parcels into 10, 20, 40 and 80 acre zones. Staff is also ignoring the fact that approximately 80%, or more, of the rural and resources lands have been zoned into a non-conforming and substandard lot size, in the old 1994 GMA Comp Plan. Work sessions are now being scheduled by staff, to review the supposed three alternatives for the SEIS, when there has been no meaningful opportunity for rural landowners to weigh in on the update process. CCCU does not believe that four open houses, poorly advertised and attended, and online discussions, constitutes a meaningful public process required under the GMA, for such a weighty and important subject, having such a massive financial and economic impact to rural and resource landowners.

On one hand county staff reports claim that more rural land needs to be preserved for agricultural uses and on the other hand, staff tells CCCU that rural lands are not going to be considered in the 2016 update. CCCU was told the same thing in the 2004 update and the 2007 update, when testimony was submitted regarding asking for a review of the rural and resource land designations and zoning. CCCU was told that those areas will be reviewed later, which never happened. CCCU, Inc. does not agree that the GMA intended that the rural lands must remain static and in the same zoning given it in 1994 and then be ignored year after year after year, at each update. In addition, the GMA Plan is generally considered a twenty year plan, which indicates that both urban and rural areas should now be evaluated and considered for change. In light of the massive downzoning of small rural and resource parcels to large and very large resource and rural parcels, all of the record indicates that incorrect and misguided designations could have occurred in 1994 and that a correction and reconsideration of those areas is now in order. Clark County Citizens United, Inc. is asking the Clark County Board of Commissioners to make those appropriate changes in a fair and balanced process and in a proper and timely fashion.

Sincerely,

Carol Levanen, Ex. Secretary
Clark County Citizens United, Inc
P.O. Box 2188
Battle Ground, Washington 98604
for your file
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----- Forwarded Message -----  
From: susan rasmussen <sprazz@outlook.com>
To: "cnidental@yahoo.com" <cnidental@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, October 12, 2014 3:00 PM
Subject: Reader

http://www.courts.wa.gov/content/Briefs/A02/396017%20respondent%27s.pdf

Sent from Windows Mail
TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. COUNTER ASSIGNMENTS OF ERROR ...................... 1

II. COUNTER STATEMENT OF THE CASE .................. 2

III. STANDARD OF REVIEW .................................. 5

IV. ARGUMENT .................................................. 15

1. The Superior Court was correct that the Growth Board lacked jurisdiction to rule that the Carlsborg CFP fails to comply with GMA, because the CFP was adopted in 2000, no appeal was timely filed, and GMA update requirements (e.g., UGAs) do not apply to County's prior enactments unless the controlling sections of the GMA have been amended in the interim.

Issue: Does RCW 36.70A.130 allow Growth Board review of unamended portions of a Comprehensive Plan and non-mandatory portions of a Capital Facilities Plan within an unamended Urban Growth Area?

2. The Superior Court was correct that the Growth Board erred in finding that the County's current choice of 2/1 du. acre in the Carlsborg non-municipal UGA, during implementation of the sewer service element of the CFP, was non-compliant and invalid.

Issue: Do RCW 36.70A.070(3) and 36.70A.110 allow the Growth Board to prohibit septic system service for UGA designations and require full implementation of sewer service as an element in all UGA CFPs?

3. The Superior Court was correct that the Growth Board erred in declaring County's Rural Lands Report did not fully support County's choice of R2 and R2W densities as consistent with the County's rural character.

Issue: Do RCW 36.70A.020 and 36.70A.110 allow the Growth Board to substitute its analyses and interpretations for County's rural density analyses and decisions under County's Rural Lands Study and supporting documentation from public hearings before the County?
4. The Superior Court was correct in rejecting Pacificwise's belated "internal consistency" challenge of the County's comprehensive plan and development regulations for rural lands, where County's creation of EZ/RWS densities is consistent with its rural planning.

Issue: Can Pacificwise for the first time on appeal raise new argument and challenges to County's rural density analyses and decisions under County's Rural Lands Study and supporting documentation from public hearings before the County?

V. CONCLUSION

APPENDIX A: Memorandum Opinion, Clallam County Superior Court

APPENDIX B: Dry Creek Coalition and Pacificwise v. Clallam County, WWQMID No. 07-2-00116c (Compliance Order-LANDID & Rural Lands, November 3, 2009).

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Washington Cases
Deschutes v. King County, 83 Wn.2d 714, 717, 521 P.2d 1181 (1974) ........................................18
Gold Star Resorts v. Pacificwise, __ Wn.2d ___, P.3d ___ (Dec. 17, 2009) ..................................................19
Quadrant v. Central Puget Sound Growth Management Hearings Board, 154 Wn.2d 224, 110 P.3d 1132 (2005) ........................................9, 10, 11
Skagit Surveyors & Eng'rs, LLC v. Friends of Skagit County, 135 Wn.2d 542, 571, 9, 958 P.2d 962 (1999) ..................26
Spokane County v. City of Spokane, 148 Wn. App. 120, 125, 197 P.3d 1228 (2009) ..........................13
Thurston County v. WWQMB, 137 Wash. App. 781, 154 P.3d 959 (2007) ......................................................... 10
Thurston County v. WWQMB, 164 Wash.2d 329, 190 P.3d 38 (2008) .......................................................... 30

Viking Properties v. Helm, 135 Wash.2d 112, 118 P.3d 322 (2005) ........................................ 10, 26
Whitney Envtl. Action Network ("WEAN") v. Island County, 122
Takoma County v. Eastern Wash. GWMB, 146 Wash. App. 679, 885-87, 192
P.3d 12 (2008) .......................................................... 12

Washington Statutes
Ch. 36.70A RCW .......................................................... 6
Ch. 70.05 RCW .......................................................... 22
RCW 34.05.570 .......................................................... 9, 10
RCW 36.70A.010 .......................................................... 6
RCW 36.70A.020 .......................................................... 7, 20
RCW 36.70A.030(14) ..................................................... 36
RCW 36.70A.040 .......................................................... 6, 20
RCW 36.70A.070 .......................................................... 28
RCW 36.70A.070(3) ..................................................... 16, 17, 20
RCW 36.70A.110 .......................................................... 20
RCW 36.70A.130 .......................................................... 17
RCW 36.70A.130(1)(d) .................................................. 17
RCW 36.70A.130(9) ..................................................... 17
RCW 36.70A.140 .......................................................... 6
RCW 36.70A.239-2301 ................................................. 7
RCW 36.70A.320 .......................................................... 7, 8
RCW 36.70A.3201 .......................................................... 8

Washington Regulations
Ch 242-02 WAC .......................................................... 10
WAC 365-195-000(2) .................................................. 6

Hearings Board Cases
Bremerton, 1995 GMH RB 384 ........................................ 26
Citizens for Good Governance v. Walla Walla County, No. 05-1-0013,
(2006) ................................................................ 26
Dry Creek Coalition and Futurewise v. Clallam County, WWQMB No.
07-1-0018c (Compliance Order-LAMI/Dis & Rural Lands, November
3, 2009) .......................................................... 5
Port Townsend v. Jefferson County, WWQMB No. 94-3-0006, p. 26
(FDO, 6/4/94) .......................................................... 27
Stephan Ludwig v. San Juan County, WWQMB Case No. 05-2-0019c
(FDO, 6/2006) .......................................................... 23
Vashon-Maury v. King County, No. 95-3-0008 (1995) ........................................ 26
Yamashita v. Lewis County, No. 03-2-0007c, (2002) ........................................ 26

County Regulations
CCC 31:02.050(31) .................................................... 33
CCC 31:02.050(31)(A) ................................................ 31
CCC 31:02.050(32) .................................................... 33
CCC Chapter 33.20 .................................................... 17
I. COUNTER ASSIGNMENTS OF ERROR

1. The Superior Court was correct that the Growth Board lacked jurisdiction to rule that the Carlsborg CFP failed to comply with GMA, because the CFP was adopted in 2000, no appeal was timely filed, and GMA update requirements (e.g., UGAs) do not apply to County’s prior enactments unless the controlling sections of the GMA have been amended in the interim.

Issue: Does RCW 36.70A.130 allow Growth Board review of unamended portions of a Comprehensive Plan on non-mandatory updates of the Capital Facilities Plan within an unamended Urban Growth Area?

2. The Superior Court was correct that the Growth Board erred in finding that the County’s current choice of 2/1.5 acres in the Carlsborg non-municipal UGA, pending implementation of the sewer service element of the CFP, was non-compliant and invalid.

[Futurewise’s Assignment of Error No. 1]

Issue: Do RCW 36.70A.070(3) and 36.70A.110 allow the Growth Board to prohibit septic system service for UGA designations and require full implementation of sewer service as an element in all UGA CFP’s?

3. The Superior Court was correct that the Growth Board erred in declaring County’s Rural Lands Report did not fully support County’s choice of R2 and RW2 densities as consistent with the County’s rural character [Futurewise’s Assignment of Error No. 2]

Issue: Do RCW 36.70A.020 and 36.70A.110 allow the Growth Board to substitute its analysis and interpretations for County’s rural density analysis and decisions under County’s Rural Lands Study and supporting documentation from public hearing before the County?

4. The Superior Court was correct in rejecting Futurewise’s belated ‘internal consistency’ challenge of the County’s comprehensive plan and development regulations for rural lands, where County’s creation of R2/RW2 densities as consistent with its rural planning.

[Futurewise’s Assignment of Error Nos. 4 & 5]

Issue: Can Futurewise for the first time appeal raise new argument and challenge to County’s rural density analyses and decisions under County’s Rural Lands Study and supporting documentation from public hearing before the County?

II. COUNTER STATEMENT OF THE CASE

This case comes before the this Court pursuant to Clallam County’s (“County’s”) successful Superior Court appeal of the Western Washington Growth Management Growth Board’s (“Growth Board’s”) Final Decision and Order (“PDO”) entered on April 23, 2008, and its Order on ... Reconsideration (“Reconsideration”) entered on June 9, 2008. Pursuant to those agency orders, County was found both ‘invalid’ and non-compliant with the Growth Management Act. On partial appeal to the Superior Court, the Court overturned the Growth Board’s decision as to the Carlsborg non-municipal UGA and as to County rural lands zoning.¹

The Growth Management Act (GMA) requires counties to review their designated urban growth areas (“UGAs”) every ten years. RCW 36.70A.130(3). Clallam County conducted its update review in response to the foregoing GMA requirements from 2004 through 2007. The County’s review included: public hearings, analysis by the Clallam County

¹ CP 482, IR 33, Final Decision & Order (“PDO”). Order on Reconsideration addressed primarily LAMBO issues of a non-participating party to this appeal.

² CP 123, Memorandum Opinion, Clallam County Superior Court (06/24/09), attached herein as Appendix “A.”

² CP 482, IR 33 PDO p. 3-5 (Procedural History); County’s Opening Brief. CP 236
Department of Community Development ("DCD"), and other measures which led to the issuance of recommendations by the Clallam County Planning Commission; performance of an urban growth area review resulting in the publication of the report entitled Clallam County’s Urban Growth Area Analysis and 10 Year Review, DCD (May 2007) ("UGA Report"); 4 and preparation of a detailed analysis of the County’s rural land element and zoning and proposals for designating limited areas of more intensive rural development, published in the reports entitled Clallam County Rural Lands Report, DCD (2006 and Suppl. 2007) ("Rural Lands Report"), 5 and Clallam County LAMIRDs Report (Dec. 2006; Suppl. 2007) ("LAMIRD Report") 6.

The appellant herein, Seattle-based special interest group Futurewise, in its Petition for Review before the Growth Board had challenged the County’s determination that its update review complied with the GMA. Futurewise argued that Clallam County zoning densities greater than one dwelling unit per five acres ("1/5 du/ac.") were not rural and this zoning generally had to be prohibited within rural areas. 7 Futurewise also challenged the sewerage and police planning policies of a non-municipal (unincorporated) UGA of Port Angeles, the commercial, retail and population center located on and about U.S. Hwy. 101, between the cities of Sequim

4 CP 228, Appx. "A".
5 CP 228, Appx. "B".
6 LAMIRDs are not part of this appeal.
7 CP 482, IR 35 FDO, pp. 9-10, 53-54

and Port Angeles.8

County’s briefing and hearing presentation before the Growth Board and Superior Court, introduced extensive evidence supporting its conclusion that its rural densities were consistent with Clallam County’s rural character and the GMA. The County submitted a Rural Lands Report, noted above, which explained how the County’s unique rural character, as expressed within its Comprehensive Plan policies (CPs) and Development Regulations (DRs) harmonized the GMA planning goals and requirements.9 Nevertheless, by improperly framing its role as factual arbiter of "what is the appropriate density within the rural areas of Clallam County," the Growth Board concluded that the rural character in all areas of Clallam County should be no more than 1/5 da, and any rural zoning with a maximum density of less than 1 du per 5 acres was noncompliant with the GMA.10 The Growth Board’s decision gave no consideration and no deference to County’s choice of facts, calculations or criteria in setting a variety of rural densities. Instead, the Growth Board obsesses over average, countywide farm sizes, existing countywide acreage numbers for a given zoning density, and other non-deferential and erroneous factors.11

In its briefing and hearing presentation on the Port Angeles non-municipal UGA before the Growth Board and Superior Court, County introduced extensive evidence regarding the history and planning of the community of

8 CP 482, IR 35 FDO, pp. 9-10, 71, 73.
9 CP 228, Appx. "B"; CP 482, IR 35, Ex. 76, Appx. "B".
10 CP 482, IR 35 FDO, p. 97, No. 36.
11 CP 482, IR 35 FDO pp. 39-41
Carlsborg—designated and zoned as a non-municipal UGA ten (10) years ago. The Carlsborg Capital Facilities Plan ("CFP") for this UGA documented the planning for municipal sewer service, addressed engineering and financing strategies for providing sewer service to Carlsborg in the near term, and provided upgraded septic system requirements and density-limiting environmental regulations to "bridge" the time span until the municipal sewer service became fully operational. Specifically, the County adopted development regulations limiting density in the area to two dwelling units per acre ("2/1 du"), or a density that per se can be safely served individual septic systems while a municipal sewer plan is being implemented. The Health Officer and Board of Health also upgraded septic system standards applicable to this area consistent with CFP policies.

Importantly, since this case has gone before the courts, County chose to reconsider RW2/R2 zoning of less than one dwelling unit per 2.4 acres outside of LAMRDs, but subsequently adopted "innovative zoning" techniques to establish 2.4 acres zoning within specific rural areas of the County. Over the objections of Futurewise, these latest rezonings of rural lands were deemed in compliance with GMA by the Growth Board.10

10 CP 482, IR 23, Carlsborg CFP Secret Study cited in CP 128 & CP 164
11 CP 168, Appx "C".
12 Id.
13 Id., as cited in CP 128 & CP 164
14 Id., as cited in CP 128 & CP 164
15 Dry Creek Coalition and Futurewise v Jefferson County, WWDG No. 07-2-0016 (Compliance Order-LAMRDs & Rural Lands, November 3, 2009) attached hereto as Appendix "B".

RW2/R2 zoning remains a potential rural zoning pending the outcome of these appeals.

III. STANDARD OF REVIEW

A. Growth Management Act.

The County begins with an overview of the Growth Management Act ("GMA") with a particular emphasis on the provisions of that statute pertaining to local deferrals. In 1990, the Washington State Legislature passed the Growth Management Act, Ch. 36.70A RCW. The Legislature found that "uncoordinated and unplanned growth" posed a threat to the "environment, sustainable economic development, and the health, safety and high quality of life enjoyed by residents of this state." RCW 36.70A.010. To address the negative consequences of "uncoordinated and unplanned growth," the Legislature required counties of certain populations to undertake land use planning. RCW 36.70A.040.

The GMA is implemented by local governments through the adoption of comprehensive plans and implementing regulations. The GMA planning process follows a "bottom up" approach. WAC 365-195-060(2). Instead of creating a statewide zoning authority or planning board, as other states have done, the GMA left the implementation to local government. That process mandates public participation in the development of comprehensive plans and development regulations implementing those plans. RCW 36.70A.140. To guide local governments in the preparation of comprehensive plans and development regulations the Legislature
identified 13 planning goals, but expressly restrained from imposing any
order or priority of goals upon the local jurisdictions. RCW 36.70A.320.

The Legislature recognized that local governments needed the
flexibility to enact comprehensive plans and development regulations that
both complied with the goals of the GMA and took into account the
unique characteristics of a particular locality. This legislative intent is
expressly set forth in the provisions of the GMA establishing Growth
Boards. The growth boards were established to hear and determine
petitions from appropriate persons alleging that a county’s comprehensive
plan or development regulations were not in compliance with requirements
of the GMA. RCW 36.70A.250-2301. Comprehensive plans,
development regulations, and amendments thereto, are presumed valid
upon adoption. RCW 36.70A.320. It is the challenge of County
regulations who bears the burden of establishing non-compliance with the
GMA—and not the County proving compliance. RCW 36.70A.320(2).

The Legislature originally provided for a standard of Growth Board
review based on the preponderance of evidence standard. In 1997,
however, it amended the GMA to provide that the “board shall find
compliance unless it determines that the action by the state agency,
county or city is clearly erroneous in view of the entire record before the
board and in light of the goals and requirements of this chapter.”
RCW 36.70A.320(3). The Legislature expressly provided a statement of
intent and finding for imposing upon the growth boards the “clearly
erroneous” standard on review of local governmental actions under GMA.

In amending RCW 36.70A.320(3) . . . the legislature intends that
the boards apply a more deferential standard of review to actions
of counties and cities than the preponderance of evidence standard
provided for under existing law.

RCW 36.70A.3201 (emphasis added).

The Legislature went on to state the reasons why local
governments planning for the growth of their communities are entitled to
such deference.

In recognition of the broad range of discretion that may be
exercised by counties and cities consistent with the
requirements of this chapter, the legislature intends for the
boards to grant deference to counties and cities in how they
plan for growth consistent with the requirements and goals
of this chapter. Local comprehensive plans and
development regulations require counties and cities to
balance priorities and options for action in full
consideration of local circumstances. The legislature finds
that while this chapter requires local planning to take place
within a framework of state goals and requirements, the
ultimate burden and responsibility for planning,
harmonizing the planning goals of this chapter, and
implementing a county’s or city’s future, rests with that
community.

Id. (emphasis added).

County submits that it has complied with the goals of the GMA in full
consideration of the local circumstances in Chelan County. The Growth
Board erroneously interpreted and applied the GMA and disregarded the
Legislature’s command to grant deference to County decisions in
implementing GMA goals. Rather, the Growth Board has imposed its own
view of the GMA upon County as to rural lands densities, and the densities
and planning for urban services within the Carlsborg non-municipal UGA.
B. Standard of Review under Growth Management.

The Washington Administrative Procedures Act ("APA") governs judicial review of challenges to Growth Board actions. Under the APA, the "burden of demonstrating the invalidity of agency action is wholly upon the party asserting invalidity." The statute sets forth nine grounds for relief from an agency decision, of which County asserts five:

(b) The order is outside the statutory authority or jurisdiction of the agency conferred by any provision of law;
(c) The agency has engaged in unlawful procedure or decisions-making process, or has failed to follow a prescribed procedure;
(d) The agency has erroneously interpreted or applied the law;
(e) The order is not supported by evidence that is substantial when viewed in light of the whole record before the court, which includes the agency record for judicial review, supplemented by any additional evidence received by the court under this chapter; [in ...]
(f) The order is arbitrary or capricious.

Appellantes bear the burden of establishing these grounds as the bases for remand, as identified and explained below:

First, agency jurisdiction is limited. "An agency may only do that which it is authorized to do by the Legislature." Any agency attempt to exercise authority outside its statutory grant is ultra vires and void.

Second, the Growth Board's Rules of Practice and Procedure set forth at Ch 242-02 WAC. The Growth Board's Rules include specific provisions that mirror language of the statute. Violations of those statutory provisions by the Growth Board also constitute "reversible" violations of Growth Board Rules.

Third, this Court reviews errors of law under RCW 34.05.570(3)(a) de novo. In doing so in APA appeals that originate from Growth Board decisions, this Court must accord deference to County planning decisions, rather than to Growth Board's decisions, as long as those local decisions are consistent with the goals and requirements of the GMA. "[T]he GMA acts exclusively through local governments and is to be construed with the requisite flexibility to allow local governments to accommodate local needs." The Growth Board has defined consistency to mean that "provisions are compatible with each other - that they fit together properly. In other words, one provision may not thwart another." In the context of the deference due to the County, this Court must defer to County decisions as long as those decisions do not thwart the GMA. This deference "supersedes deference granted by the APA and courts to

---

10 Quadrant, 154 Wn.2d at 523.
11 Quadrant, 154 Wn.2d at 527.
oops, sorry, I sent this to Oliver and Rebecca and missed you.
My bad!

From: Carol Levanen [mailto:cnldental@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 13, 2014 10:58 AM
To: Silliman, Peter; Carol Levanen; Susan Rasmussen; Leah Higgins; Rick Dunning; Rita Dietrich; Jerry Olson; Fred Pickering; Jim Mallinowski; Frank White; Benjamin Moss; Lonnie Moss; Melinda Zamora; Nick Redinger; Curt Massie; Marcus Becker; Clark County Citizens United Inc.; Barnes, Ed; Madore, David; Mielke, Tom
Subject: Clark County Comp Plan and the Clallam County Court of Appeals Decision regarding rural lands - (This information to be placed in public record)

Dear Commissioners,

It is clear to Clark County Citizens United, Inc. that county planning staff is delaying any meaningful interpretation of the public process and testimony regarding the rural lands in the 2016 update of the Comprehensive Plan. When presenting the results of a scoping for the SEIS, staff only referenced limited comments submitted into the record from the public, which came from four poorly attended meetings. These meetings were located in the urban areas of the county, and did not include rural areas. The scoping references did not include ongoing testimony from CCCU, which represents approximately 6000 rural and resource landowners, from 1994 to today, or did it consider the past public record of hundreds of landowners begging the commissioners to not place their 2.5 and 5 acre parcels into 10, 20, 40 and 80 acre zones. Staff is also ignoring the fact that approximately 80%, or more, of the rural and resources lands have been zoned into a non-conforming and substandard lot size, in the old 1994 GMA Comp Plan. Work sessions are now being scheduled by staff, to review the supposed three alternatives for the SEIS, when there has been no meaningful opportunity for rural landowners to weigh in on the update process. CCCU does not believe that four open houses, poorly advertised and attended, and online discussions, constitutes a meaningful public process required under the GMA, for such a weighty and important subject, having such a massive financial and economic impact to rural and resource landowners.

On one hand county staff reports claim that more rural land needs to be preserved for agricultural uses and on the other hand, staff tells CCCU that rural lands are not going to be considered in the 2016 update. CCCU was told the same thing in the 2004 update and the 2007 update, when testimony was submitted regarding asking for a review of the rural and resource land designations and zoning. CCCU was told that those areas will be reviewed later, which never happened. CCCU, Inc. does not agree that the GMA intended that the rural lands must remain static and in the same zoning given it in 1994 and then be ignored year after year after year, at each update. In addition, the GMA Plan is generally considered a twenty year plan, which indicates that both urban and rural areas should now be evaluated and considered for change. In light of the massive downzoning of small rural and resource parcels to large and very large resource and rural parcels, all of the record indicates that incorrect and misguided designations could have occurred in 1994 and that a correction and reconsideration of those areas is now in order. Clark County Citizens United, Inc. is asking the Clark County Board of Commissioners to make those appropriate changes in a fair and balanced process and in a proper and timely fashion.

Sincerely,

Carol Levanen, Ex. Secretary
Clark County Citizens United, Inc.
P.O. Box 2188
Battle Ground, Washington 98604
O'Donnell, Mary Beth

From: LaRocque, Linnea on behalf of Barnes, Ed
Sent: Monday, October 13, 2014 11:26 AM
To: Orjiako, Oliver; Tilton, Rebecca
Cc: O'Donnell, Mary Beth
Subject: Reader

for your file

From: Carol Levanen [mailto:cnidental@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 13, 2014 11:17 AM
To: Madore, David; Mielke, Tom; Barnes, Ed; Silliman, Peter
Subject: Fw: Reader

----- Forwarded Message -----
From: susan rasmussen <sprazz@outlook.com>
To: "cnidental@yahoo.com" <cnidental@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, October 12, 2014 3:00 PM
Subject: Reader
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I. COUNTER ASSIGNMENTS OF ERROR

1. The Superior Court was correct that the Growth Board lacked jurisdiction to rule that the Carlsborg CFP fails to comply with GMA, because the CFP was adopted in 2000, no appeal was timely filed, and GMA update requirements (e.g., UGAs) do not apply to County’s prior amendments unless the controlling sections of the GMA have been amended in the interim.

Issue: Does RCW 36.70A.130 allow Growth Board review of unamended portions of a Comprehensive Plan on non-mandatory updates of the Capital Facilities Plan within an unamended Urban Growth Area?

2. The Superior Court was correct that the Growth Board erred in finding that the County’s current choice of 2/1 dun. acre in the Carlsborg non-municipal UGA, pending implementation of the sewer service elements of the CFP, was non-compliant and invalid. (Futurewise’s Assignment of Error No. 1)

Issue: Do RCW 36.70A.070(3) and 36.70A.110 allow the Growth Board to prohibit septic system service for UGA designations and require full implementation of sewer service as an element in all UGA CFP’s?

3. The Superior Court was correct that the Growth Board erred in declaring County’s Rural Lands Report did not fully support County’s choice of R2 and RW2 densities as consistent with the County’s rural character. (Futurewise’s Assignment of Error No. 2)

Issue: Do RCW 36.70A.020 and 36.70A.110 allow the Growth Board to substitute its analysis and interpretations for County’s rural density analyses and decisions under County’s Rural Lands Study and supporting documentation from public hearings before the County?

4. The Superior Court was correct in rejecting Futurewise’s belated “internal inconsistency” challenge of the County’s comprehensive plan and development regulations for rural lands, where County’s creation of R2/RW2 densities is consistent with its rural planning.

Issue: Can Futurewise for the first time on appeal raise new argument and challenge to County’s rural density analyses and decisions under County’s Rural Lands Study and supporting documentation from public hearings before the County?

II. COUNTER STATEMENT OF THE CASE

This case comes before this Court pursuant to Clallam County’s ("County’s") successful Superior Court appeal of the Western Washington Growth Management Growth Board’s ("Growth Board’s") Final Decision and Order ("FDO") entered on April 23, 2008, and its Order on ... Reconsideration ("Reconsideration") entered on June 9, 2008. Pursuant to those agency orders, County was found both "invalid" and non-compliant with the Growth Management Act. On partial appeal to the Superior Court, the Court overturned the Growth Board’s decisions as to the Carlsborg non-municipal UGA and as to County rural lands zoning. The Growth Management Act (GMA) requires counties to review their designated urban growth areas ("UGAs") every ten years. RCW 36.70A.130(3). Clallam County conducted its update review in response to the foregoing GMA requirements from 2004 through 2007. The County’s review included: public hearings, analyses by the Clallam County

---

"CP 462, 88-35, Final Decision & Order ("FDO"). Order on Reconsideration addressed primarily LAMERD issues of a non-participating party to this appeal.

"CP 123, Memorandum Opinions Clallam County Superior Court 09/26/09, attached hereto as Appendix "A".

"CP 462, 88-35 FDO pp. 5-8 (Procedural History); County’s Opening Brief CP 234.
Department of Community Development ("DCD"), and other measures which led to the issuance of recommendations by the Clallam County Planning Commission; performance of an urban growth area review resulting in the publication of the report entitled Clallam County’s Urban Growth Area Analysis and 10 Year Review, DCD (May 2007) ("UGA Report"); and preparation of a detailed analysis of the County’s rural land element and zoning and proposals for designating limited areas of more intensive rural development, published in the report entitled Clallam County Rural Land Use Report, DCD (2006 and Suppl. 2007) ("Rural Lands Report"). and Clallam County LAMIRDs Report (Dec. 2006; Suppl. 2007) ("LAMIRD Report").

The appellant herein, Seattle-based special interest group Futurewise, in its Petition for Review before the Growth Board had challenged the County’s determination that its update review complied with the GMA. Futurewise argued that Clallam County zoning densities greater than one dwelling unit per five acres ("1/5 du/acre") were not rural and this zoning generally had to be prohibited within rural areas. Futurewise also challenged the sewerage and police planning policies of a non-municipal (unincorporated) UGA of Carlsborg, a commercial, retail and population center located on and about U.S. Hwy. 101, between the cities of Sequim and Port Angeles.

County’s briefing and hearing presentation before the Growth Board and Superior Court, introduced extensive evidence supporting its conclusion that its rural densities were consistent with Clallam County’s rural character and the GMA. The County submitted a Rural Lands Report, noted above, which explained how the County’s unique rural character, as expressed within its Comprehensive Plan policies (CPs) and Development Regulations (DRs) harmonized the GMA planning goals and requirements. Nevertheless, by improperly framing its role as factual arbiter of "what is the appropriate density within the rural areas of Clallam County," the Growth Board concluded that the rural character in all areas of Clallam County should be no more than 1/5 du., and any rural zoning with a maximum density of less than 1 du per 5 acres was noncompliant with the GMA. The Growth Board’s decision gave no consideration and no deference to County’s choice of facts, calculations or criteria in setting a variety of rural densities. Instead, the Growth Board obsessed over average, countywide farm sizes, existing countywide acreage numbers for a given zoning density, and other non-differential and erroneous factors.

In its briefing and hearing presentation on the Carlsborg non-municipal UGA before the Growth Board and Superior Court, County introduced extensive evidence regarding the history and planning of the community of

---

1 CP 228, Appx. "A".
2 CP 228, Appx. "B".
3 LAMIRDs are not part of this appeal.
4 CP 482, IR 35 FDOC, pp. 9-10, 33-54
Carlsborg—designated and zoned as a non-municipal UGA ten (10) years ago. The Carlsborg Capital Facilities Plan ("CFP") for this UGA documented the planning for municipal sewer service, addressed engineering and financing strategies for providing sewer service to Carlsborg in the near term, and provided upgraded septic system requirements and density-limiting environmental regulations to "bridge" the time span until the municipal sewer service became fully operational. Specifically, the County adopted development regulations limiting density in the area to two dwelling units per acre ("2/1 dw"), or a density that per se can be safely service individual septic systems while a municipal sewer plan is being implemented. The Health Officer and Board of Health also upgraded septic system standards applicable to this area consistent with CFP policies.

Importantly, since this case has gone before the court, County chose to rescind RW2/R2 zoning of less than one dwelling unit per 2.4 acres outside of LAMIRDs, but subsequently adopted "innovative zoning" techniques to establish 2.4 acre zoning within specific rural areas of the County. Over the objections of Futurewise, these latest rezonings of rural lands were deemed in compliance with GMA by the Growth Board.

RW2/R2 zoning remains a potential rural zoning pending the outcome of these appeals.

III. STANDARD OF REVIEW

A. Growth Management Act.

County begins with an overview of the Growth Management Act ("GMA") with a particular emphasis on the provisions of that statute pertaining to local deferrals. In 1990, the Washington State Legislature passed the Growth Management Act, Ch. 36.70A RCW. The Legislature found that "uncoordinated and unplanned growth" posed a threat to the "environment, sustainable economic development, and the health, safety and high quality of life enjoyed by residents of this state." RCW 36.70A.010. To address the negative consequences of "uncoordinated and unplanned growth," the Legislature required counties of certain populations to undertake land use planning. RCW 36.70A.040.

The GMA is implemented by local governments through the adoption of comprehensive plans and implementing regulations. The GMA planning process follows a "bottom up" approach. WAC 365-195-060(2). Instead of creating a statewide zoning authority or planning board, as other states have done, the GMA left the implementation to local government. That process mandates public participation in the development of comprehensive plans and development regulations implementing those plans. RCW 36.70A.140. To guide local governments in the preparation of comprehensive plans and development regulations the Legislature...
identified 13 planning goals, but expressly refrained from imposing any order or priority of goals upon the local jurisdictions. RCW 36.70A.020.

The Legislature recognized that local governments need the flexibility to enact comprehensive plans and development regulations that both complied with the goals of the GMA and took into account the unique characteristics of a particular locality. This legislative intent is expressly set forth in the provisions of the GMA establishing Growth Boards. The growth boards were established to hear and determine petitions from appropriate persons alleging that a county’s comprehensive plan or development regulations were not in compliance with requirements of the GMA. RCW 36.70A.250–2301. Comprehensive plans, development regulations, and amendments thereto, are presumed valid upon adoption. RCW 36.70A.320. It is the challenger of County regulations who bears the burden of establishing non-compliance with the GMA—and not the County proving compliance. RCW 36.70A.320(2).

The Legislature originally provided for a standard of Growth Board review based on the preponderance of evidence standard. In 1997, however, it amended the GMA to provide that the “board shall find compliance unless it determines that the action by the state agency, county or city is clearly erroneous in view of the entire record before the board and in light of the goals and requirements of this chapter.” RCW 36.70A.320(3). The Legislature expressly provided a statement of intent and finding for imposing upon the growth boards the “clearly erroneous” standard on review of local governmental actions under GMA.

In amending RCW 36.70A.320(3) . . . the legislature intends that the boards apply a more deferential standard of review to actions of counties and cities than the preponderance of evidence standard provided for under existing law.

RCW 36.70A.3201 (emphasis added).

The Legislature went on to state the reasons why local governments planning for the growth of their communities are entitled to such deference.

In recognition of the broad range of discretion that may be exercised by counties and cities consistent with the requirements of this chapter, the legislature intends for the boards to grant deference to counties and cities in how they plan for growth consistent with the requirements and goals of this chapter. Local comprehensive plans and development regulations require counties and cities to balance priorities and options for action in full consideration of local circumstances. The legislature finds that while this chapter requires local planning to take place within a framework of state goals and requirements, the ultimate burden and responsibility for planning, harmonizing the planning goals of this chapter, and implementing a county’s or city’s future, rests with that community.

Id. (emphasis added).

County submits that it has complied with the goals of the GMA in full consideration of the local circumstances in Clallam County. The Growth Board erroneously interpreted and applied the GMA and disregarded the Legislature’s command to grant deference to County decisions in implementing GMA goals. Rather, the Growth Board has imposed its own view of the GMA upon County as to rural lands densities, and the densities and planning for urban services within the Carlsborg non-municipal UGA.
B. Standard of Review under Growth Management.

The Washington Administrative Procedures Act ("APA") governs judicial review of challenges to Growth Board actions. Under the APA, the "burden of demonstrating the invalidity of agency action is wholly upon the party asserting invalidity." The statute sets forth nine grounds for relief from an agency decision, of which County asserts five:

(g) The order is outside the statutory authority or jurisdiction of the agency conferred by any provision of law;

(c) The agency has engaged in unlawful procedure or decision-making process, or has failed to follow a prescribed procedure;

(d) The agency has erroneously interpreted or applied the law;

(c) The order is not supported by evidence that is substantial when viewed in light of the whole record before the court, which includes the agency record for judicial review, supplemented by additional evidence received by the court under this chapter; [or] ...

(f) The order is arbitrary or capricious."

Appellants bear the burden of establishing these grounds as the bases for remand, as identified and explained below:

First, agency jurisdiction is limited. "An agency may only do that which it is authorized to do by the Legislature." Any agency attempt to exercise authority outside its statutory grant is ultra vires and void."

Second, the Growth Board's Rules of Practice and Procedure are set forth at Ch 242-02 WAC. The Growth Board's Rules include specific provisions that mirror language of the statute. Violations of those statutory provisions by the Growth Board also constitute "reversible" violations of Growth Board Rules.

Third, this Court reviews errors of law under RCW 34.05.570(3)(d) de novo. In doing so in APA appeals that originate from Growth Board decisions, this Court must accord deference to County planning decisions, rather than to Growth Board's decisions, as long as those local decisions are consistent with the goals and requirements of the GMA. "[T]he GMA acts exclusively through local governments and is to be construed with the requisite flexibility to allow local governments to accommodate local needs." The Growth Board has defined consistency to mean that "provisions are compatible with each other — that they fit together properly. In other words, one provision may not thwart another." In the context of the deference due to the County, this Court must defer to County decisions as long as those decisions do not thwart the GMA. This deference "supersedes deference granted by the APA and courts to

References:
2. Quadrant, 156 Wn.2d at 233.
3. Quadrant, 156 Wn.2d at 237.
administrative bodies in general."\textsuperscript{36} Growth Boards and parties disfavoring \textit{Quadrant v. Central Puget Sound GMA}, 154 Wn.2d 224, 110 P.3d 1132 (2005), for its local-deference olsett attempt to extract from \textit{Lewis County v. WPGMAHB}, 157 Wn.2d 488, 496, 139 P.3d 1100 (2006) the single phrase that "...the [Growth] Board itself is entitled to deference...".\textsuperscript{2} Having participated in briefing and presentation of \textit{Lewis County}, undirected counsel would respectfully disagree this was the intended 'message' to the Growth Boards.\textsuperscript{18} Rather, what those parties and the Boards have heard, but continue to fail to heed, is the message recently sent to the Eastern Growth Board by Division III, Court of Appeals, that: 

\textit{...[Growth Boards] must find compliance unless they determine a county action is "clearly erroneous in view of the entire record before the board and in light of the goals and requirements of [the GMA]." RCW 36.70A.320(2). An action is "clearly erroneous" if the board has a "firm and definite conviction that a mistake has been committed."\textsuperscript{19} Lewis County v. W. Wash. Growth Mgmt. Hearings Bd., 157 Wn.2d 488, 497, 139 P.3d 1096 (2006) (quoting Dep't of Ecology v. Pub. Util. Dist. No. 1 of Jefferson County, 121 Wn.2d 175, 201, 849 P.2d 646 (1993)).... The parties disagree over the amount of deference owed to the County's decision... In Quadrant Corp. v. Central Puget Sound Growth Management Hearings Board, the Washington Supreme Court granted deference to the agency's interpretation of the law in cases where the agency had a specialized expertise in the subject area, but also determined that the courts were not bound by the agency's interpretation of a statute. 154 Wn.2d 224, 233, 110 P.3d 1132 (2005) (quoting \textit{City of Redmond}, 136 Wn.2d at 46). Specifically, in \textit{Quadrant}, the Supreme Court held that "deference to county planning actions, that are consistent with the goals and requirements of the GMA, supersedes deference granted by the APA and courts to administrative bodies in general." Id. at 238. The court also held that while "this deference ends when it is shown that a county's actions are in fact a 'clearly erroneous' application of the GMA, we should give effect to the legislature's explicitly stated intent to grant deference to county planning decisions." Id. [Emphasis added]}

Yakima County v. Eastern Wsh GMAHB, 146 Wn. App. 679, 685-87, 192 P.3d 12 (2008). And as our Supreme Court most recently commented about the Growth Boards and GMA:

\textit{The GMA provides a "framework" of goals and requirements to guide local governments who have "the ultimate burden and responsibility for planning." RCW 36.70A.201. Great deference is accorded to a local government's decisions that are "consistent with the requirements and goals" of the GMA... [and] that from the beginning the GMA was " 'riddled with politically necessary ommissions, internal inconsistencies, and vague language.'\textsuperscript{20} Quadrant Corp., 154 Wn.2d at 233 (quoting Richard L. Senate, Revelations the Growth Management Act's Growth Management Revolution Goes to Court, 23 Seattle U. L. Rev. 5, 8 (1999)). The "GMA was spawned by controversy, not consensus" and, as a result, it is not to be liberally construed. Woods v. Kittitas County, 182 Wn.2d 597, 612 n.8, 174 P.3d 25 (2007) (quoting Senate, supra, at 34).}

\textit{Thurston County v. WPGMAHB, 164 Wn.2d 336, 341-2, 190 P.3d 38 (2008). See also, Spokane County v. City of Spokane, 148 Wn. App. 120, 125, 197 P.3d 1228 (2009): "...we strictly construe the GMA because it was controversial legislation. [Thurston County]. It consequently includes some

\textsuperscript{36} Quadrant, 154 Wn.2d at 238.
\textsuperscript{37} Defendant's Response Brief, at p. 5
\textsuperscript{38} Lewis County is of far more significance as being one of a series of Supreme Court cases regarding the arbitrary Growth Board " Felix " on GMA regulations, which in the case of Lewis County involved overturning nearly six (6) years of WPGMAHB decisions demanding that rural counties must " catalog " and set aside all "prime soils " lands as agricultural lands of long-term significance, regardless of market forces or development pressures (the " possibility of more intense use ") in determining whether it had enduring commercial qualities for farming. 157 Wn.2d at 501.}
language that is deliberately vague. Id. It also includes some intentional omissions and inconsistencies. Id.  

Fourth, substantial evidence under RCW 34.05.570(3)(c) is "a sufficient quantity of evidence to persuade a fair-minded person of the truth or correctness of the order." Growth Board disagreements with County choices in local planning being based on 'this' evidence and not 'that' evidence, and even disagreements as to how County weighed the evidence, are not grounds for finding error with County's approach.  

And fifth, as used in the APA, "arbitrary or capricious" means "willful and unreasonable action, taken without regard to or consideration of the facts and circumstances surrounding the action. Where there is room for two opinions, an action taken after due consideration is not arbitrary or capricious even though a reviewing court may believe it to be erroneous." The Court shall not defer to a Growth Board's interpretation of the GMA where that Board has misinterpreted the statute or exceeded its authority:  

Although a court will defer to an agency's interpretation when that it will help the court achieve a proper understanding of the statute, "it is ultimately for the court to determine the purpose and meaning of statutes, even when the court's interpretation is contrary to that of the agency charged with carrying out the law."


Futurewise mitigates Whidbey Envtl. Action Network ("WEAN") v. Island County, 122 Wn. App. 156, 168, 93 P.3d 885 (2004) as holding a reviewing Court may alchemize a valid Growth Board decision from an otherwise clearly erroneous ruling. Such a review standard would undermine both the deference afforded to the Growth Board in interpreting general GMA standards and the deference and discretion afforded local governments in weighing and applying the factual record to the general policies and standards of the Boards (as discussed above). Rather, WEAN holds that one invalid basis for Board rulings on rural lands densities can be overcome with other, valid Board findings. As discussed below, there are no multiple bases for this Board's ruling on County rural lands densities—only the Board's substitute 'interpretation' of County's Rural Lands Study data which ignores local discretion and decision making.  

Ironically, WEAN at page 168 is more readily known for the rural lands 'standard' espoused by the County, and ignored by the Growth Board:  

"The Act does not require a particular methodology for providing for a variety of densities." [Citation omitted, emphasis added.] And RCW 36.70A.050 allows for considerations of local conditions and the use of unspecified "innovative techniques" to achieve rural densities and uses.
III. ARGUMENT

1. The Superior Court was correct that the Growth Board lacked jurisdiction to rule that the Carlsborg CFP fails to comply with GMA, because the CFP was adopted in 2000, and no appeal was timely filed.

Under Thurston County v. WPGMHHS, 184 Wash.2d 329, 344, 190 P.3d 38 (2008), this update requirement does not apply to a jurisdiction’s prior enactments unless the controlling sections of the GMA have been amended in the interim, to wit:

We hold that a party may challenge a county’s failure to revise a comprehensive plan only with respect to those provisions that are directly affected by new or recently amended GMA provisions, meaning provisions related to mandatory elements of a comprehensive plan that have been adopted or substantively amended since the previous comprehensive plan was adopted or updated, following a seven year update.

In applying this test to the Carlsborg CFP, it appears that none of the cited and controlling sections of the GMA have been amended since this CFP was first adopted by Clallam County Ordinance in 2000 \(^\text{15}\), to wit:

\(^{15}\) Clallam County Ordinance No. 702 (2000), CP 484, IR 21, Appx. C.

--

\(^{15}\) Clallam County Ordinance No. 702 (2000), CP 484, IR 21, Appx. C.

\(^{16}\) Id, Finding 49, p. 99.
and by failing to provide for sewer service to the Carlsborg UGA, the County has not adopted a capital facilities plan that is consistent with the GMA.\footnote{Id, FDO, Summary, p. 3.}

The Carlsborg UGA sewer provisions were not amended during the County's seven year update, so they cannot be appealed under RCW 36.70A.130(1)(b). Further, Clallam County Code ("CCC") Chapter 33.20 was adopted by Ordinance No. 701, (2000).\footnote{See CP 482, IR 23, Apps. D-C, Ch. 33.20, codifiers SOURCE references, in Title 33 CCC.} It implemented the recommendations of the concurrently adopted Carlsborg CFP. Ordinance No. 702 (2000).\footnote{CP 484, IR 23, Apps. C, Clallam County Ordinance No. 702 (2000).} Neither Ch. 33.20 CCC nor the Carlsborg CFP were amended during the County's 2007 update.

Further, because RCW 36.70A.130(9) controlled as to whether or not the County was mandated to update or create a "Parks Plan", as relied upon by Futurewre, the Growth Board correctly noted that the existing, "dated" Carlsborg parks plan, incorporating and based on a "dated" 1994 county-wide CFP section, nevertheless satisfied the requirements of RCW 36.70A.070(3).\footnote{CP 482, IR 23, IR 30, at pp. 23-81.} Under Thurston County, 164 Wash.2d at 344-45, local enactments that are not amended in the local jurisdiction's GMA update under RCW 36.70A.130 do not trigger for Growth Board appeal.

Finally, limiting failure to revise challenges to those aspects of a comprehensive plan directly affected by new or substantively amended GMA provisions serves the public policy of preserving the finality of land use decisions. Finality is important because "[I]f there were not finality, no owner of land would ever be safe in proceeding with development of his property." Deichsel v. King County, 83 Wash.2d 711, 717, 521 P.2d 1181 (1974), overruled in part by Clark County Pub. Util. Dist. No. 1 v. Wilkinson, 139 Wash.2d 840, 991 P.2d 1161 (2000). The legislature recognized the importance of finality in limiting the time period for challenging a comprehensive plan to 60 days. RCW 36.70A.290(2). If we were to allow a party to challenge every aspect of a comprehensive plan for GMA compliance every seven years, the floodgates of litigation initially closed by the 60-day appeal period would be reopened.

Aspects of plans previously upheld on appeal could be subjected to a new barrage of challenges because a party could argue it is challenging a county's failure to update a provision, rather than reasserting its claim against the original plan. See, e.g., [Thurston County v. WWGADIS, 137 Wash. App. 701, 154 P.3d 959 (2007)] (allowing Futurewre's challenge to the County's UDA designations despite an earlier board decision upholding part of the County's UDA because the new challenge is based on the 2004 update). Because the legislature has not construed such a result, we choose to limit challenges for failure to update comprehensive plans to those provisions that are directly affected by new or recently amended GMA provisions.

Contrary to Futurewre's application of this case, Thurston County severely limits a challenger's ability to appeal a "non-revision" of a comprehensive plan during its update, and then to only those provisions that are directly affected by new or recently amended GMA provisions.\footnote{Id} More specifically, GMA revisions that would enable an "update" challenge to "non-revised" CP provisions or DRs were defined to mean those GMA provisions related to mandatory elements of a comprehensive plan that have been adopted or amended by the Legislature since the challenged CP or DR was adopted or updated.\footnote{Id, p. 3.}
Here, the Growth Board found non-compliance for Ch. 33.20 CCC and the CFP, for failing to comply with specific GMA provisions, even though the Growth Board lacked jurisdiction over the "non-revised", and "unamended" Carlsborg portions of the CP and the Carlsborg CFP. Futurewise argues for expansion of Thurston County as triggering a more generalized "reach back" review—where the nearest potential for review with the County's comprehensive plan sections (even if theoretical, as with its argued OFM population, or parks and recreation discussions) unlocks Pandora's Box. Our state Supreme Court recently had the opportunity to expand the "reach-back" rule beyond what was applied by this County's Superior Court, and it chose not to do so. *Gold Star Resorts v. Futurewise*, Wn.2d __, P.3d __ (Dec. 17, 2009).

As shown in the above Table of GMA amendments, there has been only one legislative amendment, to wit: RCW 36.70A.070(3) and that was solely to add park and recreation facilities to capital facilities planning, but which required State funding to become mandatory. Because no relevant GMA amendments support the Board's ruling regarding the Carlsborg Plan, the Board lacked jurisdiction over the Carlsborg CFP challenge.

2. The Superior Court was correct that the Growth Board erred in finding that the County's current choice of 2/1 da. sect in the Carlsborg non-municipal UGA, during implementation of the sewer service element of the CFP, was non-compliant and invalid.

Issue Response: RCW 36.70A.070(3) and 36.70A.110 provide no authority for the Growth Board to prohibit septic system service for UGA designations and require full implementation of sewer service as an element in all UGA CFP's. Futurewise also challenged the County's "failure to plan for sewer service to the Carlsborg urban growth area and appropriate urban density" as violating RCW 36.70A.070(1-2, 12), .040, .070, .110, & .130. The Growth Board agreed, even though GMA neither mandates full sewer service within a given time frame nor at any particular urban density. As previously argued by County, GMA merely requires CFP adoption by County to: 1) inventory existing public capital facilities; 2) forecast the "future needs" for such capital facilities; 3) identify the proposed locations and capacities of expanded or new capital facilities; 4) establish a 6-year financing plan that clearly identifies sources of public funds for such purpose; and 5) requires a reassessment of the land use element if probable funding falls short of meeting existing needs to ensure that the land use element, capital facilities plan element, and financing plan be coordinated and consistent. RCW 36.70A.070(3). That the County has done and is doing all of the above has not been disputed. Nevertheless, the Growth Board overrode County's decisions on the timing of capital facilities improvements within the Carlsborg UGA, and

---

44 CP 482, Br. 35, P20 at p.73 ("Legal Issues No 15 (Futurewise Issue 2)"
mandated that County must both show that it has contemporaneously fully planned and funded the Carlsborg sewer system by the time the Board reviewed this existing non-municipal UGA at its periodic update—or that UGA is per se noncompliant and invalid under GMA.

The GMA language relied upon by the Growth Board merely states a requirement that County develop a CFP that is consistent with the UGA land use element. As previously argued by County before the Growth Board and Superior Court, continued use of on-site systems will adequately serve as a ‘bridge’, allowing for some land development and the protection of private property rights, until sewer planning, funding and build-out is complete under the Carlsborg UGA land use element.

In support of this sewer mandate, the Growth Board and Futurewise misstate that increases in nitrate concentrations from on-site systems in Carlsborg groundwater demand an immediate ‘sewer-only’ response. This is incorrect. The Carlsborg CFP Sewer Study 

65 County’s (Superior Court) Reply Brief CP 144, CP 148A, II 23, County’s (Growth Board) Response Brief CP 144, II 23 at 020613-003175, Appendices.

Portions of Carlsborg CFP Sewer Study reproduced below were presented in County’s (Growth Board) Response Brief CP 144, II 23, 020613-003034, 34, pp 21-23.

Federal drinking water standards require possible water to have less than 10 mg/L of scientifically possible to link nitrate levels to septic discharges in the Carlsborg area. What these ‘layperson’ errors demonstrate is why drinking water and septic-public health issues in Carlsborg fall under Ch. 70.05 RCW (see Ch. 36.76A RCW), and the training and local knowledge of County health officers, and local and State Departments of Health.

To add to all of this, Futurewise champions yet another unproven mandate under GMA, that a lack of storm sewers within the Carlsborg non-municipal UGA remove this area from ‘urban’ consideration. In reality, many municipalities lack storm sewer and sewage system

---

65 County’s (Superior Court) Reply Brief CP 144, CP 148A, II 23, County’s (Growth Board) Response Brief CP 144, II 23 at 020613-003175, Appendices.

Portions of Carlsborg CFP Sewer Study reproduced below were presented in County’s (Growth Board) Response Brief CP 144, II 23, 020613-003034, 34, pp 21-23.

Federal drinking water standards require possible water to have less than 10 mg/L of

---

66 Id. Study at 020613, p. 2.

67 Groundwater and Aquifer Conservation

... it is not possible to establish with certainty how much of the increasing nitrate level is due to septic drainfield effluent; versus how much is from other human activities like leaons, pets, landscaping, or stormwater; and how much is from agricultural fertilizer, livestock waste, wildlife, or other sources.
improvements within significant portions their municipal boundaries—in addition to their UGAs. 64

In support of overriding County discretion, the Growth Board
reiterated its own, prior decisions, without addressing the specific facts,
in San Juan County, Mason County and Jefferson County 65 for what is
clearly a 'brightline' standard for requiring immediate sewer planning and
development for rural counties of this State within their non-municipal
UGAs. Notably, Carlsborg UGA lies within a critical aquifer recharge
area (CARA), a marine recovery area and shellfish protection zone", and
may never 'density' to the 'brightline' urban density touted by
Futurwise" and restated by the Growth Board for the Carlsborg UGA.

It is this local public health decision making, which takes into account

64 Ironically, assume's 'why' residences in both Centrata and Sequa, Washington
back storm sewer or runoff facilities; significant developed portions of both cities also
lack sewer systems.

65 The WSGA/SHA's penchant for citing as prior cases as definitive, legal authority
for rejecting local discretion and decision making is reminiscent of the author of a
municipal law treatise's and a Washington law professor who respectively footnote their
prior works as authority.

66 CP 492, 1B 23, 091118-021116, "passages" discussion of critical area enforcement
of UGA in Carlsborg C-77 Sever Study.

67 Futurwise has consistently relied upon unsuccessful, non-appealed matters to
bolster County's arguments. What the Growth Board "actually" stated was:

in Campbell v. San Juan County, Stephen Ludwig v. San Juan County,
WWSGSHA Case No. 05-2-0015c (FDO, 6/20/06), this Board concluded that
when considering whether an area was "characterized by urban growth," for the
purpose of determining the location of a UGA in accordance with RCW
36.70A.110(2), densities of 1 house could be considered "characterized by
urban growth." Nevertheless, the Board went on to say this about appropriate
urban densities in UGAs:

"...we said that circumstances such as the need to protect critical
areas or to protect public health and safety made densities of less than
four units per acre in UGAs a compliant way in which to harmonize
the sprawl reduction goal with other GMA goals or requirements.

local conditions, which the Growth Board has overridden in its latest foray
into GMA planning matters which require local deference.

3. The Superior Court was correct that the Growth Board erred in declaring County's Rural Lands Report did not fully
support County's choice of R3 and R2W densities as consistent with the County's rural character.

Inset: Neither RCW 36.70A.020 and 36.70A.110 allow the
Growth Board to substitute its analyses and interpretations for
County's rural density analyzes and decisions under County's
Rural Lands Study and supporting documentation from public
hearings before the County.

The Growth Board framed the compliance challenges before it as
whether County's rural densities between 2.4 acres and 4.8 acres were
rural. 68 The question the Growth Board should have answered was
whether the County committed clear error when, in reviewing the evidence
before it, that Chelan County determined that R2 and R2W zoning, in one
or more of its four (4) planning regions, and in certain areas of those
planning regions, were a recognized part of County's rural environment.

See, City of Arlington v. Cent. Puget Sound Growth Mgmt. Hearings Bd.,
164 Wn.2d 768, 782, 193 P.3d 1077 (2008). Where there was evidence in
the record supporting the County's conclusion, the Growth Board
should have deferred (but did not) to the County's zoning decisions.

By so doing, the Growth Board undermined the County's authority to
weigh a variety of different factors and facts in determining appropriate
rural densities in any given area. The Growth Board did not, for example,

68 CP 492, 1B 35, FDO at p.37 & 65.

69 ib
acknowledge the County's power to address economic factors. In fact, the FDO devotes only three, succinct sentences on the GMA goals applied by the County. The Growth Board ignored the County's efforts to customize its rural zoning to the needs of each of County's planning regions discussed in its Rural Lands Report. As noted by the Superior Court, the Rural Lands Report data ignored by the Growth Board included evidence of rural character within each study area (region) local circumstances, and the percentage of rural (rather than percentage of acres) with densities between 2.4 and 4.8 acres. Simply stated, Growth Board's decision is not supported by evidence that is substantial. In fact, the Growth Board, forcefully or not, arbitrarily imposes a 'bright line' of 1/5 dwelling unit per acre (du/ac). See, discussion in Thurston County, 164 Wn.2d at 358-59:

Since 1995, GMMBIs have utilized bright-line standards to distinguish between urban and rural densities. [Fn.21] (Thurston County v. Washington Metropolitan Planning Council, 137 Wn. App. 781, 800, 154 P.3d 959, (2007)). [Fn.22] The GMMB, as a quasi-judicial agency, lacks the power to make bright-line rules regarding maximum rural densities. Viking Props., 155 Wn.2d at 129-30. We hold a GMMB may not use a bright-line rule to delineate between urban and rural densities, nor may it subject certain densities to increased scrutiny.


(Fn. 22: The Court of Appeals stated, "[the Supreme Court has referred to a density of one dwelling unit per five acres as 'a decidedly rural density.' " Thurston County, 137 Wn. App. at 806, n.15 (quoting Skagit Syngenta & Henry, L.L.C. v. Friends of Skagit County, 135 Wn.2d 542, 571, 9, 958 P.2d 962 (1998)). This is incorrect. The cited provision refers to the dissenting opinion in Skagit Syngenta & Henry, 135 Wn.2d at 571 (Talboys, J., dissenting). To the contrary, we have rejected any bright-line rule delineating between urban and rural densities. Viking Props., 155 Wn.2d at 129-30.)

The Superior Court correctly rejected the Growth Board's undue emphasis on farming and 'farm size' (outside of County's agricultural resource lands) to establish the character of all 'rural areas'. The Growth Board, without citation or reliance on the record, had stated that County intended the Rural Lands Report to focus on farming in sustaining traditional rural lifestyles and rural based economies. The Board's FDO found that the average size of operating farms throughout Chelan County should

50 Id., FDO, pp. 60 & 63 (referencing County's "farm based economy"). This inspection of "paramount" benchmarks and standards for rural areas by the Growth Board, without examination, is particularly troublesome, where the "paramount" status or "paramount" status of rural lands has been acknowledged by the County Board, to wit: Farlow v. Jefferson County, WCGMBI No. 04-3-0006, p. 26 (FDO, 05/04). "Rural lands are the inferior most land in the GMA refrigerator." (attributed to William Huber, former Wn. Growth Board Member.)
determine the character of the County's rural area in any given area to a 1/5 du/acre uniform, minimum rural density. However, as evidenced by the Rural Lands Report, zoning is but one of many uses of rural lands activities within the County.

In addition to this unsupported methodology, the Growth Board overemphasized the total number of acres with a given density, ignoring the number of parcels with a given density within a given planning region—which ignored where the Rural Lands Report identified parcels as being located. In other words, the Board shrouded the County in a one-size-fits-all approach to rural lands in all of the 'subareas' of the County.

And while the Growth Board paid lip service its obligation to define County's rural land based upon County's studies of existing "land use patterns" in defining "rural" densities, it then found County's density-designations of those land use patterns within distinct planning regions as non-compliant. As discussed above (and by the Superior Court), the Growth Board's broad, homogenous brush stroke on County rural densities for these western, central and eastern subareas has failed "...to maintain the traditional rural lifestyles of the residents of Clallam County as required by RCW 36.70A.070 and 36.70A.011." 30

Futurewise's arguments before the Growth Board and Superior Court were also based upon a Futurewise-created "Table 1", as 'proof' that within County's R2 and RW2 zones "...most parcels are in the 4.81 acres or larger category." 31 Futurewise has misinterpreted and misapplied County's Report to create its "Table 1", which provides analysis of the "[p]ercent [of] land [zoned] R2 and RW2 by [p]arl [s]ize" rather than the 'number of total parcels in these same size ranges' as contained in County's Rural Lands Report data. Futurewise's assertion that "within these zones more parcels (emphasis added) are in the 4.81 acres or larger category than any other lot size category" is a clear misstatement of fact. The number of total parcels that are '2.4 acres and less' vs. the total number of parcels that are 'between 2.4 and 4.8 acres', is a wholly distinct and different statistical measure—and this 'integration' of statistical analyses by Futurewise does not bolster the Growth Board's decision.

In its briefing before this Court, Futurewise misstates and mischaracterizes the County's Rural Lands Report as supporting the Growth Board "bright line" on the five-acre minimum rural density. By example, in the Sequim Region, the Rural Lands Report 32 establishes that 70.5% of the 5,846 parcels within the R2 are 2.4 acres or less, with an

---

30 Id.
31 CP 176, Futurewise's Response Brief at pp. 18-19, and "Table 1".
32 CP 176, Futurewise's Response Brief, at p.19, In, 3-3.
33 CP 225, Appendix "B"; CP 442, In, 23, Ex. 76, Appendix "B".
34 CP 442, In 23 County's (Growth Board) Response Brief, Appx 9, 0011800, Appendix Table EDPR-2
average parcel size of 2.2 acres. By comparison, the Report shows that only approximately 14.2% of the 5,843 parcels within the Sequim Region have the potential to re-divide, and with 7.8% of these parcels already contain a fully developed, single-family residential use (and as such, these parcels de facto will never re-divide). This is part of County’s analyses and decision making on rural lands overridden by the Growth Board. In fact, the average parcel size in R2-zoned land ‘countywide’ is 2.4 acres 36. These and other statistical measures reported within the Rural Lands Report also ‘characterize’ rural land use patterns within the R2 zoning areas, within a given regional planning area, in County’s opinion clearly demonstrated that R2 and RW2 were appropriate in those rural areas significantly fragmented by smaller parcels.

The Growth Board focused on “% acres of land by parcel size” for ‘rural character’ and erroneously discard all other aspects of rural development properly considered by County, including: land use patterns, rural character, and ‘regional’ differences within the County demonstrated by the Rural Lands Report—thus failing to accord County due deference in local planning decisions. By further example, the County in reliance on the Rural Lands Report considered factors such as geographic isolation, limited rural land availability (such as proximity to existing road infrastructure and services, economic conditions, etc...within a sparsely populated and mostly unimproved area) as considerations for the RW2 zoned portions within the Western (Forks) Planning Region.

Furthermore, provided no evidence in the record before the County (or thereafter before the Growth Board) that per se refuted County’s decisions on rural development, rural land use patterns, and/or rural character, as reported in County’s Rural Lands Report. The Growth Board, in turn, cited neither authority nor factual justification, based upon this same record, for rejecting County’s approach to rural development, rural land use patterns, and/or rural character, as set forth in the Rural Lands Report.

It is precisely this scenario, where local discretion, interpretation and choices on evidence are erroneously and arbitrarily rejected by Growth Boards which triggered a judicial rebuke in City of Arlington v. Cent. Pkgd. Snd. GMCB., 64 Wn.2d 678, 782, 155 P.2d 1077 (2008):

In sum, we hold the Board erred in finding the County committed clear error in concluding that the land at Island Crossing had no long term commercial significance to agricultural production. The Board erred because it dismissed a key piece of evidence that supported the County’s conclusion on this point. Because there is evidence in the record to support the County’s conclusions, the Board should have deferred to the County.

Furthermore, we hold the Board erred in finding the County committed clear error in including the land at Island Crossing within the newly expanded Arlington UGA. There are facts in the record to support the conclusion that the land in question is characterized by urban growth and/or adjacent to territory already characterized by urban growth. [Emphasis added]

When evaluated as a whole, this Court must agree with the Superior Court.
to uphold County's discretion to apply the Rural Lands Report for its 'rural character', and reject the mandated five acre and larger parcel-minimums imposed throughout the County by the Growth Board.

4. The Superior Court was correct in rejecting Futurewise's belated 'internal consistency' challenge of the County's comprehensive plan and development regulations for rural lands, where County's creation of R2/RW2 densities as consistent with its rural planning.

In re Response: Futurewise cannot for the first time on appeal raise new argument and challenges to County's rural density analyses and decisions under County's Rural Lands Study and supporting documentation from public hearings before the County.

Futurewise's original Assignments of Error Nos. 4 and 5 are, in fact, redundant and duplicative, both alleging similar, 'substantial' factual bases for the Growth Board declaring 1 acre minimum, rural zoning and rejecting County's own findings and decisions on a variety of rural densities, and that the Board decision is collaterally supported by an 'internal inconsistency' argument. In addition, Futurewise's original Assignments of Error Nos. 4 and 5 are, in large part, not related and duplicative of its arguments under Assignment of Error No. 5. For the first time and belatedly before the Superior Court, Futurewise argued that County's rural character requirement in CCC 31.02.050(31)(e) calling for "open fields and woodlots interspersed with homesteads" is clearly not consistent with "a pattern of new 2.4 acre lots" in the Rural Lands Report. Futurewise cannot explain what data or photos in the Report clearly prove inconsistency with this element of rural character—given the 'farming' focus of the Growth Board and Futurewise. Clearly, maps in each of the four planning regions from the Report contradict the 1/5 acre as overall rural character. Specifically, photo-maps from the Sequim Region for R2 wood lots (SPDR-1), R2 open space lots (SPDR-2), commercial lavender patches needing as little as 1.6 acres (SPDR-3), and rural residential lands (SPDR-4), as well as the Straits Region images with organic farming needing as little as 2.6 acres (SPR-2) and R2 commercial woodlots (SPR-3).”

As noted supra, Futurewise has misprints Whidbey Envtl. Action Network (“WEAN”) v. Island County, 122 Wn. App. 156, 168, 93 P.2d 885 (2004) to argue that it be allowed to 'shake-and-bake' the Growth Board record to repair what would otherwise be erroneous Growth Board bases for its ruling. Such a review standard would undermine both the deference afforded to the Growth Board in interpreting general GMA standards and the deference and discretion afforded local governments in weighing and applying the factual record to the general policies and standards of the Board (as discussed above).

At best, WEAN holds that one invalid basis for Board rulings on rural lands densities can be overcome with other, valid Board findings. As discussed above, there are no multiple bases for this Board’s ruling on County rural land densities—only the Board’s substitute ‘interpretation’

---

66 CP 176, Futurewise's Response Brief, at p. 19, lns. 12-14.

68 CP 402, 19, 33, Clallam County's Response Brief, , Appendix B, 001800, Appendix
69 Id.
which ignores local discretion and decision making. Cognizant of this
shortcoming, Futurewise belatedly (and impermissibly) argues for the first
time on appeal that County’s rural lands decisions are inconsistent (i.e.,
internal inconsistency) with its Comprehensive Plan.

In addition to Futurewise’s selective references to elements of County
rural lands definition under CCC 31.02.050(31), the County’s “rural
character” is primarily defined as “the existing and preferred patterns of
land use and development established for lands designated as rural areas or
lands under this comprehensive plan.” 89 Under this definition, rural
characteristics may include, “but are not limited to”... “open fields and
woodlots”—but also include “life styles and economies common to the
areas designated as rural areas and lands” under the County’s planning.89

Futurewise re-asserts that this language from County’s own
comprehensive plan and studies establishes that 2.4 acre densities are not
consistent with the county’s rural character. However, Futurewise then
avoids the following definition in County’s CP, “Rural Development” at
CCC 31.02.050(32) which reads as follows:

“Rural development” means development outside the urban growth
area and outside agricultural, forest, and mineral resource lands
designated pursuant to RCW 36.70A.170. Rural development can
consist of a variety of uses and residential densities, including
clustered residential development, at levels that are consistent with
the preservation of rural character and the requirements of the rural
element. Rural development does not refer to agriculture or
forestry activities that may be conducted in rural areas.
(Emphasis added).

88 Brief of Appellant Futurewise at p. 27
89 Id

Treating the County rural areas as homogenous (as did the Growth
Board) or selectively excerpting statistics for one or more of the four
regional comprehensive plans does not overcome the County’s decision
making or sole discretion to designate R2/RW2 in certain rural areas of the
County.

As before the Growth Board and Superior Court, Futurewise lapses
into a series of generalized, “learned treatise” arguments, which the
Growth Board, itself, summarily dismissed and criticized Futurewise as
rely arguing “...academic studies without providing a comparative
analysis to the facts and circumstances that are reflected within Clallam
County ...”90

Futurewise next attempts to reargue its failed “fish and wildlife habitat”
and “impervious surfaces” challenges, rejected by both the Growth Board
and Superior Court as a secondary basis for upholding the Growth Board’s
non-compliance and invalidity rulings.91 Similarly Futurewise reargues its
failed “traffic” issues of high rural densities increasing traffic “because
more people drive alone and must drive longer distances to work and to
meet the needs of their families” as per as sustaining the noncompliance
finding since County’s the definition of rural character includes a reference
to low traffic volumes. Again, this argument was rejected by the Growth
Board, which Futurewise does not disclose to this Court. Specifically, the
Board noted Futurewise’s challenge involved little more than a series of

90 CP 482, BR 31, PGO at pp 88 & 89
91 Id., at p. 82, lines 1–21
conclusory references and statements without analysis of their applicability to or significance in Chelan County rural lands. In fact, Futurewise did not provide any analyses of County driving distances to work or for families in R2/RW2 lands. It is, however, significant that most R2 lands are within close proximity to at least one of municipal UGA or LAMIRD.

Futurewise's remaining arguments are devoted to disclaiming the current usefulness of any 'bright line' rule of one dwelling unit per five acres standard coming from the Growth Boards—which 'bright line' existed with the Growth Boards until they were overturned by the Supreme Court in Thurston County for ignoring local discretion and arbitrarily imposing minimum parcel sizing on rural zoning. In addition, Futurewise cites the Growth Board discussion of County's "existing land use pattern" as support for the Board's "un-'bright line', five acre minimum rural parcel size for County. However, the Board discussion was based upon Futurewise's flawed analyses of County's Rural Lands Report, discussed supra."

Futurewise shows the purpose of this Court's review, claiming that because there is substantial evidence in the record to support both Futurewise's and Growth Board's choices of evidence and a 'given' application of those facts in determining County's 'rural character' (regardless of the Board's actual findings), that County's choices must fail. However, this is precisely the flawed perspective on Growth Board authority was criticized by our Supreme Court in City of Arlington, discussed supra, where 'Board' authority on factual matters (as opposed to legal interpretations of GMA goals) must yield to local discretion and choices in selecting and weighting facts and factors in local planning. As noted by in Thurston County, 164 Wn.2d at 359-60:

"The legislature did not specifically define what constitutes a rural density. Instead, it provided local governments with general guidelines for designating rural densities. A rural density is "not characterized by urban growth" and is "consistent with rural character." . . . Whether a particular density is rural in nature is a question of fact based on the specific circumstances of each case.

Finally, the GMA does not dictate a specific manner of achieving a variety of rural densities. [Whitney Envtl. Action Network v. Island Cy., 122 Wn. App. 156, 167, 93 P.3d 885 (2004)]. Local conditions may be considered and innovative zoning techniques employed to achieve a variety of rural densities.

And finally, Thurston County reinforces the proposition that 'rural character' considerations of counties may include, but are not limited to, the factors listed in former RCW 36.70A.650(14). Under the rulings in Thurston County (issued after the Growth Board decision), Futurewise's (and Growth Board's) reliance on a 1997 discussion of rural character in Eastern Washington from Tugwell v. Kittitas County, and a ten year old 'cubic commentary' of a CTED planner, renders all the more arbitrary, . . .


CP 482, 68, 35, FDO at p 60.

You can view the original version of this document in its natural format.
rather than more convincing, the Growth Board's compliance order.

V. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons Clallam County respectfully requests that the Court uphold the decision of Superior Court overturning the decision of the Western Washington Growth Management Hearings Board and remanding this matter for further proceedings.

DATED this 8th day of February, 2010.

CLALLAM COUNTY PROSECUTING ATTY
Deborah S. Knisley, Prosecuting Attorney

Douglas 6. Hanse, WSBA #20127
Chief Civil Deputy Prosecutor
Of attorneys for Respondent County

APPENDIX A
O’Donnell, Mary Beth

To: McCall, Marilee
Cc: Orjiako, Oliver; Euler, Gordon; O’Donnell, Mary Beth; Kamp, Jacqueline
Subject: RE: CLARK COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE - Planning Commission Worksession and Open Houses scheduled for October

For questions 1-3:
The Open Houses on October 29 and 30 will have full size boards of all of the alternatives, as well as some copies zoomed in.
Those materials are still being worked on for the Open Houses and will not be presented at the Planning Commission work session.
They will also be uploaded to the web site after they are complete, and I will be sending out another bulletin so that you are aware when they have been posted.

For questions 4-5, I have forwarded your request to Planning staff and they will work on information to answer those questions.

Thank you!

Marilee McCall / Administrative Assistant
Clark County Community Planning
450-397-2280 ext. 4558
1300 Franklin Street | Vancouver, WA 98660
P.O. Box 9810 | Vancouver, WA 98666
www.clark.wa.gov/planning

From: Wait, Judith Ann [mailto:judith.wait@email.wsu.edu]
Sent: Monday, October 13, 2014 4:04 PM
To: McCall, Marilee
Cc: Orjiako, Oliver; Euler, Gordon; O’Donnell, Mary Beth
Subject: Re: CLARK COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE - Planning Commission Worksession and Open Houses scheduled for October

Thanks for the update and invitation, Marilee.

I have a few questions after looking at the presentation that will be used for the Worksession with the Planning Commission:

1. I'm wondering how we could get copies of the maps at a legible scale, printed out. I like the side-by-side, but one 8x11 page is not big enough for two maps (especially with the similar color schemes for different classifications).
2. Perhaps a simplified map for comparison of the main differences. This would be really good for Rural and Agriculture and Forest parcels.
3. It would also be good to access the maps digitally (for zooming in). It might be good for you to zoom in on a particular area where the differences are most dramatic, so the actual impact can be viewed.

4. Is there a table listing the acreage differences by type (zoning and comp plan mapping) so the two can be compared numerically as well.

5. Can we also get a labeled map and/or reference to the parcel numbers for the City UGA expansion proposals, please.

respective thanks,

Jude Wait

---

From: McCall, Marilee <Marilee.McCall@clark.wa.gov>
Sent: Friday, October 10, 2014 5:08 PM
To: McCall, Marilee
Cc: Orjiako, Oliver; Euler, Gordon; O'Donnell, Mary Beth
Subject: CLARK COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE - Planning Commission Worksessions and Open Houses scheduled for October

The Clark County Planning Commission will have a work session on the Comprehensive Plan 2016 update:

Thursday, October 16 at 5:30 p.m.
Clark County Public Service Center, 1300 Franklin, Vancouver, WA 6th Floor

The work session topic is a preview and discussion of the three mapping alternatives for the Comprehensive Plan that will be presented to the public at Open Houses on October 29 and 30.

All of the information that will be presented to the Planning Commission is available for review at: http://www.clark.wa.gov/planning/PCmeetings.html

Updates on meetings and materials that will be presented for review on the Comprehensive Plan public events will continue to be posted at: http://www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/index.html

If you are receiving this notification, you will receive all updates, news releases, and public notices regarding the plan. If you wish to be removed from this listing, please reply with “Unsubscribe” in the subject line of your email.

Thank you for your interest in Clark County!

Marilee McCall | Administrative Assistant for
Oliver Orjiako | Director
Community Planning | “Planning for Clark County’s promising future”
tel: 360.739.7280 ext. 4112 | fax: 360.739.6762
P.O. Box 9810 | Vancouver WA 98666
www.clark.wa.gov/planning

This e-mail and related attachments and any response may be subject to public disclosure under state law.
O'Donnell, Mary Beth

From: Orjiako, Oliver
Sent: Thursday, October 16, 2014 8:38 AM
To: Euler, Gordon; Alvarez, Jose; O'Donnell, Mary Beth
Cc: Cook, Christine
Subject: FW: contact info for comp plan

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

FYI

From: LaRocque, Linnea On Behalf Of Barnes, Ed
Sent: Thursday, October 16, 2014 8:04 AM
To: McCauley, Mark; Orjiako, Oliver
Subject: FW: contact info for comp plan

FYI. Please see below email.

Linnea LaRocque, Administrative Assistant
Clark County Board of Commissioners
360-397-2252 ext. 4167
*OBox 5000, Vancouver WA 98666

SAVE PAPER - Please do not print this e-mail unless absolutely necessary

From: Carol Levanen [mailto:cnldental@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 15, 2014 6:40 PM
To: Madore, David; Mielke, Tom; Barnes, Ed; Carol Levanen; Susan Rasmussen; Leah Higgins; Rick Dunning; Rita Dietrich; Jerry Olson; Fred Pickering; Jim Malinowski; Frank White; Benjamin Moss; Lonnie Moss; Melinda Zamora; Nick Redinger; Curt Massie; Marcus Becker; Zachary McIsaac; Clark County Citizens United Inc.
Subject: contact info for comp plan

Dear Commissioners,

When I attempt to write a comment to the on line locations for comments to the planning department regarding the comp plan proposals, I find that one is not available and the other is not secure. Don't you think landowners have a right to easily and securely send their comments via an e-mail to the planning department.......I do.

Best Regards,  Carol
CCCU, Inc.
Hello Commissioner:

Just FYI. Mark tested it and it worked on his iPad. Thanks.

From: McCauley, Mark
Sent: Thursday, October 16, 2014 9:18 AM
To: Orjiako, Oliver
Subject: Re: Link to comment form

worked for me

Sent from my iPad

On Oct 16, 2014, at 9:00 AM, "Orjiako, Oliver" <Oliver.Orjiako@clark.wa.gov> wrote:

    Good morning Mark:
    
    Here’s the link. Thanks.
    
    Oliver

From: McCall, Marilee
Sent: Thursday, October 16, 2014 8:52 AM
To: Orjiako, Oliver
Subject: Link to comment form

http://www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments.html

Marilee McCall | Administrative Assistant
Clark County Community Planning
360-397-2280 ext. 4558
1300 Franklin Street | Vancouver, WA 98660
P.O. Box 9810 | Vancouver, WA 98666
www.clark.wa.gov/planning
October 15, 2014

Mr. Oliver Orjiako
Clark County Community
Planning Department
1300 Franklin Street
Post Office Box 9810
Vancouver, Washington 98666-9810

Subject: 2016 Comprehensive Plan Update
          Property at 21605 N.E. 10th Avenue

Dear Oliver:

I represent Pac-West, LLC, also known as Sanders Trucking, which owns property at 21605 N.E. 10th Avenue. Dale Sanders previously asked the County to consider adding this property to the Vancouver UGA, and I am reaffirming that request. It is currently in Urban Reserve, with CR-1 zoning, and an industrial zone overlay. According to County policy, property that is in the Urban Reserve is slated for eventual inclusion in the UGA. The County has also signaled that this property is appropriate for the light industrial zone, which my client supports.

Alternatively, my client would be amenable to a text amendment that would allow light industrial uses in the CR-1 zone since these uses are what is currently occurring, and this is what is planned for the area. Second, my client would like to connect to sewer. Sewer is already allowed in rural centers if the sewer lines exist, UDC 40.370.010(C), so it should not be a major policy change to allow connection to sewer for properties within rural centers if sewer is nearby. We understand that there is a major sewer project planned in the area that my client would like to connect to once installed.
Please docket these requests and add me to the mailing list for any updates. Thank you.

Very truly yours,

LeAnne M. Bremer, P.C.

cc: Dale Sanders
    Gordon Euler
October 15, 2014

Mr. Oliver Orjiako
Clark County Community Planning Department
1300 Franklin Street
Post Office Box 9810
Vancouver, Washington 98666-9810

Subject: 2016 Comprehensive Plan Update
Property at 21605 N.E. 10th Avenue

Dear Oliver:

I represent Pac-West, LLC, also known as Sanders Trucking, which owns property at 21605 N.E. 10th Avenue. Dale Sanders previously asked the County to consider adding this property to the Vancouver UGA, and I am reaffirming that request. It is currently in Urban Reserve, with CR-1 zoning, and an industrial zone overlay. According to County policy, property that is in the Urban Reserve is slated for eventual inclusion in the UGA. The County has also signaled that this property is appropriate for the light industrial zone, which my client supports.

Alternatively, my client would be amenable to a text amendment that would allow light industrial uses in the CR-1 zone since these uses are what is currently occurring, and this is what is planned for the area. Second, my client would like to connect to sewer. Sewer is already allowed in rural centers if the sewer lines exist, UDC 40.370.010(C), so it should not be a major policy change to allow connection to sewer for properties within rural centers if sewer is nearby. We understand that there is a major sewer project planned in the area that my client would like to connect to once installed.
Oliver Orjiako  
October 15, 2014  
Page 2

Please docket these requests and add me to the mailing list for any updates. Thank you.

Very truly yours,

LeAnne M. Bremer, P.C.

cc: Dale Sanders  
    Gordon Euler
O'Donnell, Mary Beth

From: Orjako, Oliver
Sent: Thursday, October 16, 2014 8:38 AM
To: Euler, Gordon; Alvarez, Jose; O'Donnell, Mary Beth
Cc: Cook, Christine
Subject: FW: contact info for comp plan

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

FYI

From: LaRocque, Linnea On Behalf Of Barnes, Ed
Sent: Thursday, October 16, 2014 8:04 AM
To: McCauley, Mark; Orjako, Oliver
Subject: FW: contact info for comp plan

FYI. Please see below email.

Linnea LaRocque, Administrative Assistant
Clark County Board of Commissioners
300-597-2232 ext. 4167
*OBox 5000, Vancouver WA 98666

SAVE PAPER - Please do not print this e-mail unless absolutely necessary

From: Carol Levanen [mailto:cnldental@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 15, 2014 6:40 PM
To: Madore, David; Mielke, Tom; Barnes, Ed; Carol Levanen; Susan Rasmussen; Leah Higgins; Rick Dunning; Rita Dietrich; Jerry Olson; Fred Pickering; Jim Malinowski; Frank White; Benjamin Moss; Lonnie Moss; Melinda Zamora; Nick Redinger; Curt Massie; Marcus Becker; Zachary McIsaac; Clark County Citizens United Inc.
Subject: contact info for comp plan

Dear Commissioners,

When I attempt to write a comment to the on line locations for comments to the planning department regarding the comp plan proposals, I find that one is not available and the other is not secure. Don't you think landowners have a right to easily and secureing send their comments via an e-mail to the planning department.......I do.

Best Regards, Carol
CCCU, Inc.
Hello Commissioner:

Just FYI. Mark tested it and it worked on his iPad. Thanks.

From: McCauley, Mark
Sent: Thursday, October 16, 2014 9:18 AM
To: Orjiako, Oliver
Subject: Re: Link to comment form

worked for me

Sent from my iPad

On Oct 16, 2014, at 9:00 AM, "Orjiako, Oliver" <Oliver.Orjiako@clark.wa.gov> wrote:

Good morning Mark:

Here's the link. Thanks.

Oliver

From: McCall, Marilee
Sent: Thursday, October 16, 2014 8:52 AM
To: Orjiako, Oliver
Subject: Link to comment form

http://www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments.html
October 15, 2014

Mr. Oliver Orjiako
Clark County Community
Planning Department
1300 Franklin Street
Post Office Box 9810
Vancouver, Washington 98666-9810

Subject: 2016 Comprehensive Plan Update
Property at 21605 N.E. 10th Avenue

Dear Oliver:

I represent Pac-West, LLC, also known as Sanders Trucking, which owns property at 21605 N.E. 10th Avenue. Dale Sanders previously asked the County to consider adding this property to the Vancouver UGA, and I am reaffirming that request. It is currently in Urban Reserve, with CR-1 zoning, and an industrial zone overlay. According to County policy, property that is in the Urban Reserve is slated for eventual inclusion in the UGA. The County has also signaled that this property is appropriate for the light industrial zone, which my client supports.

Alternatively, my client would be amenable to a text amendment that would allow light industrial uses in the CR-1 zone since these uses are what is currently occurring, and this is what is planned for the area. Second, my client would like to connect to sewer. Sewer is already allowed in rural centers if the sewer lines exist, UDC 40.370.010(C), so it should not be a major policy change to allow connection to sewer for properties within rural centers if sewer is nearby. We understand that there is a major sewer project planned in the area that my client would like to connect to once installed.
Please docket these requests and add me to the mailing list for any updates. Thank you.

Very truly yours,

LeAnne M. Breiner, P.C.

cc: Dale Sanders
    Gordon Euler
October 15, 2014

Mr. Oliver Orjiako  
Clark County Community  
Planning Department  
1300 Franklin Street  
Post Office Box 9810  
Vancouver, Washington 98666-9810

Subject: 2016 Comprehensive Plan Update  
Property at 21605 N.E. 10th Avenue

Dear Oliver:

I represent Pac-West, LLC, also known as Sanders Trucking, which owns property at 21605 N.E. 10th Avenue. Dale Sanders previously asked the County to consider adding this property to the Vancouver UGA, and I am reaffirming that request. It is currently in Urban Reserve, with CR-1 zoning, and an industrial zone overlay. According to County policy, property that is in the Urban Reserve is slated for eventual inclusion in the UGA. The County has also signaled that this property is appropriate for the light industrial zone, which my client supports.

Alternatively, my client would be amenable to a text amendment that would allow light industrial uses in the CR-1 zone since these uses are what is currently occurring, and this is what is planned for the area. Second, my client would like to connect to sewer. Sewer is already allowed in rural centers if the sewer lines exist, UDC 40.370.010(C), so it should not be a major policy change to allow connection to sewer for properties within rural centers if sewer is nearby. We understand that there is a major sewer project planned in the area that my client would like to connect to once installed.
Please docket these requests and add me to the mailing list for any updates. Thank you.

Very truly yours,

LeAnne M. Bremer, P.C.

cc: Dale Sanders
    Gordon Euler
O’Donnell, Mary Beth

From: Tilton, Rebecca
Sent: Friday, October 17, 2014 10:52 AM
To: Barnes, Ed; Madore, David; Mielke, Tom; Silliman, Peter; Ojeda, Oliver; O’Donnell, Mary Beth
Cc: LaRocque, Linnea
Subject: Written Testimony re: Comp Plan Update
Attachments: Carol Levanen comments_101414.pdf

Hello,

Attached please find written comments submitted by Carol Levanen during the Board’s Hearing of October 14, 2014 (public comment time).

Thank you,
Rebecca

Rebecca Tilton, Clerk of the Board
Board of Clark County Commissioners
1300 Franklin Street
PO Box 5000
Vancouver, WA 98666-5000
PHONE: 360-397-2232, ext. 4305 | E-MAIL: Rebecca.Tilton@clark.wa.gov
Clark County Board of Commissioners
P.O. Box 5000
Vancouver, Washington 98666

Re: Washington State Department of Agriculture - Future of Farming
Strategic Plan 2020 and Beyond - 2008 Executive Summary (For the public record)

The following information and excerpts were taken from the Future of Farming report, sponsored by the Washington State Department of Agriculture. This report gives good insight to the limited agriculture that exists in Clark County and why. The Growth Management Act, in essence, directs counties to designate and preserve lands that have prime soil and the growing capacity to support long term commercially viable resource lands, considering proximity to markets, already developed land and the consideration of a more valuable use for the land. In Clark County, there is very little, if any, land that meets that test, other than as small lot hobby farming.

The Future of Farming Project Steering Committee members were appointed by the Directors of Agriculture as authoritative industry representatives. Members were from Mt. Vernon, Okanogan, Seattle, Carnation, Coulee City, Yakima, Ephrata, Enumclaw, Mosses Lake, Oakville, Rockford, Elma, Pullman, Shelton and Pasco. There were no representatives from Southwest Washington, including Clark, Cowlitz and Skamania.

1. The report states that Future of Farming participants reported regulations as their biggest obstacle.....smaller operations face special disadvantages due to regulatory complexities and many farmers explained the regulatory burdens discourage their children from taking over the farm, discourage investment in value-added opportunities and discourage new entrants from establishing farms.

2. The fifth noteworthy resource to protect is long term capital for investment in perennial plantings, facilities and equipment and short term credit for operations.

3. Many processors are now part of multinational organizations with many alternative raw product sources and will continue to locate in Washington only as long as it makes business sense to do so.

4. Increasingly, the agriculture system of all counties and regions of the world are becoming integrated into one global "food system".

5. Farmers and agribusinesses certainly believe that regulation has become a major hindrance to their profitability and survival. They disagree with the "business friendly" ratings that Washington has received.

6. Fifty percent (50%) of Washington total land is owned by the federal, state and county governments. Most housing and other development is on former agriculture land.

7. A number of programs already exist at the federal, state, and local level, either to sustain farmers in farming or to maintain land in farms. (A recent public record comment by CCCU states that the federal government would only consider loans for farming on six (6) acres of land in Clark County, according to a specific federal formula)
8. The Report stresses the loss of Prime farmland to non agriculture uses.

9. Water is a critical ingredient of agriculture production. According to the 2002 census, over seventy-five (75%) of Washington harvest by value was from the 11.9% of Washington farmland that was irrigated.

10. Like all other businesses, agriculture needs long-term capital for land, buildings, and durable equipment. It also needs long term capital for investments in crops. It needs short term operating capital to cover recurring expenses such as labor, utilities, and feed.

11. The grower may not receive final payment for orchard crops until two or more years after the first variable costs of the crop.

12. Farmers and agribusinesses have one major asset that they can use as collateral for long term loans: their land.

13. In 2002, 32.3% of real estate debt was supplied by the Farm Credit system. The debt to asset ratio can be expected to rise.

14. Agriculture is not recognized as a career opportunity. Agriculture class size has been dropping, which further encourages educational institutions to reduce or eliminate their investment in agriculture education and instructors.

15. Industry representatives consistently voiced a concern about the increasing average age of farmers, due in part to the lack of young people entering the industry.

16. Most economic activities will only take place if the value created by moving a product from point A to point B exceeds the cost of transportation.

17. One ton of freight can be carried 202 miles by rail, per gallon of fuel, 514 miles by inland barge, but only 59 miles by truck.

18. Respondents agreed that agriculture needs to close the perception gap between agriculture realities and the public's understanding of the agriculture situation.

The perception gap needs to be closed in Clark County, also. When the Farm Home Administration moves from Vancouver, to Brush Prairie and finally to Chehalis, in Lewis County, it's a sure sign they are no longer needed in this county to provide agriculture funding. Small parcel hobby farms is the only way that agriculture exists in Clark County.

Sincerely,

Carol Levanen, Ex. Secretary
Clark County Citizens United, Inc.
P.O. Box 2188
Battle Ground, Washington 98604
We are aware that many of CCCU's comments going back to Jan. 2014 are not included in the scoping report. We want all of our comments concerning the updates to the 2016 county comp. plan be included in the report. These written and verbal comments were placed in the public record during BOCC, planning commission public hearings, and the four open houses. These many comments cannot be ignored in the scoping, seis, and the updated 2016 comprehensive plan.

Sincerely,
Susan Rasmussen for Clark County Citizens United, Inc.
Please, for index. Thanks.

Oliver

-----Original Message-----
From: Cnty 2016 Comp Plan
Sent: Tuesday, October 21, 2014 3:52 PM
To: Orjiako, Oliver
Subject: FW: Vancouvers UGB

Forwarding questions received at the general Comp Plan email box.
Thank you very much~

Marilee McCall | Administrative Assistant Clark County Community Planning
360-397-2280 ext. 4558
1300 Franklin Street | Vancouver, WA 98660 P.O. Box 9810 | Vancouver, WA 98666
www.clark.wa.gov/planning

-----Original Message-----
From: Juno [mailto:deerfeeder@juno.com]
Sent: Sunday, October 19, 2014 11:45 PM
To: Cnty 2016 Comp Plan
Cc: Euler, Gordon
Subject: Vancouvers UGB

Can the County lever the city to increase the boundaries to create some jobs? We are sitting on 20 A. That has been in limbo for 8years, in and out of the growth plans! Our 20 A. is on 132 ave. & 119 st. One side is the UBG line, the other side is Laglers property. We are on the record and we are telling you we want to come in and support jobs in Clark County. At the same time we could use our retirement investment before were gone!
See you at the next meeting, I may speak if there is a opportunity Thank you!

Jerry & Michelle Winters
5420 Idaho St.
Van. Wash. 98661
O'Donnell, Mary Beth

From: Orjiako, Oliver
Sent: Wednesday, October 22, 2014 9:04 AM
To: McCall, Marilee
Cc: O'Donnell, Mary Beth
Subject: FW: Write your Commissioner

Just FYI on emails relating to the request from Jerry and Michelle Winters. Thanks.

Oliver

-----Original Message-----
From: Swanson, Jeff
Sent: Tuesday, October 21, 2014 8:15 AM
To: McCauley, Mark; Madore, David
Cc: Orjiako, Oliver; Euler, Gordon
Subject: RE: Write your Commissioner

The Winters property is outside the Vancouver UGA adjacent to the Lagler property, subject of the rural industrial land bank application. If I'm not mistaken, they have consulted with Mr. Horenstein regarding being included in the application although I believe they have ultimately declined to participate in that process. If they wish to have their property added to the Vancouver UGA then they need to contact Chad Eiken at the city of Vancouver.

-----Original Message-----
From: McCauley, Mark
Sent: Tuesday, October 21, 2014 8:03 AM
To: Madore, David
Cc: Swanson, Jeff; Orjiako, Oliver
Subject: RE: Write your Commissioner

These folks need to contact the city. Chad Aiken is their planner, if I am not mistaken. Oliver, can you please confirm? Thanks. Mark

-----Original Message-----
From: Madore, David
Sent: Tuesday, October 21, 2014 12:25 AM
To: Deerfeeder@juno.com; McCauley, Mark; Swanson, Jeff
Subject: Re: Write your Commissioner

Jerry and Michelle,

Thank you for your letter. I will consult with staff on this and we will get back with you.

Yes, we need land for jobs.
Thank you,

David Madore

> On Oct 20, 2014, at 11:46 PM, "Deerfeeder@juno.com" <Deerfeeder@juno.com> wrote:
> 
> Internet Form Results:
> 
> FORM: emailform.asp
> FORM submitted at 10/20/2014 11:46:49 PM
> 
> First Name: Jerry
> Last Name: Winters
> Phone: 694-8696
> Email: Deerfeeder@juno.com
> Address: 5420 Idaho st.
> City: Van
> State: Wa
> Subject: UGB
> Message:
> How can I ask Vancouver to enlarge their UGB?
> I want to request bringing in 20A. On 132 ave. and 119 th. St. Between the existing UGB and Lagliers property. I thought Clark County had more control over the maps and creating jobs?
> Thank You
>
> Jerry & Michelle Winters
> 5420 Idaho St.
> Van. Wa.
> 694-8696
> Deerfeeder@juno.com
>
> Clark County Form Mailer, 2014
O'Donnell, Mary Beth

From: Euler, Gordon
Sent: Thursday, October 30, 2014 1:54 PM
To: Snodgrass, Bryan
Cc: O'Donnell, Mary Beth
Subject: FW: Vancouvers UGB

Bryan:

In deleting some older e-mails I came across this one. I don't know if you saw this particular message, but thought you should have it for the record.

Gordy

-----Original Message-----
From: Juno [mailto:deerfeeder@juno.com]
Sent: Sunday, October 19, 2014 11:45 PM
To: Cnty 2016 Comp Plan
Cc: Euler, Gordon
Subject: Vancouvers UGB

Can the County lever the city to increase the boundaries to create some jobs? We are sitting on 20 A. That has been in limbo for 8 years, in and out of the growth plans! Our 20 A. is on 132 ave. & 119 st. One side is the UBG line, the other side is Laglers property. We are on the record and we are telling you we want to come in and support jobs in Clark County. At the same time we could use our retirement investment before were gone! See you at the next meeting, I may speak if there is a opportunity Thank you!

Jerry & Michelle Winters
5420 Idaho St.
Van. Wash. 98661

Sent from my iPad
FYI

Linnea LaRocque, Administrative Assistant
Clark County Board of Commissioners
560-397-2252 ext. 4167
PO Box 5000, Vancouver WA 98666

SAVE PAPER - Please do not print this e-mail unless absolutely necessary

From: Carol Levanen [mailto:cnidential@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 21, 2014 9:09 PM
To: dscee@clarkcd.org; Carol Levanen; Susan Rasmussen; Leah Higgins; Rick Dunning; Rita Dietrich; Jerry Olson; Fred Pickering; Jim Malinowski; Frank White; Benjamin Moss; Lonnie Moss; Melinda Zamora; Nick Redinger; Curt Massie; Marcus Becker; Zachary McIsaac; Clark County Citizens United Inc.; Madore, David; Mielke, Tom; Barnes, Ed
Subject: maps

Hello Denise, 

Clark Conservation District

Thanks for forwarding the soil information to Susan......she forwarded it to me, also. In all the research we have done regarding the current soils maps, we can find no where that the county actually used the soil manual for their data. They might have skimmed over it, but they didn't even have the ability to apply it via computer data base information, when it was created in 1990-1994. If indeed it was used then, the massive amount of Prime ag land that Vancouver put into the urban growth boundary in 2007 would have been noted as such on the maps. It was not. All of our research indicates the existing maps were created from staff and arial photos. The Hearings Board, head planners, county attorney, and other past county documents confirm that was the case. We believe the GMA intended that only true prime, rich, productive ag land should be preserved, which makes sense. There would not be any real purpose to call other rural lands, resource land, except to lock it up, and a past report to the commissioners by planning staff, says just that: The intent was to block the land up. We did note that when looking up prime ag land under the state website, it refers us to the county soils maps. It appears that the state doesn't really have "prime" soils of their own, but rather allows the counties to determine that. The 1994 erroneous planning process is the zoning we see today and those were the maps that were supposedly used. One would have to overlay the zones over the supposed soil to see if even that was actually done, which we will also research. The process for the original Comp plan was horrendous and our county continues to suffer under it. We all need to help the commissioners do the right thing for all of the rural landowners of our county, as the unincorporated areas should be the commissioners main focus and concern. But, we are all in this thing together. Thanks Again for the information!

Best Regards, Carol Levanen, Ex. Secretary, CCCU, Inc.
Just FYI

From: Madore, David
Sent: Tuesday, November 04, 2014 4:07 PM
To: Orjiako, Oliver
Subject: FW: Board of Commissioner Work Session - 10-22-2014 (For the Record)

Fyi

From: Carol Levanen [mailto:cnldental@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 22, 2014 11:39 PM
To: Silliman, Peter; Madore, David; Mielke, Tom; Barnes, Ed; Carol Levanen; Susan Rasmussen; Leah Higgins; Rick Dunning; Rita Dietrich; Jerry Olson; Fred Pickering; Jim Malinowski; Frank White; Benjamin Moss; Lonnie Moss; Melinda Zamora; Nick Redinger; Curt Massie; Marcus Becker; Zachary McIsaac; Clark County Citizens United Inc.
Subject: Board of Commissioner Work Session - 10-22-2014 (For the Record)

Dear Commissioners,

CCEU would like to clarify the record regarding previous zoning maps that planner, Oliver Orjiako presented to the Board of Commissioners at the recent work session on October 22, 2014. He showed the commissioners the resource zoning maps that he said had been in place prior to 1994. He was stressing to the commissioners how much resource land there was. But, he failed to mention that the maps had been in constant flux and what the parcel sizes were in those zones at that time. They were 2.5, 5, 10, and 20 acre zones, not the 5, 10, 20, 40 and 80 acres that are currently in place. CCEU has a very large two inch binder of various land use maps of Clark County dating from 1987 to 2014. One particular Clark County, Washington 1993 map, of a township of the Rock Creek, Fargher Lake, View, Cedar Creek areas, shows the existing parcelization in those areas at the time, along with the names of the owners of the parcels. It’s very telling. These were lands that had been divided long before the GMA. There are many historical family names on that map, in addition to Long View Fibre Company, School Land, State Forest Board, Washington State Game Department, and others. This map shows the people and the rural parcelization that helps define and is part of the rural character in that area of Clark County. It shows the pattern of small parcelization of 2.5 and 5 acres throughout the area. Another old map (with no date) called Clark County Land Use and Traffic Circulation, shows the broad expanse of state, federal, and large private timber lands in eastern Clark County. A Draft 20 year Plan Map shows the massive areas of the old Agri-Forest 40 acre zoning, which was ruled as illegal in the court. The notebook has numerous Agri-Forest maps of different areas showing the parcelization that was in place at the time. There is a Portland metro agriculture map that includes Clark County. This book also has aerial photos of the Agri-Forest lands that have white tape strips surrounding parcels of rural land. There is a map called, Prime Farmland - Clark County Washington, General Highway maps - Thematic detail compiled by state staff. US Department of Agriculture Soil Conservation Service M7-0-24076. It is very different than the 1994 GMA SEIS map of Prime and Unique Agriculture Soil, the Forest Soil map, and the existing Comprehensive Plan map of 1994 and today. CCEU’s notebook also contains a Growth Management - Issue 9 - June 1994 Perspectives map of Alternative A, B and C. Alternative A has Ag Tier 1 - 20 acres, Ag Tier 2 - 10 acres, Forest Tier 1 - 40 acres, Forest Tier 2 - 20 acres, Rural Farm - 10 acres, Rural Estate - 5 acres and Rural Residential 2.5 acres. There are maps of the old Resource Line that divided the rural lands. There are also 1996 Orthophotography - Clark County, Washington aerial maps.

If a picture tells a thousands words, these maps certainly do. It was erroneous for Clark County to ignore the parcelization of the rural areas and over designate resource lands in 1994, even though they had maps and other documents to determine the area differently. For this Board of Commissioners to continue to accept that faulty data is also erroneous. The court in 1997 has said, “The Board’s (WWCHHH) 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 of the terms of the MA. Clark County must come into compliance with this court decision and it’s plain meaning. The rural development (parcelization) in the rural lands must be recognized in a meaningful way by the county and in the 2016 Comprehensive Plan.

Sincerely,
Carol Levanen, Ex. Secretary
Clark County Citizens United, Inc.
P.O. Box 2188
Battle Ground, Washington 98604
O'Donnell, Mary Beth

From: Orjiako, Oliver
Sent: Wednesday, October 22, 2014 2:43 PM
To: O'Donnell, Mary Beth
Subject: FW: public comment

Just Fyi.

From: LaRocque, Linnea On Behalf Of Barnes, Ed
Sent: Wednesday, October 22, 2014 11:00 AM
To: Orjiako, Oliver
Cc: McCauley, Mark
Subject: FW: public comment

FYI

Linnea LaRocque, Administrative Assistant
Clark County Board of Commissioners
560-397-2232 ext. 4167
P.O. Box 5000, Vancouver WA 98666

SAVE PAPER - Please do not print this e-mail unless absolutely necessary

From: Carol Levanen [mailto:cnidental@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 21, 2014 8:33 PM
To: Mielke, Tom; Barnes, Ed; Madore, David
Subject: public comment

Dear Commissioners,

I just tried to send a comment on the county web page regarding the comp plan update, using the link that was provided. When I tried to send it, it was not able to be sent and did not go through. How many times has this happened to other landowners? Or, is just me. In the past faxes and mailings took almost two weeks to reach the commissioners and on-line doesn't seem to be much better. Please make it easier for landowners to provide comments over the 2016 comp plan process, instead of having to work through the maze that is now available. Thanks!

Best Regards, Carol Levanen, Ex. Secretary
Clark County Citizens United, Inc.
P.O. Box 2188
Battle Ground, Washington 98604

If the information you’re looking for isn’t included at the link above, please feel free to call our office for further explanation.

Thank you,

Marilee McCall | Administrative Assistant
Clark County Community Planning
360-397-2280 ext. 4558
1300 Franklin Street | Vancouver, WA 98660
P.O. Box 9810 | Vancouver, WA 98666
www.clark.wa.gov/planning

From: enricaac@juno.com [mailto:enricaac@juno.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 22, 2014 3:07 PM
To: Cnty 2016 Comp Plan
Subject: Growth Plan Update

We have just received a notice in the mail regarding open houses scheduled regarding Clark County's proposed revisions to its Comprehensive Growth Management Plan. The notice says that the current zoning for our parcel will be changed from "FR-40" to "FR-20". Would you please tell us what those two zoning codes actually mean?

It also says the our Current Comprehensive Plan designation will change from "FR-2" to "FR". Would you please tell us what those two plan designations mean?

We attempted to look up on-line the details for zoning codes and plan designations but could find nothing on the website listed on the notice.

thank you,

Steve and Anne Tendler
O'Donnell, Mary Beth

From: Alvarez, Jose
Sent: Tuesday, October 28, 2014 4:46 PM
To: 'Gamble0453@comcast.net'
Cc: O'Donnell, Mary Beth
Subject: RE: 2016 Comp Plan comments submitted

Mr. Gamble,

The smallest parcel size in the rural area is 5 acres unless you are in one of the 7 rural centers (Amboy, Brush Prairie, Chelatchie Prairie, Dollars Corner, Fargher Lake, Hockinson, Meadowglade) where 1 and 2.5 acre zones are allowed.

Thanks for your comment,

Jose Alvarez
Planner III
Clark County
Department of Community Planning
360.397.2280 x4898

-----Original Message-----
From: Cnty 2016 Comp Plan
Sent: Tuesday, October 28, 2014 4:03 PM
To: Alvarez, Jose
Subject: FW: 2016 Comp Plan comments submitted

-----Original Message-----
From: NoReply@Clark.Wa.Gov [mailto:NoReply@Clark.Wa.Gov]
Sent: Wednesday, October 22, 2014 6:48 PM
To: Cnty 2016 Comp Plan
Subject: 2016 Comp Plan comments submitted

Following comments were submitted online:

Parcel No: 195997000

Subject: R-5

Comments:
Why R5 when a large percentage of the properties are less than 5 acres? Would it not make more sense to zone R1. This would permit growth. R5 most would remain the same?

Submitted by:
Ted Gamble

Email: Gamble0453@comcast.net

Address:
6810 NE 159th street
Vancouver, wa
Following comments were submitted online:

Parcel No: 264138000

Subject: change of comp plan

Comments:
I have no problem with the change suggested to change current zoning from AG-20 to AG10

Submitted by:
Julie McAdams

Email: brickyardfarmwa@aol.com

Address:
38310 NE 119th Ave
Amboy, Washington
From: James Winkler <jhw@winklercompanies.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 22, 2014 3:43 PM
To: Cnty 2016 Comp Plan
Cc: James Winkler; 'Victor Winkler'
Subject: FW: Prop ID# 215139002

From: James Winkler
Sent: Wednesday, October 22, 2014 3:42 PM
To: 'commp.plan@clark.wa.gov'
Cc: James Winkler; 'Victor Winkler'
Subject: Prop ID# 215139002

I am a co-owner of the property identified above and located at 613 NW 259th St, Ridgefield 98642. We received a notice that the property would be rezoned from AG-20 to AG-10. Although the rezoning may be an improvement, it is far short of what we believe appropriate for the property. When we acquired the property the county removed it from the farm tax deferral because it was devoid of agricultural value and used as a horse boarding and training facility. The soils are capable of supporting only grass/hay production and poorly suited for growing a crop. By continuing an agricultural zone, we are denied the ability to put the property to a more productive and appropriate use. I submit the property is best suited for rezoning for a residential or industrial use. Given that our property envelops several large homes, I recommend consideration be given to rezoning the property for single family home use.

Thank you for considering our request.

Jim

--

James H. Winkler
Winkler Development Corporation
210 SW Morrison Street, Suite 600
Portland, OR 97204
jhw@winklercompanies.com
tel: 503.225.0701
fax: 503.273.8591
www.winklerdevcorp.com
From: NoReply@Clark.Wa.Gov
Sent: Thursday, October 23, 2014 9:52 AM
To: Cnty 2016 Comp Plan
Subject: 2016 Comp Plan comments submitted

Following comments were submitted online:

Parcel No:

Subject: Comp. Land Plan

Comments:
I am in full agreement with the redesignation of AG-20 to AG-10. The present size is very unpracticle for AG in Clark County. The large farms have all moved or in the process of doing so. Twenty acres for small labor intensive agriculture is too much for most to handle. Those that desire to just live on twenty acres have no idea how much equipment and time is required to do this and many of these properties go into disrepair for the lack of this preparation.

Submitted by:
Kommer Langendoen

Email: kommer@juno.com

Address:
25578 NE 38th St.
Camas, Wa 98607
Following comments were submitted online:

Parcel No:

Subject: Comp. Land Plan

Comments:
I am in full agreement with the redesignation of AG-20 to AG-10. The present size is very unpracticable for AG in Clark County. The large farms have all moved or in the process of doing so. Twenty acres for small labor intensive agriculture is too much for most to handle. Those that desire to just live on twenty acres have no idea how much equipment and time is required to do this and many of these properties go into disrepair for the lack of this preparation.

Submitted by:
Kummer Langendoen

Email: kummer@juno.com

Address:
25578 NE 38th St.
Camas, WA 98607
Comments, questions by Val Alexander, Board Member of Friends of Clark County

On the rural industrial land bank:

This issue was just settled in March, 2014, with the county having to take back the de-designation of the Lagler property after it was changed in 2007. Are there some figures that tell us how much it cost the county in legal fees for defending itself in this suit? Can it afford to risk another lawsuit on this matter?

If the county goes ahead with its plans, who will pay for the crossing of 503 to reach the railroad?

On the county comp plan alternatives:

I understand there is quite a push to add more lots in rural areas. Who will be responsible for the water supply when the present day rural lots lose their wells?

Can the county afford to build new roads....it is not maintaining the present roads very well at all. Many are too narrow for legal striping.

I think it is unreasonable to allow Battleground to expand their urban growth boundary for industrial development when they allowed houses to be built on their property that was designated for creating jobs.

Val Alexander
2404 NW Coyote Ridge Rd.
La Center, WA 98629
Hello,

Please find attached written testimony received during the public comment portion of the Board’s October 21 hearing (Val Alexander; Bianca Benson; Sydney Reisbeck; and Carol Levanen).

Thank you,
Rebecca

Rebecca Tilton, Clerk of the Board
Board of Clark County Commissioners
1300 Franklin Street
PO Box 5000
Vancouver, WA 98666-5000
PHONE: 360-397-2232, ext. 4305 | E-MAIL: Rebecca.Tilton@clark.wa.gov
10/21/14 Testimony
Blanca Benson
Friends of Clark County

What a busy time for you all. Elections are in full swing and you must be very busy with the absurd advisory vote and defeating the much needed home rule charter. But I’ll move beyond all that to what will certainly be a very busy 2015. The county is spending a lot of money on the Comprehensive Growth Plan Update. Staff is working plenty of hours, billable to citizens, to come up with the best way to anticipate the growth of our county and assume the needs of our community. Certainly it seems reasonable to some that we have plenty of space in Clark County to expand industrious enterprises as well as make room for everyone to have a view from their spacious living. Where could they possibly be a problem?

Well for starters, the staff has had to entertain the ideas of certain special interest groups that goes above and beyond putting Clark County in the line of fire of appeals and law suits for years after the Comp Plan is implemented. There is an idea floating around that if we can reduce the size of rural parcels that we somehow gain. What we in-fact would lose is hundreds of billable hours, from consultants, from staff and from legal.

One thing that time and time again we see overlooked is water availability for our current rural land owners. These people may be farmers, ranchers, Christmas tree growers, vintners, or just folks with a couple acres with no intention of ever growing food for themselves or neighbors. What all these people have in common is a need for water. But if you take a 20 acre agricultural parcel and try to develop 4 – 5 acre parcels you quadruple the water usage on land that is suitable for food production. We pave over 4 times the amount of ground where water can infiltrate and replenish our aquifers. Now, 4 families have a view of rolling hills, well, for now, but nobody can water their gardens which provide fresh food for several months a year and canned goods for the rest. Their chickens don’t get fed and they sure as shovels can’t produce food for anyone else in the county. We create a community where food safety is in jeopardy. Where we must rely solely, on food transported over a falling 25 bridge and our emergency food supply is reduced to what’s available for 3 days at the grocery stores. In an emergency.

Speaking of transportation, all this new buildable land has to have improved infrastructure. Sure that creates road jobs but does the county have the money to build new roads let alone maintain old ones? What about the expansion of the schools? Do we have a history of passing levies to increase schools while reducing class size?

Why on earth would we want to sprawl our community all over the countryside, overdeveloping prime farmland, reducing our availability of water and putting ourselves at risk for years of appeals to the growth management board and lawsuits? No matter what contrived maps certain groups show you and no matter how many countless hours they consume of staffs time, what they are suggesting is illegal and will result in wasted tax dollars.
If you look back at the SEPA scoping comments that were submitted in September, 42% of comments were in support of preserving farmland. You’re going to see petitions and more public comment in the coming two months. Don’t think everyone wants to pave over Clark County, because, after all once you pave over farmland it’s gone forever.
Some concerns about current Clark County processes and projects.

For the BOCC Hearing, 10/21/14

To: The Board of Clark County Commissioners.

Friends of Clark County is about to become creatively repetitive about certain current processes, alternatives and projects which will affect Clark County for years to come.

Over time, we will circle back to these from many directions as we stay within our 3 minutes.

One over-riding concern is the multiple-pronged effort to decrease lot sizes and change zones, some with minimum process. These may endanger us as a County. We cannot afford multiple lawsuits. Waging a multi-pronged simultaneous attack on aspects of our Growth Management Plan can look like a challenge to the GMA and the cumulative effects of the proposals will be considered at the Washington State level.

What are the proposals that decrease lot sizes and change zones?

1) Commissioners propose to decrease minimum lot size for agricultural zones from 20 acres to 10 acres and forestry lots from 40 to 20 acres.

2) Commissioners propose to combine Rural lot sizes (of 20, 10, and 5 acres) into one category that will have a single, "easier, more
simple, process “to change from one to another”. What is this “simplification”? Is this an massive zone change with no process?

3) A second zone change is the proposal to de-designate agricultural land for an Industrial Land Bank when there is already land available near the railroad and there is no protection of other, equally suited agricultural land. This will also be appealed to the Growth Management Board.

Is this a 3-pronged challenge to the Growth Management Act that may be considered by its cumulative effects and increase fines for each action?

Sydney Reisbick, President
For Friends of Clark County
PO Box 513
Vancouver, WA 98666
www.friendsofclarkcounty.org
friendsofclarkcounty@tds.com
On page 60 in the Draft EIS, it discusses SETTINGS, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION. In item I Earth - A. Soils - 1 Setting, it discusses agriculture and forest soils. It reads, "The GMA requires local jurisdictions to identify and protect agriculture and timber lands of long term commercial significance. The Washington State Department of Community and Economic Development (CTED) recommends using the soil classification system developed by the Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) and establishing larger minimum lot sizes to ensure the commercial viability of resource industries. The most recent comprehensive soil survey of Clark County was completed by the NRCS in 1972. Since soil does not change rapidly, information from the 1972 survey can still be considered reliable."  

The NRCS has classified the soils of Clark County into eight major soil associations: Sauvie, Puyallup, found in the bottomlands and flood plains; Hillsboro, Gee, Odne, Hillsboro Dollar, Cove, and Lauren, Sitton, Wind River, found in terraces; Hesson, Ocleque and Hesson Olympic, found in uplands; and Cinebar Yacolt and Olympic, Kinney, found in the foothills.

...The GMA requires protection of Agricultural land, which is defined to some extent by soil suitability. It is not acceptable under the GMA to propose unnecessary conversion of agriculturally viable land to urban uses."  

The soils mentioned in the Draft EIS are actually substandard soils of Class III to CI V, with a few in the Class II range.

When a man was in the process of purchasing a 10 acre parcel of land to build a home on, massive buffers and setbacks around a man made pond were required. The county agent claimed it was a large wetland that had just been made into a pond. On November 22, 2006, a letter was sent to Keith Simonson regarding wetlands. It was signed by commissioners Boldt, Stuart and Morris. It states "The question of the pond, whether natural or manmade, does not change the existence of the wetland. Soils maps and aerial photographs dating back to 1955 show the historic spring and stream channel. United State Department of Agriculture soils maps indicate that the area determined to be wetland contains Cove Silty Clay Loam, a slowly drained type."

The county can't have it both ways. The resource soils maps are erroneous and need to be changed, and Cove needs to be removed from the list of prime agriculture soils.

Sincerely, 

Carol Levanen, Ex. Secretary
Clark County Citizens United, Inc.
P.O. Box 2188, Battle Ground, Washington 98604
November 22, 2006

Carol Levanen
PO Box 2188
Battle Ground, WA 98604

Dear Ms. Levanen:

Thank you for making us aware of the recent issues encountered by Keith Simonson regarding wetlands. We certainly agree that wetland ordinances must be applied in a flexible, balanced, and reasonable manner.

We have consulted our staff and have some additional details that you will likely appreciate.

- No Wetland or Habitat permit is required for the construction of the house in the area that he has chosen.
- The question of the pond, whether natural or manmade, does not change the existence of the wetland. Soils maps and aerial photographs dating back to 1955 show the historic spring and stream channel. United States Department of Agriculture soils maps indicate that the area determined to be wetland contains Cove Silty Clay Loam, a slowly drained type.
- His proposal to groom and enhance the pond also meets the exemption allowing removal of non-native weeds and blackberries. Native replanting and enhancements in wetland and buffers are also exempt.
- These pre-determinations are an overview in order to assist citizens in evaluating property. It is meant to be a service to the citizen by providing a quick decision. He has the right to a second opinion from a hired, private sector biologist.
- If he decides to purchase the property and build a house, there is no additional charge for another Habitat permit.

We hope that this information with be of help to you and Mr. Simonson and clears up any uncertainty about permit requirements. If you have any additional questions, you may call Marian Anderson, Community Development Ombudsman, for assistance at 360.397-2375 ext.4487.

Sincerely,

Marc Boldt
Chair

Steve Stuart
Commissioner

Betty Sue Morris
Commissioner

LR 06-253
C: Community Development
3. The land has long-term commercial significance. To determine this factor, counties should consider the following:

- Classification of prime and unique farmland soils mapped by NRCS
- Availability of public facilities and services, including roads used for transporting agricultural products
- Tax status under Chapter 84.34 RCW
- Relationship or proximity to urban growth areas
- Predominant parcel size
- Land use patterns and their compatibility with agricultural practices
- Intensity of nearby land uses
- History of land development permits
- Land values under alternative uses
- Proximity to markets

Counties may consider other factors, including:

- Food security issues, such as providing food supplies for food banks, schools and institutions, vocational training opportunities in agriculture and heritage or artisanal foods
- Agricultural lands of local importance, as determined through public consultation

OVERVIEW OF AGRICULTURAL LANDS IN GRAYS HARBOR COUNTY

Prime Farmland Soils

Prime farmland soils cover approximately 171,800 acres within Grays Harbor County, which accounts for approximately 14.0% of the county's land area. Exhibit A-1 is a map showing the general location of prime agricultural soils in Grays Harbor County.

There are 35 soil types classified as prime farmland soils in Grays Harbor County. Prime farmland soils have an adequate and dependable supply of moisture from precipitation or irrigation. Temperature and growing season are favorable, and the level of acidity or alkalinity is acceptable. The soils have few, if any, rocks and are permeable to water and air. They are not excessively erodible or saturated with water for long periods and are not flooded during growing season. The slope ranges mainly from 0 to 8 percent.
Appendix A: Counties and Cities that Qualify for the Ten Year Update
This list is current through April 1, 2007 when the next set of population estimates will be produced by the Washington State Office of Financial Management. Because these criteria are based on population and growth rates, CTED should be consulted after that date to determine if a county or city is eligible for an extension to the RCW 36.70A.130(4) update deadlines.

**Growth Management Act - Timelines Bill - ESSB 6427**

An act relating to schedules for the review of comprehensive plans and development regulations for certain cities and counties; recasting and amending RCW 36.70A.130: and creating a new section. The law defines small and slow-growing counties as those with a population of less than 50,000 and a growth rate of 17 percent or less over the ten-year period prior to their update deadline. Small and slow-growing cities are those with a population of 2,000 or less and a growth rate of 17 percent or less over the same ten-year period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualifying counties</th>
<th>Qualifying cities within</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>Ritzville; Washtucna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asotin</td>
<td>Asotin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>Dayton; Starbuck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>Bridgport; Mansfield; Waterville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferry</td>
<td>Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garfield</td>
<td>Pomeroy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kittitas</td>
<td>Bingen; Goldendale; White Salmon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>Almira; Creston; Davenport; Harrington; Odessa; Sprague; Wilbur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okanogan</td>
<td>Brewster; Coulee Dam; Elmer City; Nespelem; Okanogan; Omak; Orovell; Pateros; Tonasket; Twisp; Winthrop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>Ilwaco; Long Beach; Raymond; South Bend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pend Oreille</td>
<td>Cusick; Ione; Metoline; Metoline Falls; Newport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skamania</td>
<td>Stevenson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevens</td>
<td>Chewelah; Colville; Kettle Falls; Northport; Springdale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walla Walla</td>
<td>Cathlamet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitman</td>
<td>Albion; Colfax; Colton; Endicott; Garfield; La Crosse; Malden; Lamont; Oakesdale; Palouse; Rosalia; St. John; Tekoa; Uniontown,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-qualifying counties</td>
<td>Qualifying cities located in non-qualifying counties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benton</td>
<td>Benton City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelan</td>
<td>Cashmere; Chelan; Leavenworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowlitz (CARL)</td>
<td>Castle Rock (CARL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>Kahlotus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Coulee City; Electric City; George; Grand Coulee; Hartline; Krupp; Soap Lake; Wilson Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Harbor (CARL)</td>
<td>Cosmopolis; Elma; McCleary; Montesano; Oakville; Westport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island</td>
<td>Coueville; Langley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kittitas</td>
<td>Cle Elum; Kittitas; Roslyn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis</td>
<td>Moscow; Morton; Pe Ell; Toledo; Winlock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mason</td>
<td>No cities qualify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Juan</td>
<td>No cities qualify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skagit</td>
<td>Concrete; La Conner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spokane</td>
<td>Deer Park; Fairfield; Latah; Medical Lake; Millwood; Rockford; Sprangle; Waverly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walla Walla</td>
<td>Prescott; Waitsburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yakima</td>
<td>Nahcian; Wapato</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Re: Clark County Rural Lands, the Law and the 2016 Comprehensive Plan Review

(This information to be placed into public record)

In response to an appeal filed against Clark County by Clark County Citizens United, Inc. in Case # 96-2-00080-2, the Honorable Edwin J. Poyfair ruled on April 4, 1997, in the FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND ORDER. Included in the Order, he found that Clark County failed to comply with many legal mandates of the Washington State Growth Management Act. In support of that decision, the Court of Appeals of the State of Washington Division II, upheld portions of the Poyfair decision in 1999. When these items were remanded to the county by the Western Washington Growth Management Hearings Boards, the county went through the motions of appearing to be complying with the court rulings, when in fact many of the items were brushed over and under the table, without completing the task. Later, after the WWGMHB continued to rule Clark County's Comprehensive Plan as invalid, the Honorable John F. Nichols placed a stay on the actions in 1997, until Clark County could become compliant.

Since that time, Clark County Citizens United, Inc. has been waiting for the corrections and completion of the court mandates. Every year since the court decisions, the standing board of commissioners have put off completing the task. When CCCU questioned the county as to when the work would be completed, the commissioners claimed that the work was in progress and they would have something soon. Then CCCU was told in 2004 that only urban areas were being considered in the review of the Comprehensive Plan. But, in fact, a moratorium was shockingly placed on the rural lands in the interim. CCCU heartily protested against that action. Commissioners again, asked CCCU to just be patient. In 2007, CCCU was told not to participate in the review of the Comp Plan because, again, the urban lands were the only thing on the table, and the county would get to the rural lands, soon. Even so, CCCU submitted testimony regarding the EIS. A rural lands task force was set up supposedly to aid the process, but failed to accomplish any of the court mandated directives. This task force report is now the excuse to retain large lot rural and resource zoning, instead of forming policy to comply with the court and the law.

Specifically, Item 6, Comprehensive Plan EIS and Item 7, Rural Land Densities, of the court rulings have never been completed. What has been left, is a plan that continues to reflect the illegal activity that occurred in 1994 in the rural and resource lands.

Item 6, Comprehensive Plan EIS. “The County failed to comply with SEPA’s requirement for additional environmental review when a proposal changes substantially from the one addressed in the initial EIS. The Board’s decision to uphold the adequacy of the EIS absent additional environmental analysts regarding the... changes to the pattern of rural development was clearly erroneous.”
7. **Rural Land Densities.** "The County's rural and resource development regulations are inconsistent with the GMA. The GMA requires counties to determine that planning goals are utilized and are a part of the consideration supporting its decisions. 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."

"It is evident that rural land use density regulations were driven in part by earlier Growth Management Hearings Board decisions requiring urban population plus rural populations to equal Office of Financial Management population forecasts. This formulaic view of the GMA requirement is fatally flawed. 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 are adequately sized and infrastructure in those growth areas is provided for. This Board decision, however, compelled the county to downzone substantial portions of the rural areas in order to meet the Board's apparent requirements."

"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. By trying to comply with the Board's errant decision the County violated a GMA planning goal."

*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 of the terms of the GMA."

**ORDER**

"Based on the foregoing Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law IT IS HEREBY; ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that the Clark County Comprehensive Plan and Development Regulations adopted in Ordinance 1994-12-47 on December, 20, 1994 are remanded...with direction to enter a decision in accord with this Order mandating County action to correct the violations of the GMA identified herein:"

Clark County Citizens United, Inc., representing approximately 6,000 members, expects Clark County to comply with the court rulings in these three areas:

1. Resource land zoning and regulations must be designated and applied to reflect the existing parcelization and development. There must be compliance with the GMA and the WAC criteria regarding maps, soils and use.
2. Rural lands zoning and regulations must be designated and applied to reflect the existing parcelization and development. There must be compliance with the GMA and the WAC criteria regarding maps and use.

3. The 2016 SEIS must adequately reflect these changes to the Rural lands and the Resource lands in the 2016 Clark County Comprehensive Land Use Plan.

The county has ignored these court mandates for all these years, while continuing to apply an unauthorized formula. With the 20 year 2016 review, the county must finally come into compliance with the law. These court decisions won’t go away any time soon, and neither will the rural landowners. Clark County Citizens United, Inc. asks the Clark County Board of Commissioners to be rural land and resource land advocates, to assure that the economic viability of those lands will prosper and grow, well into the future.

Sincerely,

Carol Levanen, Ex. Secretary
Clark County Citizens United, Inc.
P.O. Box 2188
Battle Ground, Washington 98604
Mary Beth: For the index.

Jose: FYI.

Gordy

From: Orjiako, Oliver
Sent: Thursday, October 23, 2014 11:43 AM
To: 'Steven B Madsen'
Cc: Eric Golemo; Mark Ghiglieri; Scott Taylor; Euler, Gordon; Alvarez, Jose
Subject: RE: Comprehensive Plan Update Process

Hello Steve:

Thank you for your email and inquiry. In response, property owners can submit their requests anytime during the comprehensive plan update process. The county’s 2016 growth plan update is slated for completion before or on June 30, 2016.

As you are probably aware, there are no guarantees on site-specific requests. All requests made are docketed and put into the index of record. Staff look forward to receiving your request. I hope this is helpful. Please, let me know if you have questions. Thank you for your interest in Clark County Planning process.

Kind Regards,

Oliver

From: Steven B Madsen [mailto:sb.madsen@hotmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 23, 2014 11:26 AM
To: Orjiako, Oliver
Cc: Eric Golemo; Mark Ghiglieri; Scott Taylor
Subject: Comprehensive Plan Update Process

Hello Oliver,

I represent Crystal Peak Holdings which owns about 750 acres comprising about 24 parcels northeast of Battle Ground and including Bell Mountain. Zoning for the parcels ranges from R-10 to FR-80. Based on my client’s development plans, we were intending to apply for an R-5 rezone for several parcels totaling about 200 acres and currently zoned R-10 & R-20. This is based on the fact that there are a very large number of 5-acre parcels surrounding our property and the rezone would be consistent with historic and anticipated future development patterns for the area as well as the availability of public services, specifically public water.

I am working with Eric Golemo and SGA Engineering on this project. Eric has informed me that, based on recent presentations by county staff regarding the rural lands update to the 2016 Comprehensive Plan, it may be a better
strategy to request Comp Plan designation changes for the parcels through the update process. I have not followed that process as closely this time as I did when I was with the BIA. Could you please let me know when your deadline is for submission for requests by property owners for specific Comp Plan changes. I can have the request prepared by next week.

Thank you,

Steve Madsen

The Law Office of Steven B. Madsen
PO Box 269
Cougar, WA 98616
(360) 957-4578
sb.madsen@hotmail.com
I grew up in this area and picked berries and beans as a youth. I recently moved back here from Southern Oregon where small farms are numerous and was dismayed to see the loss of farm land. I eagerly went to the farmers' market in Vancouver and was amazed that most of the produce came from eastern Oregon. Now I see a proposal to reduce from land by 600 acres to increase industrial land for jobs. Jobs are of no use if you can't buy food. Farm land also increases jobs. Once farm land is lost it cannot be reclaimed. Please think of the future and save farm land.

Dr. E Verbeck
McCall, Marilee

From: Ken Callantine <anoidjetjockey@aol.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 23, 2014 9:49 AM
To: Cnty 2016 Comp Plan
Subject: Stop The Proposed Change

To whom it may concern:

In no uncertain terms, I DO NOT support changing and/or accepting the proposed change to my property from AG20 to AG10. Changing the AG20 status to the AG10 status will have devastating consequences to my property personally and to this beautiful area. All of my neighbors and as well as myself purchased property in this area for one major reason and that was to get out of the population centers and away from all the problems found in small parceled areas. We moved to this area because of it's rural setting and the low density population. We purchased these properties precisely because we have a 20 acre minimum and thus the very structure of the area would limit congestion, bottlenecks, traffic jams, all forms of environmental pollution, and the general overcrowdedness of an area closer to population centers. Stop the proposed change!

Sincerely,
Ken Callantine
property owner
33502 NE 60th Ave.
La Center, WA 98629
McCall, Marilee

From: NoReply@Clark.Wa.Gov
Sent: Friday, October 24, 2014 9:33 AM
To: Cnty 2016 Comp Plan
Subject: 2016 Comp Plan comments submitted

Following comments were submitted online:

Parcel No: 216259000

Subject: proposed zone changes

Comments:
I will be out of town and can not make the meetings. I have wanted to see the zone change on our property for some time. However I would propose a 5 acre zoning as opposed to 10. Several reasons: surrounding properties for the most part are 5 acres or less. our property could not possibly utilized as ag land, mostly ravines and steep terrain. it would be better served as 5 acre parcels. please consider this in your upcoming decision. thank you

Submitted by:
James Riedl

Email: tradewinds55@msn.com

Address:
22510 nw cornell dr
ridgefield, wa
Following comments were submitted online:

Parcel No: 

Subject: Comp plan update

Comments:
None of the proposed options for updating parcel sizes go far enough. The most restrictive zoning should be a 6 acre minimum parcel size. This would allow more families to have the freedom to own some acreage. The 6 acre size would allow for a 1 acre home site area and the balance of the acreage could be used for farm or forestry.

If there are only three options available, then we would support option #2. Thanks

Submitted by:
Clinton Kysar

Email: kysarc@gmail.com

Address:
PO Box 344
Amboy, WA
McCall, Marilee

From: NoReply@Clark.Wa.Gov
Sent: Friday, October 24, 2014 2:47 PM
To: Cnty 2016 Comp Plan
Subject: 2016 Comp Plan comments submitted

Following comments were submitted online:

Parcel No: 170419000

Subject: Keep Alternative #1

Comments:
Alternative #1 keeps us save from overuse of the Livingston Pit.

Submitted by:
Dan Rock

Email: danrock57@q.com

Address:
26815 N.E. Highland Meadows Drive
 please forgive me if this is a duplicate.

From: Carol Levanen [mailto:cnldental@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, October 24, 2014 2:05 AM
To: Madore, David; Mielke, Tom; Barnes, Ed
Subject: Community and the Heritage Farm

Dear Commissioners,

Susan has always shared her time and expertise with the Clark County Fair Princesses, the ice cream booth, helping with the Nutcracker Ballet and many other things. I have tried to help the dental hygiene association on the state level, local level and in volunteer dental clinics. But, now both of us have been given another calling that we feel compelled to do. Some day, we hope all will be well with the rural people and we can go back to our expertise.

I would love to see the heritage farm become a top-notch regional park. It is so ideal for it. The location is perfect, there's history, there's space, there's already a park, there's a purpose and there's access. I think the Farmers Market should be there, and the produce from the farm sold to offset costs. There should be multi-use trails, and rest stops along the way. There should be public presentations about the farming history in the area and a little museum or walking museum to go with it. There should be horse drawn wagon rides. There should be food gardens and playgrounds. There should be educational classes on agriculture for the children and adults. Those on food assistance should be planting, cultivating, harvesting, selling and using their crops. The soil is ideal. Working with your hands in the earth always makes a person feel special. There should be orchards with pruning and compost classes. There should be flower gardens, too. There should be gardening classes on how those living on home lots can be self sufficient. Many of the old buildings with shelter, are perfect to set up a farmers market with all types of vendors. There is space for parking of cars, trucks and horse trailers. I believe it is a jewel just waiting to be carved. If I wasn't so busy with land use, I would be interested in helping with such a project, but the land use work is of utmost importance at this time. Please seriously think about my suggestions, as that land is surely well suited for such a park and I would love to see it happen.

Best regards, Carol
O’Donnell, Mary Beth

From: Orjiako, Oliver
Sent: Monday, October 27, 2014 1:19 PM
To: Euler, Gordon; Alvarez, Jose; O’Donnell, Mary Beth
Cc: Cook, Christine
Subject: FW: Pacific fisheries management council

FYI

From: LaRocque, Linnea On Behalf Of Barnes, Ed
Sent: Monday, October 27, 2014 12:18 PM
To: Orjiako, Oliver
Cc: Tilton, Rebecca
Subject: FW: Pacific fisheries management council

Oliver, fyi

From: Carol Levanen [mailto:cnidental@yahoo.com]
Sent: Saturday, October 25, 2014 10:29 AM
To: Madore, David; Mielke, Tom; Barnes, Ed; Silliman, Peter
Subject: Pacific fisheries management council

A CCCU board member’s father is on the Board of Pacific Fisheries Management Council. He has asked to visit with us regarding comp plans and land use. We will be setting up time to talk with him.
Mary:

Thanks for your e-mail. Your comment is in the record as supporting the proposal for a smaller minimum parcel size for parcels zoned for agricultural. It could be that the smaller parcel size will only be implementable with a cluster provision.

Gordy Euler
Clark County Community Planning

-----Original Message-----
From: NoReply@Clark.Wa.Gov [mailto:NoReply@Clark.Wa.Gov]
Sent: Saturday, October 25, 2014 7:50 AM
To: Cnty 2016 Comp Plan
Subject: 2016 Comp Plan comments submitted

Following comments were submitted online:

    Parcel No: 197189000

    Subject: ag-10

    Comments:
    We have close neighbors on 2 sides with small acreages and we used to be 5 acre minimum, but because we did not divide before we have been punished by being put in ag zone. We like the idea of at least smaller lot sizes but would you consider clustering which still leaves open space but gives more people the chance to enjoy rural life?

    Submitted by:
mary cole

    Email: cole.mary.ann@gmail.com

    Address:
O’Donnell, Mary Beth

From: Alvarez, Jose
Sent: Tuesday, October 28, 2014 4:26 PM
To: 'martybennett@hotmail.com'
Cc: O’Donnell, Mary Beth
Subject: RE: Alternative 1 (No Change) is my preference

Mr. Bennett,

If there are environmental restrictions in place those generally have a specific building envelope where development can occur. In order to divide the property the development review process will identify any environmental constraints and will have to comply with the latest environmental regulations. Tax assessment questions can be directed to the county assessor. http://www.clark.wa.gov/assessor/index.html

Thank you for your comments,

Jose Alvarez
Planner III
Clark County
Department of Community Planning
360.397.2280 x4898

---

From: Cnty 2016 Comp Plan
Sent: Tuesday, October 28, 2014 4:03 PM
To: Alvarez, Jose
Subject: FW: Alternative 1 (No Change) is my preference

---

From: Marty Bennett [mailto:martybennett@hotmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 22, 2014 4:06 PM
To: Cnty 2016 Comp Plan
Subject: Alternative 1 (No Change) is my preference

For what it’s worth, my 2 cents on the re-zoning options is "Alternative 1". I suspect that the people driving for the re-zoning change are doing so with dollar signs in their eyes. They are not taking in to account the qualitative aspects of re-zoning and increased growth (you just have to look towards the greater tri-county Portland Oregon metro area to see the reduction in quality of life with increased growth). So, no changes to the existing zoning please.

Additionally, since I am currently on Ag-20, a change to Ag-10 would increase my already high (in my opinion) property taxes (despite Mr. Mielke’s previous erroneous beliefs to the contrary). Yes, presumably, my property would then be more valuable - but only if I sell and move, an option that I would not like to have forced on me.
Finally, if you do re-zone my particular property to Ag-10, how will you account for all the current property environmental restrictions in place? Would they just be removed so that growth could occur? Or would the restrictions remain? If the restrictions on building remain, would that be taken in to account when the property is assessed for tax purposes?

Anyway, just my 2 cents here (and a little venting at what I see as the end of the quality of life here in Clark County if the zoning change "Alternative 2" occurs).

Thank you for your time in reading this and best wishes with wrestling with the implications of whichever course the commission chooses to pursue in this matter.

Marty Bennett
28416 NE 122nd Ave
Battle Ground, WA
360-666-9822
Just FYI

From: Tilton, Rebecca
Sent: Wednesday, October 29, 2014 4:32 PM
To: Mielke, Tom; Madore, David; Barnes, Ed; Orjiako, Oliver; O'Donnell, Mary Beth; Silliman, Peter
Subject: Written Comments re: Comp Plan Update

Hello,

Please find attached written testimony received during the public comment portion of the Board’s October 28, 2014 hearing from Carol Levanen and Susan Rasmussen.

Thank you,
Rebecca

Rebecca Tilton, Clerk of the Board
Board of Clark County Commissioners
1300 Franklin Street
PO Box 5000
Vancouver, WA 98666-5000
PHONE: 360-397-2232, ext. 4305 | E-MAIL: Rebecca.Tilton@clark.wa.gov
Clark County Board of Commissioners
P.O. Box 5000
Vancouver, Washington 98666

Re: Rural Representation and the 2016 Comprehensive Plan (For the public record)

In RCW 36.70A.035 Public participation, the GMA directs counties (1) The public participation requirements of this chapter shall include notice procedures that are reasonably calculated to provide notice to property owners and other affected and interested individuals. ... In RCW 36.70A.140 Comprehensive plans - Ensure public participation, it states, Each county and city that is required or chooses to plan under RCW 36.70A.040 shall establish and broadly disseminate to the public a public participation program identifying procedures providing for early and continuous public participation in the development and amendment of comprehensive land use plans and development regulations implementing such plans. The procedures shall provide for broad dissemination of proposals and alternatives, opportunity for written comments, public meetings after effective notice, provision for open discussion, communication programs, information services and consideration of and response to public comments.

Ridgefield, with 4,763 people, La Center, with 2,800 people, and Yacolt, with 1,586 people, (2010 US Census), have been able to give early and continuous participation in the Comprehensive Plan update. A representative from each city sits at the table with commissioners to discuss their wants and needs. Clark County Citizens United, Inc. representatives, speaking for approximately 6,000 rural landowners, equal to Ridgefield’s and La Center’s population combined, come forward in the process and are told to speak to Futurewise, a Seattle environmental group, to discuss what to do with rural lands. Are rural people invisible in Clark County? Do those living in three fourths of the county land mass, not count? The GMA, often discusses the importance of property owners participation, yet staff and the commissioners discussions have centered on the cities.

The proposals brought by staff, for three alternatives presented in the SEIS, were created long before rural people could consider possible changes to the 2016 Comprehensive Plan. Staff hangs their hat on the Rural Task Force and a survey that went to a select rural population, who all said smaller lot sizes. But, staff defined that to mean only changes to resource lands with parcel sizes of 10 and 20 acres, ignoring the rural areas. Their excuse is that they don't want an appeal.

After 20 years, the county commissioners can no longer ignore the needs and wants of rural people and the rural economy. They can no longer ignore that almost 100% of the rural land parcels are much smaller than allowed in their zones and the changing face of agriculture and forestry in the county and nation. The commissioners must balance the rural land needs with the cities in the 2016 Comprehensive Plan. Cities are not required to have people come forward, en mass, to support their position, nor should rural representatives. This in not the intent of the GMA.

Clark County Citizens United, has presented often, for the wants and needs of rural people. We ask the Board of Commissioners to reconsider the staff proposal, to better meet those concerns.

Sincerely,
Carol Levanen, Ex. Secretary
Clark County Citizens United, Inc.
P. O. Box 2188, Battle Ground, Washington, 98604
Dear Commissioners,

The United States is one of the most obese societies in the world. Kaiser Permanente recommends that children only watch television for one hour and the rest of the time they need to get out and play. It’s time for America to raise healthy and educated children, who will eventually become the U.S. work force. Housing is very important and should be healthy, safe and affordable. Children don’t do well in confined spaces. Apartment living is not the best choice for our families. Children should be able to access the natural environment, swing sets, backyard swimming pools, pets, gardens, trees, and sand boxes, in the security of their backyard, under adult supervision.

Housing needs to be manageable for the owner, both physically and financially. In the real estate market, buyers are looking for a home with space around it. The ideal is a home on one acre and the market bears that out with premium prices. Adults owning homes have pride in ownership and stay healthier maintaining their homes. The community also benefits with increased tax revenue, and neighborhood involvement. Even the small attached homes on small parcels can be a good starting point for responsible home ownership, particularly for first time buyers. These homes are affordable and the money they spend goes toward equity. As a realtor, I see that small lots are limiting and do not fit with families, as the children play in the street, creating a safety hazard. But, they are better than apartments. All too often, we see apartment complexes in disrepair because the owner is only trying to make income from the property and has no interest in adding expenses to keep a good maintenance schedule. If apartments are on the high end and well maintained, they are also expensive to rent. This limits the market for that type of housing. To meet the multi-housing quota, I believe people living in the small attached homes is preferable.

The ideal lot sizes, and what the market is looking for is one to five acres. Any thing larger than that is not financially doable for the majority of home buyers. Employment numbers will increase with good paying jobs, if there are more desirable lots and builders are able to meet the demand. The increase in additional property tax will benefit the county, too. People want to have their own space and the real estate market reflects that. Homeownership is also good for the mental and physical well being of the whole family. Apartment dwellers are often transient and low income who are, for whatever reason, struggling financially. When they can finally buy a little home somewhere to call their own, it elevates their social status and self-confidence and that of their family as they now have their own space. Multi-housing is a stepping stone to home ownership. The real estate industry would like to see more home options available in Clark County that provide for a multitude of housing types in all areas of the county to reflect the many types of people wanting to live here. The people of Clark County want and need to buy for their life style, whether that be attached homes, small homes on small lots or a medium size home on a large lot. Since I’m in the market every day, I see so many buyers who ask why there are not half and 1-5 acres available? If this is coming up so often, why haven’t things changed? I believe our county needs to be working for the good of the people of Clark County.

Sincerely,

Leah Higgins
O'Donnell, Mary Beth

From: Tilton, Rebecca
Sent: Wednesday, October 29, 2014 4:32 PM
To: Mielke, Tom; Madore, David; Barnes, Ed; Orjiako, Oliver; O'Donnell, Mary Beth; Silliman, Peter
Subject: Written Comments re: Comp Plan Update

Hello,

Please find attached written testimony received during the public comment portion of the Board’s October 28, 2014 hearing from Carol Levanen and Susan Rasmussen.

Thank you,
Rebecca

Rebecca Tilton, Clerk of the Board
Board of Clark County Commissioners
1300 Franklin Street
PO Box 5000
Vancouver, WA 98666-5000
PHONE: 360-397-2232, ext. 4305 | E-MAIL: Rebecca.Tilton@clark.wa.gov
Please respond to the below question(s) submitted to the Comp Plan “inbox” folder and cc: Mary Beth for the index.

Thank you!

Marilee McCall | Administrative Assistant
Clark County Community Planning
360-397-2280 ext. 4558
1300 Franklin Street | Vancouver, WA 98660
P.O. Box 9810 | Vancouver, WA 98666
www.clark.wa.gov/planning

From: charles wagon [mailto:odesteb@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 23, 2014 11:50 AM
To: Cnty 2016 Comp Plan
Subject: CGMP

'ello , I received a notice that my zoning was going to change on my home at 21807 NE 279th St., Battle Ground, prop. ID # 233908000. My question is: is there a process that would allow me to request going from FR 20 zoning to 5 or 10 ac. lots. I'm bordered on 2 sides by state lands and on the other by residential property. (5 ac.). The old gentleman who owned it at the time it was zoned was retired and on a fixed income and was unable to afford the taxes so he put it in timberland classification so as to be able to keep it. When it was zoned the county came up the sec. line with 5 ac. residential lots until they got to his property corner and the jutted over into the sec. and around his 40 .ac. and zoned it f 40. It's obvious if you look at a map what happened, almost like being penalized for being old, retired and poor. I own 30 ac. plus 3 ac. that I bought from the DNR on a trespass issue so changing it from 40 to 20 doesn't help the property at all. It's almost solid rock so it can't be farmed and doesn't grow trees effectively so it seems using it for homes would be putting it to the best use. If you could let me know what avenues I have to get it lowered I'd surely appreciate it.

Thank you, Orville Esteb
O'Donnell, Mary Beth

From: Alvarez, Jose
Sent: Tuesday, October 28, 2014 12:12 PM
To: 'odesteb@gmail.com'
Cc: O'Donnell, Mary Beth
Subject: 2016 Comp Plan request

Mr. Esteb,

In response to your email submittal dated October 23, 2014 regarding zoning and comprehensive plan amendment for a property with parcel identification number of 233908000. The 32 acre parcel currently has a Forest Tier 2 comprehensive plan designation and an FR-40 zoning designation. As you are aware the current proposal is to amend the minimum parcel size from 40 acres to 20 acres. In order to change the zoning to an R-5 or R-10 zone would require de-designating the property from the Forest resource designation. The Washington Administrative Code (WAC) has specific criteria that need to be met in order to de-designate resource land. That is provided below. If you would like to submit a letter that addresses the standards below we may consider it as part of the Comprehensive Plan update process.

WAC 365-190-060

Forest resource lands.

(1) In classifying and designating forest resource lands, counties must approach the effort as a county-wide or regional process. Cities are encouraged to coordinate their forest resource lands designations with their county and any adjacent jurisdictions. Counties and cities should not review forest resource lands designations solely on a parcel-by-parcel basis.

(2) Lands should be designated as forest resource lands of long-term commercial significance based on three factors:

(a) The land is not already characterized by urban growth. To evaluate this factor, counties and cities should use the criteria contained in WAC 365-196-310.

(b) The land is used or capable of being used for forestry production. To evaluate this factor, counties and cities should determine whether lands are well suited for forestry use based primarily on their physical and geographic characteristics.

Lands that are currently used for forestry production and lands that are capable of such use must be evaluated for designation. The landowner’s intent to either use land for forestry or to cease such use is not the controlling factor in determining if land is used or capable of being used for forestry production.

The land has long-term commercial significance. When determining whether lands are used or capable of being used for forestry production, counties and cities should determine which land grade constitutes forest land of long-term commercial significance, based on local physical, biological, economic, and land use
considerations. Counties and cities should use the private forest land grades of the department of revenue (WAC 458-40-530). This system incorporates consideration of growing capacity, productivity, and soil composition of the land. Forest land of long-term commercial significance will generally have a predominance of the higher private forest land grades. However, the presence of lower private forest land grades within the areas of predominantly higher grades need not preclude designation as forest land.

(3) Counties and cities may also consider secondary benefits from retaining commercial forestry operations. Benefits from retaining commercial forestry may include protecting air and water quality, maintaining adequate aquifer recharge areas, reducing forest fire risks, supporting tourism and access to recreational opportunities, providing carbon sequestration benefits, and improving wildlife habitat and connectivity for upland species. These are only potential secondary benefits from retaining commercial forestry operations, and should not be used alone as a basis for designating or dedesignating forest resource lands.

(4) Counties and cities must also consider the effects of proximity to population areas and the possibility of more intense uses of the land as indicated by the following criteria as applicable:

(a) The availability of public services and facilities conducive to the conversion of forest land;

(b) The proximity of forest land to urban and suburban areas and rural settlements: Forest lands of long-term commercial significance are located outside the urban and suburban areas and rural settlements;

(c) The size of the parcels: Forest lands consist of predominantly large parcels;

(d) The compatibility and intensity of adjacent and nearby land use and settlement patterns with forest lands of long-term commercial significance;

(e) Property tax classification: Property is assessed as open space or forest land pursuant to chapter 84.33 or 84.34 RCW;

(f) Local economic conditions which affect the ability to manage timberlands for long-term commercial production; and

(g) History of land development permits issued nearby.

(5) When applying the criteria in subsection (4) of this section, counties or cities should designate at least the minimum amount of forest resource lands needed to maintain economic viability for the forestry industry and to retain supporting forestry businesses, such as loggers, mills, forest product processors, equipment suppliers, and equipment maintenance and repair facilities. Economic viability in this context is that amount of designated forestry resource land needed to maintain economic viability of the forestry industry in the region over the long term.

Jose Alvarez
Planner III
Clark County
Department of Community Planning
360.397.2280 x4898
O'Donnell, Mary Beth

From: Orjiako, Oliver
Sent: Tuesday, October 28, 2014 8:54 AM
To: 'Lynn Carman'
Cc: McCall, Marilee; O'Donnell, Mary Beth; Cnty Board of Commissioners General Delivery
Subject: RE: 2016 Plan Update/BOCC worksession of 10/22/2014

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Hello Lynn:

I thank you very much for your email and comment. Your email will be included in our 2016 comp plan update index of record. Again, thank you for your interest in Clark County planning process.

Kind Regards,

Oliver

From: Lynn Carman [mailto:lynn.carman@comcast.net]
Sent: Tuesday, October 28, 2014 8:48 AM
To: Orjiako, Oliver
Cc: McCall, Marilee; O'Donnell, Mary Beth; Cnty Board of Commissioners General Delivery
Subject: RE: 2016 Plan Update/BOCC worksession of 10/22/2014

I have gone over the three options and don’t find that any of these three will solve the 60 years of neglect that has been allowed to happen. They still make for bad planning on the part of the county. We also know that one can’t mix and match any of the three plans as that them makes for one to have to start over in the process.

Option 1, Status quo isn’t an option, it just makes it worse.
Option 2, makes for more density in the rural area which isn’t supported by infrastructure and could end up like what highway 99 is if the county allows this to happen. Sorry but it should have density if there isn’t funds to support it. Option 3, more land for business in just a couple areas isn’t going to work. Cut the number of acres in half and see if this is what it is really going to work to get business out there. But again it’s doesn’t address the neglect, you are in hopes it will bring business here. Clark County will only be a bedroom community to Portland.

Growth can be controlled but I don’t see it being done with any of the options with this go around of GMA. We can’t support what has been allowed to happen with the last three go around of GMA. When is the county going to take a proactive stance not a reactive stance and then try to fix it problems that has happened with bandaids?

Sincerely,

Lynn Carman

From: Orjiako, Oliver [mailto:Oliver.Orjiako@clark.wa.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, October 21, 2014 2:45 PM
To: 'lynn.carman@comcast.net'
Hello Lynn:

Thank you for email and inquiry. In response to your questions, yes you can still send in comments relating to the proposed alternatives to be studied in the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (DSEIS). Comments are welcomed throughout the planning process until the Board makes the final decision on the comp plan update slated for completion on or before June 30, 2016.

The current GMA is the same as the one in 1994 with the updates in 2004, 2007, and associated annual review and docket map changes. I believe that Marilee provided you with a link http://www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/index.html for more information on the 2016 plan update.

We will be delighted to meet with you in person to review all our maps if the version on the website is too small to read. I thank you for your continued interest in Clark County planning process. Please, let me know if you have further questions. Thanks.

Best Regards,

Oliver

This e-mail and related attachments and any response may be subject to public disclosure under state law.
O'Donnell, Mary Beth

From: LaRocque, Linnea on behalf of Barnes, Ed
Sent: Wednesday, October 29, 2014 9:05 AM
To: O'Donnell, Mary Beth
Subject: RE: E-mail forwards of HB and court actions to Peter Silliman

neither of the two I sent this morning had any attachments.

Linnea LaRocque, Administrative Assistant
Clark County Board of Commissioners
560-397-9232 ext. 4167
PO Box 5000, Vancouver WA 98666

SAVE PAPER - Please do not print this e-mail unless absolutely necessary

From: O'Donnell, Mary Beth
Sent: Wednesday, October 29, 2014 8:54 AM
To: Barnes, Ed; Orjlako, Oliver
Cc: Tilton, Rebecca
Subject: RE: E-mail forwards of HB and court actions to Peter Silliman

I'm sorry, I don't see any attachments?

From: LaRocque, Linnea On Behalf Of Barnes, Ed
Sent: Wednesday, October 29, 2014 8:09 AM
To: Orjlako, Oliver
Cc: Tilton, Rebecca; O'Donnell, Mary Beth
Subject: E-mail forwards of HB and court actions to Peter Silliman

for your files

Linnea LaRocque, Administrative Assistant
Clark County Board of Commissioners
560-397-9232 ext. 4167
PO Box 5000, Vancouver WA 98666

SAVE PAPER - Please do not print this e-mail unless absolutely necessary

From: Carol Levanen [mailto:confidential@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 28, 2014 11:36 PM
To: Madore, David; Mielke, Tom; Barnes, Ed; Carol Levanen; Susan Rasmussen; Leah Higgins; Rick Dunning; Rita Dietrich; Jerry Olson; Fred Pickering; Jim Malinowski; Frank White; Benjamin Moss; Lonnie Moss; Melinda Zamora; Nick Sadinger; Curt Massie; Marcus Becker; Zachary McIsaac; Clark County Citizens United Inc.
Subject: Fw: E-mail forwards of HB and court actions to Peter Silliman
---- Forwarded Message ----
From: Carol Levanen <cccuinc@yahoo.com>
To: "peter.silliman@clark.wa.gov" <peter.silliman@clark.wa.gov>; CNL Contract Dental Hygiene Service <cnldental@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 28, 2014 11:23 PM
Subject: E-mail forwards of HB and court actions to Peter Silliman

Hello Peter,

Thanks for meeting with us in place of Commissioner Madore. We regret that he was unable to meet with us today, but we would like to meet with him at a later date, and wish to reschedule the meeting, hopefully soon. Please let us know what will work out with him. I have forwarded you a handful of court cases supporting our recommendations of small lot sizes in rural and resource zones. In doing so, I see that I have already forwarded some of these to you in the past. Please scroll through them until you get to the topic that addresses our issues. Thanks!

Best Regards,  Carol Levanen, Ex. Secretary, Clark County Citizens United, Inc.

Clark County Citizens United, Inc.
P.O. Box 2188
Battle Ground, Washington 98604
E-Mail cccuinc@yahoo.com
November 13, 2014

Community Planning Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
PO Box 9810
Vancouver, Washington  98666-9810

Dear Sirs and Madams:

Subject:  Comments on the 2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan Update
Alternatives.
Sent via U.S. Mail with enclosures and via email to: comp.plan@clark.wa.gov

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the alternatives for the 2016
Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update. Based on the currently available
information, we support Alternative 1. We recommend Clark County not reduce the
Agriculture (AG-20) minimum lot size and density from 20 acres to 10 acres. We also
recommend Clark County not change the Forest-40 (FR-40) zone minimum parcel size
and density from 40 acres to 20 acres. We also recommend the county not change
some of the minimum lot sizes for the Rural-20 (R-20) zone. The reasons for these
recommendations are explained below, but first we briefly discuss why urban growth
areas and the protection of agricultural land are required by Washington’s Growth
Management Act (GMA).

Futurewise is working throughout Washington State to create livable communities,
protect our working farmlands, forests, and waterways, and ensure a better quality of
life for present and future generations. We work with communities to implement
effective land use planning and policies that prevent waste and stop sprawl, provide
efficient transportation choices, create affordable housing and strong local businesses,
and ensure healthy natural systems. We are creating a better quality of life in
Washington State together. We have members across Washington State including
Clark County.

Why Urban Growth Areas (UGAs) are required

To save taxpayers and ratepayers money

The Growth Management Act (GMA) requires urban growth areas and limits their size
for many reasons. One of the most important is that compact urban growth areas
(UGAs) save taxpayers and ratepayers money. In a study published in a peer reviewed

---

1 Clark County Comprehensive Growth Management Plan Update 2015-2035 Proposed Alternatives
Information Sheet p. *1 accessed on Nov. 12, 2014 at:
journal, John Carruthers and Gudmaundur Ulfsarson analyzed urban areas throughout the United States including Clark County. They found that the per capita costs of most public services declined with density and increased where urban areas were large. Compact urban growth areas save taxpayers and ratepayers money. This study was published in a peer reviewed journal.

**Compact urban growth areas also help conserve water long-term**

Clark County contains significant limitations on available water. Large lots and low densities increase water demand, increase leakage from water systems, and increase costs to water system customers. So accommodating the same population in the existing or a smaller UGA can reduce future water demands and costs.

**Urban growth areas encourage housing growth in cities and protect rural and resource lands**

To examine the effect of King County, Washington’s urban growth areas on the timing of land development, Cunningham looked at real property data, property sales data, and geographic information systems (GIS) data. These records include 500,000 home sales and 163,000 parcels that had the potential to be developed from 1984 through 2001. Cunningham concluded that “[t]his paper presents compelling evidence that the enactment of a growth boundary reduced development in designated rural areas and increased construction in urban areas, which suggests that the Growth Management Act is achieving its intended effect of concentrating housing growth.” He also concluded that by removing uncertainty as to the highest and best use of the land that

---

2 John Carruthers and Gudmaundur Ulfsarson, *Urban Sprawl and the Cost of Public Services 30*

ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING B: PLANNING AND DESIGN 503, 511 (2003). Enclosed with the paper original of this letter.

3 Id. at 518.

4 ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING B: PLANNING AND DESIGN is a peer reviewed or refereed journal, see the ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING B “Guidelines for authors: EPB” webpage accessed on Nov. 12, 2014 at: http://www.epplan.com/hauthor.htm and enclosed with the paper original of this letter.


7 Id. at p. 8.

8 Christopher R. Cunningham, *Growth Controls, Real Options, and Land Development*, 89 THE REVIEW OF ECONOMICS AND STATISTICS 343, 343 (2007). Enclosed with the paper original of this letter.

9 Id. at 356.
it accelerated housing development in King County. This study was published in a peer reviewed journal.

Reducing development in rural areas and natural resource lands can also have significant environmental benefits, such as protecting water quality and working farms and forests. For example, Lin Robinson, Joshua P. Newell, and John M. Marzluff compared geo-referenced aerial photos and building permit data to determine land use changes on the fringe of the King County urban growth along I-90 east of Seattle. This area includes suburban cities, rural areas, and natural resource lands. They concluded that King County’s urban growth areas were accommodating growth and the designated agricultural lands and forest lands of long-term commercial significance were being maintained as farm and forest land.

One of the most controversial issues related to urban growth areas is whether the restricted land supply causes increases in housing costs. Carruthers, in another peer reviewed study, examined the evidence for the Portland urban growth area and concluded that it was not increasing housing costs because the city's high density zoning allowed the construction of an abundant housing supply.

Urban growth areas help keep our existing cities and towns vibrant and economically desirable

In a peer reviewed study, Dawkins and Nelson found that the city of Yakima’s share of the metropolitan housing market increased after adoption of the GMA. This and other measures showed that center cities in states with growth management laws

10 Id. at 356 – 57.
11 Thomson Reuters, Top Peer Reviewed Journals – Economics & Business p. "3 enclosed with the paper original of this letter.
14 John I. Carruthers, The Impacts of State Growth Management Programmes: A Comparative Analysis 39 Urban Studies 1959, 1976 (2002). Carruthers included Washington’s GMA in his analysis, but concluded that it was too early to tell if it was successful since it had only been in place for seven years in the data he analyzed, but he believed the GMA had promise if “consistently enforced.” Id. at 1977. Urban Studies is a peer reviewed journal. Manuscript Submission Process p. 2 enclosed with the paper original of this letter and accessed on Nov. 13, 2014 at: http://www.uk.sagepub.com/repository/binaries/pdf/ujis-msgprocess.pdf.
attract greater shares of the metropolitan area’s housing market than center cities in states without growth management aiding center city revitalization. This reduces the tendency to move out of existing center cities.

Urban growth areas promote healthy lifestyles

Aytur, Rodriguez, Evenson, and Catellier conducted a statistical analysis of leisure and transportation-related physical activity in 63 large metropolitan statistical areas, including Seattle, Tacoma, and Spokane from 1990 to 2002. Their peer reviewed study found a positive association between residents’ leisure time physical activity and walking and bicycling to work and “strong” urban containment policies such as those in Washington State. This article was published in a peer reviewed scientific journal.

Why the GMA protects agricultural lands of long-term commercial significance

Farming and ranching is a $50.8 million industry in Clark County. The average market value of agricultural products sold for each farm in Clark County increased by five percent between 2007 and 2012. Clark County ranked 23 among Washington Counties in terms of the market value of products sold. Clark County ranked third in the state in 2012 in sales of cut Christmas trees, ninth in the state in 2012 for sales of hay and other crops, and ninth in state in 2012 for sales of sheep, goats, wool, mohair, and milk and also sales of Horses, ponies, mules, burros, and donkeys.

Unfortunately, “[one of the key obstacles [to agriculture] in Clark County is the limited access to high quality agricultural land at an affordable cost.” This is one of the reasons why the Washington State Department of Agriculture’s Washington

20 Id. at 330.
23 Id.
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Agriculture Strategic Plan 2020 and Beyond documents the need to conserve agricultural lands to maintain the agricultural industry and the jobs and incomes the industry provides.25 As the strategic plan concludes "[t]he future of farming in Washington is heavily dependent on agriculture’s ability to maintain the land resource that is currently available to it."26

Allowing the conversion of Clark County’s farmland is also a bad idea for the Clark County budget. As the Washington Agriculture Strategic Plan 2020 and Beyond documents:

For each $1 paid in taxes by farm and forest lands in [Skagit] county, those lands received back about 51 cents in services, contributing a 49 cent subsidy for the rest of the taxpayers in the county. For every $1 paid in taxes by residential properties, those properties received $1.25 in public services.27

So protecting farmland helps protect the Clark County economy and budget.

We recommend adoption of Alternative 1 because the currently available information shows it meets community needs

The Population and Jobs Projections – Issue Paper 2 shows that Alternative 1 meets the community’s needs for land for housing and jobs.28 Because it will result in the most compact urban growth areas, it will also help bring Clark County, its cities, its taxpayers, and its residents the benefits of compact urban growth areas documented above.

We recommend that Clark County not reduce the Agriculture [AG-20] minimum lot size and density from 20 acres to 10 acres

We recommend that Clark County not reduced the Agriculture (AG-20) minimum lot size and density from 20 acres to 10 acres because it will not protect the County’s agricultural industry and working farms and the county does not have the water to provide for the increased development.

In the Soccer Fields decision, the Washington State Supreme Court has held that [t]he County was required to assure the conservation of agricultural lands and to assure that

26 Id. at p. 50.
27 Id. at p. 53.
the use of adjacent lands does not interfere with their continued use for the production of food or agricultural products. A ten acre minimum lot size and density will not meet this standard. Professor Arthur C. Nelson analyzed agricultural land preservation techniques and concluded that "[m]inimum lot sizing at up to forty-acre densities merely causes rural sprawl—a more insidious form of urban sprawl." Further, Clark County’s average farm size has increased from 37 acres in 2007 to 39 acres in 2012, an increase of 5.4 percent. During the same time period, Washington’s average farm size increase by 4 percent. The increase in average farm size does not support a reduction in the minimum lot size and density.

Rather than reducing the minimum lot size, which will not protect agricultural land from incompatible development as Professor Nelson’s analysis shows, the county should maintain or increase the minimum lot size and adopt exclusive farm use zoning. This is the path that Skagit County is taking to protect its farmland.

A second reason to not reduce the minimum lot size is that Clark County does not have the water available to serve a doubling of the number of lots allowed in the county’s AG-20 zone. So the first to subdivide will get water, and other property owners that may need farm worker housing or a house for a son or daughter will not. Further, new houses on agricultural land may drill deeper wells, sucking their neighbors wells dry, requiring them to either dig deeper wells or go without water. Finally, residential development can often outbid farmers for irrigation water, converting it to domestic uses and leaving the county’s farmers without the water they

29 King County v. Central Puget Sound Growth Management Hearings Bd. (Soccer Fields), 142 Wn.2d 543, 556, 14 P.3d 133, 140 (2000) emphasis in original.
30 Arthur Nelson, Preserving Prime Farmland in the Face of Urbanization: Lessons from Oregon 58 JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN PLANNING ASSOCIATION 467, 471 (1992) copy enclosed with this letter and the paper original of this letter. As was documented above, the Journal of the American Planning Association is a peer reviewed journal.
32 Id.
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need.\textsuperscript{36} It is fairer to adopt minimum lot sizes and densities that will allow all property owners some water, rather than giving the very limited remaining water to a few that subdivided first.

We recommend that Clark County not reduce the Forest-40 (FR-40) zone minimum parcel size and density from 40 acres to 20 acres

Like agricultural lands, Clark County must also assure the conservation of forest lands and to assure that the use of adjacent lands does not interfere with their continued use for the production forest products.\textsuperscript{37} A twenty acre forest zone will not meet these requirements.

Parcels smaller than 40 acres have much lower timber harvest rates and are more likely to be converted to residential land uses.\textsuperscript{38} Parcels smaller than 50 acres have higher than average costs for preparing timber sales, harvesting trees, and reforesting the site.\textsuperscript{39} So reducing the minimum lot size and density below 40 or 50 acres will not protect forest land as the Growth Management Act requires. Rather the minimum lot size should be retained. Further, we recommend that Clark County follow Whatcom County’s example and prohibit residential uses in its zone that applies to forest land of long-term commercial significance except for living quarters for those who are engaged in forest management activities on the property, such as fire crews and logging crews, and watchpersons. These uses are reviewed as conditional uses.\textsuperscript{40}

Another reason to not reduce the minimum lot size is that Clark County does not have the water available to serve a doubling of the number of lots allowed in the county’s FR-40 zone along with its existing rural zoning.\textsuperscript{41} So the first to subdivide will get water, and other property owners that may need a house for a son or daughter will

\textsuperscript{36} Washington State Department of Agriculture, \textit{Washington Agriculture Strategic Plan 2020 and Beyond} p. 56 (2009).

\textsuperscript{37} RCW 36.70A.0601(6a).

description

\textsuperscript{39} R. Neil Sampson, \textit{Implication for Forest Production in Responses to “America’s Family Forest Owners”} 102 \textit{JOURNAL OF FORESTRY} 4, 12 (October/November 2004). Enclosed with the paper original of this letter. The Journal of Forestry is a peer reviewed scientific journal. See the Journal of Forestry Guide for Authors webpage available at: http://www.safnet.org/periodicals/jofguideforauthors.cfm and enclosed with the paper original of this letter.

\textsuperscript{40} Whatcom County Code (WCC) § 20.43.158; 159. Accessed on Oct. 13, 2014 at: http://www.codepublishing.com/wa/whatcomcounty/ and enclosed with the paper original of this letter.
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not. It is fairer to adopt minimum lot sizes and densities that will allow all property owners some water, rather than giving the very limited remaining water to a few that subdivided first.

We recommend that Clark County not change some of the minimum lot sizes for the Rural-20 (R-20) zone and instead adopt GMA compliant rural designations

As we have documented above, Clark County does not have the water available to serve increased rural and resource land densities. It is fairer to adopt minimum lot sizes and densities that will allow all property owners some water, rather than giving the very limited remaining water to a few that subdivided first.

Further, the Washington State Supreme Court’s Kittitas County v. Eastern Washington Growth Management Hearings Board decision addressed the mandate that “[t]he GMA includes requirements that counties consider and address water resource issues in land use planning.” The court determined that “[i]n fact, several relevant statutes indicate that the County must regulate to some extent to assure that land use is not inconsistent with available water resources.” The Supreme Court concluded that “the County is not precluded and, in fact, is required to plan for the protection of water resources in its land use planning.” Increasing rural densities and the densities of resource lands without adequate water resources violate the Washington State Supreme Court’s Kittitas County holdings.

Also in the Kittitas County v. Eastern Washington Growth Management Hearings Board decision, the Washington State Supreme Court concluded that the Kittitas County Comprehensive Plan failed to provide for a variety of rural densities. Like the Kittitas County rural comprehensive plan designation that was found to violate the GMA, Clark County only has one rural comprehensive plan designations. We recommend the county adopt three designations to match its rural zones.

Thank you for considering our comments. If you require additional information please contact me at telephone 206-343-0681 Ext. 118 and email jtm@futurewise.org

---

43 Kittitas County v. Eastern Washington Growth Management Hearings Bd., 172 Wn. 2d 44, 175, 256 P.3d 1193 (2011) (“See, e.g., RCW 36.70A.020(10) (GMA goal to protect the environment, including “water quality [] and the availability of water”), .070(1) (requiring that land use elements “shall provide for protection of the quality and quantity of groundwater used for public water supplies”), (5)(c)(v) (requiring that rural elements include measures “[p]rotecting ... surface water and groundwater resources”).

44 Kittitas County, 172 Wn.2d at 178 (emphasis in original).

45 Id. at 179 underlining added.

46 Kittitas, 172 Wn. 2d at 167 – 70, 256 P.3d at 1204 – 05.
Sincerely,

[Signature]

Tim Trohimovich, AICP
Director of Planning & Law

Enclosures
Citations are included in the index.
O'Donnell, Mary Beth

*rom: Euler, Gordon
*nt: Wednesday, July 02, 2014 9:11 AM
To: Till, Leisha
Cc: Orjiako, Oliver; O'Donnell, Mary Beth; McCall, Mariele; Anderson, Colete
Subject: RE: Request For Proposal 675

Leisha:

Thanks!

Gordy

From: Till, Leisha
Sent: Tuesday, July 01, 2014 5:04 PM
To: 'michelle.percussi@acem.com'; 'menglish@ahbl.com'; 'csteen@anamarinc.com'; 'eberschinski@anchorqea.com'; 'mhavighorst@ashcreekassociates.com'; 'atsi@fidalgo.net'; 'jo@ainw.com'; 'mgreen@aesgeo.com'; 'beckwith@beckwithconsult.com'; 'janine.lamaie@abam.com'; 'rjobeese@bbaenv.com'; 'admin@berkconsulting.com'; 'mariede.hopkins@bhconsultants.com'; 'fhflckinger@brwncald.com'; 'bstassoc@seanet.com'; 'office@budingerinc.com'; 'ksanford@budingerinc.com'; 'kathy.morrison@us.bureauveritas.com'; 'prequalifications@camsys.com'; 'donaclabaugh@cardno.com'; 'shelly.christensen@cardno.com'; 'sethney.how@cardnotec.com'; 'Gene.Peterson@ch2m.com'; 'chaddurand@clearwayenv.com'; 'tad.deshler@cohoenvironmental.com'; 'lance@columbiawestengineering.com'; 'kathy.sitchin@confenv.com'; 'christa@cetagroup.com'; 'psr_marketing@deainc.com'; 'aologue@edhovee.com'; 'EASeattle@eaest.com'; 'rachel@eco-land.com'; 'vrichards@ene.com'; 'marnie.tylers@ecow.com'; 'rfp@eonw.com'; 'falcon@econsvconsulting.com'; 'annifer@eldredassoc.com'; 'spittman@elementsolutions.org'; 'gkemp@encoec.com'; 'corpcomm@environissues.com'; 'Valerie.lee@eltd.net'; 'info@e-pure.com'; 'creese@esassoc.com'; 'jmix@excelsior-design.com'; 'sfredericksen@xltech.com'; 'd.grayuskil@fehrandpeers.com'; 'ljfishebj@comcast.net'; 'stephen.bentsen@floydsnyder.com'; 'david@fortresscorporation.com'; 'mathews@fulcrum.net'; 'mchartier@geconsultants.com'; 'geimarketing@geoengineers.com'; 'dparkinson@geosyntec.com'; 'julie@geotest-inc.com'; 'midge.graybeal@ghd.com'; 'debbiej@pnecorp.com'; 'caanderson@golder.com'; 'joshua.proudfoot@goodcompany.com'; 'clake@goodsteinlaw.com'; 'jcarroll@gsiw.com'; 'erin@hamerenvironmental.com'; 'susan.kemp@hartcrowser.com'; 'wamktg@hrinc.com'; 'jhecker@heckerarchitects.com'; 'ccassidy@herreraincl.com'; 'jpatterson@herreraincl.com'; 'mbuttin@herreraincl.com'; 'agarner@hewaregco.com'; 'EPCRM@icfi.com'; 'julie@inovapcd.com'; 'billh@insightgeologic.com'; 'epilcher@integral-corp.com'; 'hthrthompson@interfluve.com'; 'jared.moore@jacobcs.com'; 'rbrooks@jbenv.com'; 'abass@kane-environmental.com'; 'jwalker@kellerassociates.us.com'; 'key@keyenvironmentalsolutions.com'; 'scottk@kindredhydro.com'; 'djc@landauinc.com'; 'gmiddleton@rilrason.com'; 'hchlehuber@hwlochner.com'; 'agesner@grpmack.com'; 'marinesurveys.inc@gmail.com'; 'nalongi@maulfoster.com'; 'scott.larsen@meadhunt.com'; 'mnminor@dnoise.com'; 'curt@millersolomon.net'; 'bwhite@m-m.net'; 'bcaouette@normandeau.com'; 'jgrenszund@obec.com'; 'tshell@obec.com'; 'nmlines@orioneses.com'; 'courtney.mcaddren@otak.com'; 'chris@pgwg.com'; 'info@psesurvey.com'; 'marketingtoolbox@parametric.com'; 'seattlemarketing@pbworld.com'; 'lcastro@peretee.com'; 'chisholm@placeandpolicy.com'; 'TomArnold@PrismEnvBusiness.com'; 'Info@prothman.com'; 'jlynch@prrbiz.com'; 'janelle.moses@psiusa.com'; 'rwlundquist@raedeke.com'; 'brian@richaven.com'; 'carrie@riddof.com'; 'bbessinger@sspa.com'; 'cathym@scjalliance.com'; 'gheiland@scsengineers.com'; 'chw@shanwil.com'; 'jrasmussen@shockeyplanning.com'; 'louier@sseconsultants.com'; 'jbrennan@skillings.com'; 'mstaton@irconsulting.com'; 'tomsmyda@adol.com'; 'pnilsen@soundearthinc.com'; 'jerry@soundviewconsultants.com'; 'jomalley@spectrumin-net.com'; 'reneegiroux@stanntec.com'; 'bgromes@studiocascade.com'; 'cbreeds@subterra.us'; 'marketingadmin@svrdesign.com'; 'jmeier@svwa.com'; 'office@tca-inc.com'; 'tamily.tedrow@tetratex.com'; 'info@greenbusch.com'; 'nway@watershedco.com'; 'purchasing@tierra-row.com'; 'timkrause@seanet.com'; 'mikeread@tenw.com'; 'haynie@tenw.com'; 'jill@tswinw.com'; 'scrosby@triangleassociates.com'; 'linda.stroud@urs.com'; 'cott@usastrategics.com'; 'ccalvert@via-architecture.com'; 'rballinger@via-architecture.com'; 'jkelly@via-architecture.com'; 'erin.kingsley@walliseng.net'; 'tom@walsh-cg.com'; 'rwalton@westconsultants.com'; 'SEAMKTGSubscriptions@whpacific.com'; 'ckanenwischer@wagarch.com'; 'wa.info@worleyparsons.com'
Hello Plan Holders,

The attached document is an RFP being released from Clark County, Washington, on Wednesday July 2, 2014; titled Request for Proposal 675 Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) for the 2016 Clark County Comprehensive Growth Management Plan Update.

All related documents, including the RFP, Plan Holders list and any additional information is available on our website http://www.clark.wa.gov/general-services/purchasing/rfp.html. The Questions & Answers section will be updated when available.

NOTE: E-Verify participation is required by ALL applicants.

We hope you will find this project of interest. Thank you for your time and attention.

LeaNah Till
Clark County Purchasing
Office Assistant III
360-397-2323

Have a***)
(.* (.* (* Great Day!*}
Just an FYI:

I responded back to one of the emails in the comp plan email folder. It had to do with the definitions. I just posted the page of definitions so I went ahead and let them know that it was available to view. See my email below.

Thanks!
Jacqui

From: Kamp, Jacqueline
Sent: Thursday, October 23, 2014 3:54 PM
To: 'enricaac@juno.com'
Subject: RE: Growth Plan Update

Hello Steve & Anne,

Today we have added a definitions page for the 2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update project. Here is link to the definitions. There are also links to the zoning code within each designation.


If you have any more questions about your property and the proposed changes, please feel free to email or call. I'm out of the office on Fridays, but if you call and press "0" another staff person can assist you. Otherwise I'm happy to talk with you on Monday.

Thank you!
Jacqui

Jacqui Kamp, AICP
Planner II
Clark County Community Planning
360-397-2280 ext.4913
www.clark.wa.gov/planning

Please note that I am out of the office on Fridays.
We have just received a notice in the mail regarding open houses scheduled regarding Clark County's proposed revisions to its Comprehensive Growth Management Plan. The notice says that the current zoning for our parcel will be changed from "FR-40" to "FR-20". Would you please tell us what those two zoning codes actually mean?

It also says the our Current Comprehensive Plan designation will change from "FR-2" to "FR". Would you please tell us what those two plan designations mean?

We attempted to look up on-line the details for zoning codes and plan designations but could find nothing on the website listed on the notice.

thank you,
Steve and Anne Tendler
Every property in the county has a comprehensive plan designation and zoning that implements it. We have two forest designations, Forest Tier I and Forest Tier II, which are implemented by FR-80 and FR-40 zoning, respectively. FR stands for Forest Resource.

There are two things being proposed for the 2016 comprehensive plan update with regard to forest lands:
1) A proposal to have a single comprehensive plan designation, (F), implemented by the same two zones (FR-80 and FR-40).
2) A proposal to reduce the minimum parcel size for lands zoned FR-40 from 40 acres to 20 acres; there would be a new FR-20 zone created that would be applied to all lands that are now zoned FR-40. If this proposal goes forward, we may require folks who are eligible to subdivide to create cluster lots. There would be no requirement to subdivide, but the option would be there for some property owners with larger parcels. The downside to this is that property taxes would increase; land economics are such that two 10-acre parcels are worth more than a 20-acre parcel, for example.

I hope that helps. Let me know if you have other questions.

Gordy Euler
Clark County Community Planning

Gordy:
Can you please respond to these questions and CC: Mary Beth for the index?

Thank you,
Marilee

am not real clear on what FR-2, my current designation, and FR the proposed designation is. In what way would it change? What does FR stand for? Thanks for your help in making me understand what your proposal is.
Sandra
From: Carol Levanen [mailto:cnidental@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 29, 2014 8:29 PM
To: Silliman, Peter; Carol Levanen; Susan Rasmussen; Leah Higgins; Rick Dunning; Rita Dietrich; Jerry Olson; Fred Pickering; Jim Malinowski; Frank White; Benjamin Moss; Lonnie Moss; Melinda Zamora; Nick Redinger; Curt Massie; Marcus Becker; Zachary McIsaac; Clark County Citizens United Inc.; Madore, David; Mielke, Tom; Barnes, Ed
Subject: Comprehensive Open House Comments - 10-29-2014 (For the public record)

Dear Commissioners,

I was very disappointed at the format and the process used for the open house. The presentation took quite some time, and there was no invitation for public comments from the audience. In addition, there was no announcement to the audience to be sure to submit their comments in the box on the table, for anything they might want to say. The maps around the room were not very informative to a layman and all very similar. I talked with a group of folks before the meeting, and they all had concerns they wanted to voice. But, they were not given an opportunity to do so. Many left or got up from their seats during the presentation.

But, I understand that at the LaCenter open house that is scheduled for 10–30-2014, they will be taking verbal testimony from the audience. Is it just a coincidence that in that area of the county is where many Futurewise supporters live? There was a good turnout at the first meeting, but they are not likely to attend the second meeting, so unless they dropped something in the box, their voice was not heard. On the other hand, tomorrow's meeting will allow those attending to comment verbally and in writing. The GMA requires meaningful public participation by all participants, both verbal and written.

Sincerely,

Carol Levanen, Ex. Secretary
Clark County Citizens United, Inc
P.O. Box 2188
Battle Ground, Washington 98604
More ...FYI

From: LaRoque, Linnea On Behalf Of Barnes, Ed
Sent: Thursday, October 30, 2014 12:59 PM
To: Orjiako, Oliver
Cc: Tilton, Rebecca; O'Donnell, Mary Beth
Subject: FW: correction to previous e-mail regarding 10-29-2014 Open House - for the record

From: Carol Levanen [mailto:cnidental@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 31, 2014 10:04 AM
To: Silliman, Peter; Carol Levanen; Susan Rasmussen; Leah Higgins; Rick Dunning; Rita Dietrich; Jerry Olson; Fred Pickering; Jim Malinowski; Frank White; Benjamin Moss; Lonnie Moss; Melinda Zamora; Nick Redinger; Curt Massie; Marcus Becker; Zachary McIsaac; Clark County Citizens United Inc.; Madore, David; Mielke, Tom; Barnes, Ed
Subject: correction to previous e-mail regarding 10-29-2014 Open House - for the record

Dear Peter,

My previous email regarding the 2016 update of the Comprehensive Plan Open Houses indicated the second open house on 10-30-2014 will be located in La Center, when the actual location is in a Ridgefield fire station. The proximity of the location to La Center communities is confusing as to where the actual formal lines meet. This change does not affect the other information in the e-mail. Please attach this e-mail to the previous e-mail with this correction. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Carol Levanen, Ex. Secretary, Clark County Citizens United, Inc.
Dear Commissioners,

Last night, the planners presented another open house. This was well attended. However, there were no opportunities made available to the public to have open discussions, questions answered, and concerns voiced. It is my understanding that these open houses provide the appropriate forums in which the citizens may openly collaborate. These presentations are falling way short of their goals.

It was very evident at your last work session with Oliver that nobody is at the table to represent the interests and futures of the rural communities and their citizens. According to the Rural Development Council, this methodology is obsolete. The rural communities and their citizens need representation for their interests and future designs. This community requires equal standing among the local jurisdictions. This ensures that the rural communities get their fair share of good family-wage jobs. These jobs help to create the solid foundation that supports a diverse, and robust rural economy. In turn, a hearty rural economy sustains all important rural character (per GMA). According to the Dept. of Commerce, (Terry Lawhead), the responsibility of representation for rural interests falls to the County by default.

The rural communities and their citizens are continually ignored. This is not only immoral, it is unlawful. Last night, Gordy Euler told me the three alternative plans came directly from the Commissioners. Gordy said, “Talk to them if you don’t like the plans.” I am appealing to the Commissioners to assume the controls of this plan...you are the bosses. Navigate towards a future with hearty growth in mind... for jobs, housing, rural lifestyles, hobby farms, very small to small farms, and small family-forestry farms.

All of this is supported in written details in the Situation Assessment, Berk Report, 2012. This report clearly shows the changing face of agriculture in Clark County and how it has evolved over the past 20 years. Farming in Clark County is no longer agriculture in the traditional sense of large farms. Present and future trends need to be acknowledged and the proper changes to the comprehensive plan need to reflect this.
Oliver has said, "We don’t promise change. We promise analysis!" Oliver stated two weeks ago before the Planning Commission; “We want to clean up the maps.” Let’s see a demonstration of this analysis put into action. Let's see a cleaning up of the maps for the resource and rural lands where a mere 17% of the parcels conform to their actual zoning. The Clark County 1994 Comp. Plan was obsolete before it was signed into law. Judge Poyfair’s Superior Court Order is compelling; “The result is a plan that gives little regard for the realities of existing rural development in direct contradiction of the terms of the GMA.” This was written April, 1997!

Our three Clark County Commissioners are the bosses in charge here. Demand better work from our county planners. Demand that they recognize the studies in the reports. Demand proper analysis, and design appropriate alternatives accordingly. During discussions with the Wa. State Dept. of Commerce, they have said; “Clark County planners aren’t planning. They’re practicing lethargy, or a self-serving agenda.”

We need two more alternatives that properly reflect present and future trends, the uniqueness of our county, the desires of the rural citizens, and growth for all communities. This will support a robust regional economy for all.

My best to all of you,
Susan Rasmussen
Sent from Windows Ma
To: Silliman Peter, david.madore@clark.wa.gov, tom.mielke@clark.wa.gov, ed.barnes@clark.wa.gov, cnldental@yahoo.com, susan.rasmussen, Leah Higgins, Rick TDunning, Rita Dietrich, Jerry Olson, Fred Pickering, Jim Malinowski, Frank White, Benjamin Moss, Lonnie Moss, Melinda Zamora, Nick Redinger, Curt Massie, Marcus Becker, Zachary McIsaac, Clark County Citizens United Inc.

Dear Commissioners,

CCCU would like to clarify the record regarding previous zoning maps that planner. Oliver Orjaka presented to the Board of Commissioners at the recent work session on October 22, 2014. He showed the commissioners the resource zoning maps that he said had been in place prior to 1994. He was stressing to the commissioners how much resource land there was. But, he failed to mention that the maps had been in constant flux and what the parcel sizes were in those zones at that time. They were 2.5, 5, 10, and 20 acre zones, not the 5, 10, 20, 40 and 80 acres that are currently in place. CCCU has a very large two inch binder of various land use maps of Clark County dating from 1987 to 2014. One particular Clark County, Washington 1983 map, of a township of the Rock Creek, Fargher Lake, View, Cedar Creek areas, shows the existing parcelization in those areas at the time, along with the names of the owners of the parcels. It's very telling. These were lands that had been divided long before the GMA. There are many historical family names on that map, in addition to Long View Fibre Company, School land, State Forest Board, Washington State Game Department, and others. This map shows the people and the rural parcelization that helps define and is part of the rural character in that area of Clark County. It shows the pattern of small parcelization of 2.5 and 5 acres throughout the area. Another old map (with no date) called Clark County Broad Land Use and Traffic Circulation, shows the broad expanse of state, federal, and large private timber lands in eastern Clark County. A Draft 20 year Plan Map (Rural and Natural Resource Lands) map shows the massive areas of the old Agri-Forest 40 acre zoning, which was ruled as illegal in the court. The Notebook has numerous Agri-Forest maps of different areas showing the parcelization that was in place at the time. There is a Portland metro agriculture map that includes Clark County. This book also has aerial photos of the Agri-Forest lands that have white tape strips surrounding parcel of rural land. There is a map called, Prime Farmland - Clark County Washington, General Highway maps - Thematic detail compiled by state staff. US Department of Agriculture Soil Conservation Service M7-0-24076. It is very different than the 1994 GMA SEIS map of Prime and Unique Agriculture Soil. the Forest Soil map, and the existing Comprehensive Plan map of 1994 and today. CCCU's notebook also contains a Growth Management - Issue 9 - June 1994 Perspectives map of Alternative A, B and C. Alternative A has Ag Tier 1 - 20 acres, Ag Tier 2 - 10 acres, Forest Tier 1 - 40 acres, Forest Tier 2 - 20 acres, Rural Farm - 10 acres, Rural Estate - 5 acres and Rural Residential 2.5 acres. There are maps of the old Resource Line that divided the rural lands. There are also 1998 Orthophotography - Clark County, Washington aerial maps.

If a picture tells a thousands words, these maps certainly do. It was erroneous for Clark County to ignore the parcelization of the rural areas and over designate resource lands in 1994, even though they had maps and other documents to determine the area differently. For this Board of Commissioners to continue to accept that faulty data is also erroneous. The court in 1987 has said, "The Board's (WWSMGB) 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 of the terms of the GMA. Clark County must come into compliance with this court decision and it's plain meaning. The rural development (parcelization) in the rural lands must be recognized in a meaningful way by the county and in the 2016 Comprehensive Plan.
Sincerely,

Carol Levanen, Ex. Secretary
Clark County Citizens United, Inc.
O Box 2186
Battle Ground, Washington 98604
Mr. York,

With regards to the potential division of a forty acre lot into four ten acre lots. Any future development would have to comply with current stormwater regulations and that would be addressed through the development review process and notice will be sent to neighbors within 500 ft. of the site. Please let me know if you have any other questions.

Jose Alvarez
Planner III
Clark County
Department of Community Planning
360.397.2280 x4898

Hi. This is Tom York again at 28901 ne 66th ave Battleground, Wa 98604. I am really concerned about this rezoning of large pieces of property. Primarily, my concerns are with wetlands. Our farm property is already being artificially flooded every winter by a development of houses put in to the north of our property. These houses should never been allowed to be built. Why? They are built on wetlands. None of these parcels perk. None of these properties was built with bioswells. So, the developers/county allowed them to be on a shared drainfield put on the lot just to the north of our property. To make it more interesting, each of these parcels has put an illegal non permitted water drainage into our property and into their very own undocumented shared drainfield. There has never been any drainage easements bought for any of this. So, the effect is our property gets all their unwanted storm water mixed with their sewer water. I personally had three different county inspectors out to inspect this. One was Cory Armstrong. Nothing was even looked into. There is a 40 acre piece of property to our east which is documented as mostly wetlands. If it is divided into 10 acre pieces, where is all that water gonna go? Probably to our property legally or not. That is my concern with this subdividing of property. Tom York (360)907-1243
Hi. This is Tom York at 28901 ne 66th ave Battleground, Wa 98604. More concerns for splitting up properties into smaller parcels that should be addressed first: abandoned McMansions on ten acres (look up my driveway), county roads without any lines painted on them, (look at all of these unfinished infrastructures in the county first), community septic drainfields on non perkable land that don’t work, if developers want to rape country land, make them bring in sewer systems first, "traffic problems from adding more people to country roads." "Jobs' make these jobs "You" talk about before splitting up and dividing and adding who knows how many more people to a nice area. Do things for a good reason, not a "made up" reason. Hold the county commissioners accountable for the decisions they make.

On Thu, Oct 23, 2014 at 8:25 AM, Cnty 2016 Comp Plan <comp.plan@clark.wa.gov> wrote:

***This is an auto reply message. Please do not reply to this message.***

Thank you for your interest in the County's Comprehensive Plan review process.

Your comment will be entered into the record to be forwarded to the Planning Commission and Board of County commissioners to consider during their deliberations on this process.

Please don't hesitate to contact us with any additional questions or comments about the Comprehensive Plan review.

Clark County Community Planning

Main telephone number: (360) 397-2280

Street address: 1300 Franklin Street, Vancouver, Washington, 98660

Mailing address: P.O. Box 9810, Vancouver, Washington, 98666-9810

Director: Oliver Orjako

This e-mail and related attachments and any response may be subject to public disclosure under state law.
Hi. My name is Tom York and live at 28901 ne 66th ave battleground, 98604. The county has already sent me a questionnaire asking if my wife and I would like to subdivide our property. I filled out the questionnaire and said "No" I don't want to subdivide our property. My answer was and still is "No" we do not want to subdivide our twenty acre piece of property. We use our property as a farm. Subdividing it would only make us pay more taxes. I personally cannot understand why the county would want to subdivide more property anyway. Clark county is in a depression. The only recent jobs have been very temporary construction jobs, not full time permenant jobs. Have you driven in Battleground lately? It's a traffic jam. I believe "We" in Clark county have enough people already. Also, if more development is allowed, the "commissioners" should bring in the jobs to accomodate everybody who's out of work first, then accomodate all the people who they bring in from new devopment first, before new devopment is allowed. The way I see it, our commissioners are just doing the same stupid thing Clark county has done forever, allowing rampant development for no logical reason. Who knows, may David Madore and Tom Mielke are "secret developers themselves? I wouldn't be surprised. Tom York (360)-907-1243
O'Donnell, Mary Beth

From: Lebowsky, Laurie
Sent: Wednesday, October 29, 2014 12:18 PM
To: 'Daniel Magnusson'
Cc: O'Donnell, Mary Beth
Subject: RE: Growth Management Plan Questions

Hello Daniel,

Construction of a single family residence, or additions on legal lots do not trigger frontage improvements.

I hope this answers your question. If you have further questions or need further clarifications, please email me or call me at (360) 397-2280 ext.4544.

Laurie Lebowsky

From: Daniel Magnusson [mailto:dmagnuss@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 28, 2014 11:57 PM
To: Lebowsky, Laurie
Subject: Re: Growth Management Plan Questions

Hello Marilee,

Thank you for your response. So, for a few years we have been thinking about adding on to our house. When you say, "Again, this road would be constructed through re-development of properties", will the plan for the road have any impact on our ability to remodel? I know that sometimes when there is new construction, there is a requirement that the developer put in the road and everything. I would assume that we wouldn't have to do that as homeowners, but I just wanted to double check if there is any impact to our ability to the add-on that my wife and I have been thinking about for a few years. The house and the add-on are plenty far enough from the road, so set-backs shouldn't be a problem and we'd go through the proper permitting process when the time comes. I just want to make sure we wouldn't be on the hook to pay for these new road updates if we're simply adding on to an existing structure.

Thanks.

-Dan

On Tue, Oct 28, 2014 at 9:13 AM, Lebowsky, Laurie <Laurie.Lebowsky@clark.wa.gov> wrote:

Mr. & Ms. Magnusson:

Part of our comprehensive plan update includes a circulation plan for the Pleasant Highlands area. The Pleasant Highland planning is bordered on the south by 119th Street, 50th Avenue borders the west, 72nd borders on the east, and 139th Street on the north side.
Mr. & Ms. Magnusson:

Part of our comprehensive plan update includes a circulation plan for the Pleasant Highlands area. The Pleasant Highland planning is bordered on the south by 119th Street, 50th Avenue borders the west, 72nd borders on the east, and 139th Street on the north side.

This circulation plan includes re-designation of NE 129th Street as a neighborhood circulator. The plan also includes extending NE 129th Street from NE 72nd Avenue to NE 50th Avenue.

No construction is part of this plan. The proposal only involves identifying a connection on the arterial atlas. The road would be built as properties re-develop.

The road cross-section design for a neighborhood circulator is 54’ of right-of-way and 36’ curb-to-curb paved width.

Again, this road would be constructed through re-development of properties.

Feel free to email me or call me if you have further questions. My number is (360) 397-2280 ext.4544. I hope this information helps.

Laurie Lebowski

From: Cnty 2016 Comp Plan
Sent: Monday, October 27, 2014 4:34 PM
To: Lebowski, Laurie
Cc: O'Donnell, Mary Beth
Subject: FW: Growth Management Plan Questions

Received in the Comp Plan "Inbox".
Please respond to questions and cc: Mary Beth for the Index.
Thank you,

Marilee McCall / Administrative Assistant
Clark County Community Planning
360-397-2280 ext. 4558
1300 Franklin Street | Vancouver, WA 98660
P.O. Box 9810 | Vancouver, WA 98666
www.clark.wa.gov/planning

rom: Daniel Magnusson [mailto:dmagnuss@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, October 25, 2014 5:37 PM
From: Cnty 2016 Comp Plan
Sent: Monday, October 27, 2014 4:34 PM
To: Lebowsky, Laurie
Cc: O’Donnell, Mary Beth
Subject: FW: Growth Management Plan Questions

Received in the Comp Plan “Inbox”.
Please respond to questions and cc: Mary Beth for the Index.
Thank you,

Marilee McCall | Administrative Assistant
Clark County Community Planning
360-397-2280 ext. 4558
1300 Franklin Street | Vancouver, WA 98660
P.O. Box 9810 | Vancouver, WA 98666
www.clark.wa.gov/planning

From: Daniel Magnusson [mailto:dmagnuss@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, October 25, 2014 5:37 PM
To: Cnty 2016 Comp Plan
Subject: Growth Management Plan Questions

Hello,

I just received a post card in the mail indicating that there are changes being proposed to the 20 year growth management plan. I would like to understand how these changes affect our property:

Daniel and Darlene Magnusson
7103 NE 129th Street
Vancouver, WA 98686

I looked at "maps online" and it appears that part of the plan is regarding "punching through" NE 129th street from 72nd Ave. through to 50th Ave. I would like to know what size road they are considering for this. It looks like our zoning is still R-30, correct? No changes to that?

Thank you for your help in understanding what is being proposed.

Best Regards,

Dan
Following comments were submitted online:

**Parcel No:** 205384000

**Subject:** We need to be 5R not 20R.

**Comments:**
As you can see this parcel is part of our Ahola Grandparents Homestead received in approx. 1895. It is still almost totally owned by their Ahola descendants. The 49 acres owned by us 3 sisters needs to be broken up now so we don't have to own it together and leave a legal mess for our children. This land is always only select logged and will remain so. We need 5 acre pieces not 20 acre as you propose. Thank you, Alina McElveny

**Submitted by:**
Alina McElveny

**Email:** [macbun@q.com](mailto:macbun@q.com)

**Address:**
22501 NE 159th St
Brush Prairie, WA
McCall, Marilee

From: Juno <deerfeeder@juno.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 29, 2014 11:08 PM
To: Cnty 2016 Comp Plan
Subject: 20 acres

We have 20 A. That has been, in and out of the UGB. Last I remember we were Industrial Reserve. Where are we now? Our 20 A is on 132 ave. second parcel north of 119 th St. Laglers borders one side, Goglesns., pig, goat, and sheep farm border one side and a Russian Church is in the back.

For the record were in favor of coming in to the 2016 plan. We think Light Industrial, Industrial, Commercial or residential. We support land for jobs. When 132 ave. becomes the new 137 ave, the lands with frontage to 132 nd. Could create jobs for Clark County.

Thank You:

Jerry and Michelle Winters

Sent from my iPad
October 28, 2014

VIA EMAIL

Carol Levanen, Ex. Secretary
Clark County Citizens United, Inc.
P.O. Box 2188
Battle Ground, WA 98604

RE: Comprehensive Growth Management Act Review

Dear Carol:

I understand you are meeting with Commissioner David Madore tomorrow. For our discussion earlier today, this letter conveys a legal perspective on upcoming action by the Clark County Commissioners. Please feel free to share this with Commissioner Madore.

This upcoming review of the Comprehensive Growth Management Plan (GMP) is of great importance to Clark County and has obvious legal significance. The State Environmental Protection Act (SEPA) imposes certain requirements on this process. While the ultimate decision regarding the appropriate course resides with the Commissioners, it is incumbent upon the Clark County administrative staff to provide to the Commissioners with an appropriate Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). It is my belief that the staff has failed to meet this obligation to date, thus impairing the ability of the Commissioners to make an informed decision on all available options.

Under the terms of SEPA, the staff is to present a “reasonable number and range” of alternatives to the Commissioners for consideration. WAC 197-11-440. Currently, County administrative staff preparing decision documents for the Commissioners have offered a total of one rural rezoning alternative to the status quo, in addition to one alternative that affects only the cities of La Center and Battle Ground. This effectively hamstrings the Commissioners in terms of their authority and decision options, is contrary to a good public process, and violates Washington law. The EIS process (by the terms of the Washington Administrative Code and the Revised Code of Washington) is supposed to provide both the Commissioners and the public with “sufficient information for a reasoned choice among alternatives.” Solid Waste Alternative Proposers v. Okanogan County, 66 Wn. App. 439, 442 (1992); see also WAC 197-11-440(5). One choice hardly accomplishes this legislative and judicial intent.

I believe the most legally defensible position is for the Commissioners to task the County staff with preparing an analysis of a reasonable range of at least four significant alternatives to the status quo, for a total of five alternatives upon which to judge future growth options for Clark County. Absent such a reasonable range of alternatives, I believe the CCCU has a strong position to litigate further process by Clark County as contrary to the spirit and intent of SEPA and Washington case law under SEPA.

I understand CCCU is prepared to offer, at a minimum, two alternative approaches to add to the upcoming GMP review so as to provide a responsible range of options that reflects genuine urban growth expectations over the course of the next 20 years. Not only are these alternatives appropriate under the terms of SEPA and the spirit of the EIS process, they are simply helpful to the Commissioners and allow them to exercise their inherent and legally granted power to rule on issues of public importance such as this.

I believe CCCU should ask that the Commissioners insist that the new alternatives to be proposed by CCCU be thoroughly analyzed by the County administrative staff in a neutral manner alongside the existing alternative, and be presented to the Commissioners as part of their decision regarding amendment of the GMP.

Should you have any questions about the legal basis of this perspective, please do not hesitate to call on me at any time.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Zachary O. McIesac

ZOM:tm
From: O'Donnell, Mary Beth
To: Alvarez, Jose
Cc: O'Donnell, Mary Beth
Subject: RE: Alternative 1 (No Change) is my preference

Mr. Bennett,

If there are environmental restrictions in place those generally have a specific building envelope where development can occur. In order to divide the property the development review process will identify any environmental constraints and will have to comply with the latest environmental regulations. Tax assessment questions can be directed to the county assessor. [http://www.clark.wa.gov/assessor/index.html](http://www.clark.wa.gov/assessor/index.html)

Thank you for your comments,

Jose Alvarez
Planner III
Clark County
Department of Community Planning
360.397.2280 x4898

---

From: Cnty 2016 Comp Plan
Sent: Tuesday, October 28, 2014 4:03 PM
To: Alvarez, Jose
Subject: FW: Alternative 1 (No Change) is my preference

From: Marty Bennett [mailto:martybennett@hotmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 22, 2014 4:06 PM
To: Cnty 2016 Comp Plan
Subject: Alternative 1 (No Change) is my preference

For what it's worth, my 2 cents on the re-zoning options is "Alternative 1". I suspect that the people driving for the re-zoning change are doing so with dollar signs in their eyes. They are not taking in to account the qualitative aspects of re-zoning and increased growth (you just have to look towards the greater tri-county Portland Oregon metro area to see the reduction in quality of life with increased growth). So, no changes to the existing zoning please.

Additionally, since I am currently on Ag-20, a change to Ag-10 would increase my already high (in my opinion) property taxes (despite Mr. Mielke's previous erroneous beliefs to the contrary). Yes, presumably, my property would then be more valuable - but only if I sell and move, an option that I would not like to have forced on me.
Finally, if you do re-zone my particular property to Ag-10, how will you account for all the current property environmental restrictions in place? Would they just be removed so that growth could occur? Or would the restrictions remain? If the restrictions on building remain, would that be taken in to account when the property is assessed for tax purposes?

Anyway, just my 2 cents here (and a little venting at what I see as the end of the quality of life here in Clark County if the zoning change "Alternative 2" occurs).

Thank you for your time in reading this and best wishes with wrestling with the implications of whichever course the commission chooses to pursue in this matter.

Marty Bennett
28416 NE 122nd Ave
Battle Ground, WA
360-666-9822
I spoke with Mallory Lewis advising her that the open houses will focus on the three proposed options for consideration in the SEIS process for the plan review and update. Thanks.

Oliver

From: Cnty 2016 Comp Plan
Sent: Tuesday, October 28, 2014 2:46 PM
To: Orjiako, Oliver
Cc: O’Donnell, Mary Beth
Subject: FW: Land Use allowance - questions on postcards

Forwarding email received in the Comp Plan email box.
Please cc: Mary Beth so there is a copy of response for the index.
Marilee

From: Engineer Assistant [mailto:ea@deltamanagementco.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 28, 2014 9:24 AM
To: Cnty 2016 Comp Plan
Cc: Kia Keyvani
Subject: Land Use allowance

Good Morning,

This email is in regard to a public notice received for proposed changes to one of our properties. Tax ID 182153000, Ridgefield. I am trying to determine if the property owner (or representative) needs to be present. Will there be opportunity for discussion relating directly to this parcel? We have requested an exemption in use to allow for an RV Park on this property, can you tell me if that allowance will be discussed directly or is this just general information. Any advice would be greatly appreciated. Thank you for your time.

Respectfully,

Mallory Lewis
Delta Management Co
203 E. Reserve Street
Vancouver WA, 98661
t. 360-696-4448 EXT 1020
f. 360-695-1970
O'Donnell, Mary Beth

From: Orjiako, Oliver
Sent: Thursday, October 30, 2014 1:18 PM
To: Barnes, Ed
Cc: Tilton, Rebecca; O'Donnell, Mary Beth
Subject: RE: Comprehensive Open House Comments - 10-29-2014 (For the public record)

Hello Commissioner:

We had at least close to 200 in attendance. In my presentation I announce how folks can share their comments. First, they want more alternatives studied for urban growth and lament lack of public participation and now the presentation took long.

Best - Oliver

From: LaRocque, Linnea On Behalf Of Barnes, Ed
Sent: Thursday, October 30, 2014 12:54 PM
To: Orjiako, Oliver
Cc: Tilton, Rebecca; O'Donnell, Mary Beth
Subject: FW: Comprehensive Open House Comments - 10-29-2014 (For the public record)

From: Carol Levanen [mailto:cnldental@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 29, 2014 8:29 PM
To: Stillman, Peter; Carol Levanen; Susan Rasmussen; Leah Higgins; Rick Dunning; Rita Dietrich; Jerry Olson; Fred Pickering; Jim Malinowski; Frank White; Benjamin Moss; Lonnie Moss; Melinda Zamora; Nick Redinger; Curt Massie; Marcus Becker; Zachary McIsaac; Clark County Citizens United Inc.; Madore, David; Mielke, Tom; Barnes, Ed
Subject: Comprehensive Open House Comments - 10-29-2014 (For the public record)

Dear Commissioners,

I was very disappointed at the format and the process used for the open house. The presentation took quite some time, and there was no invitation for public comments from the audience. In addition, there was no announcement to the audience to be sure to submit their comments in the box on the table, for anything they might want to say. The maps around the room were not very informative to a layman and all very similar. I talked with a group of folks before the meeting, and they all had concerns they wanted to voice. But, they were not given an opportunity to do so. Many left or got up from their seats during the presentation.

But, I understand that at the LaCenter open house that is scheduled for 10–30-2014, they will be taking verbal testimony from the audience. Is it just a coincidence that in that area of the county is where many Futurewise supporters live? There was a good turnout at the first meeting, but they are not likely to attend the second meeting, so unless they dropped something in the box, their voice was not heard. On the other hand, tomorrows meeting will allow those attending to comment verbally and in writing. The GMA requires meaningful public participation by all participants, both verbal and written.

Sincerely,

Carol Levanen, Ex. Secretary
Clark County Citizens United, Inc
P.O. Box 2188
Battle Ground, Washington 98604
O’Donnell, Mary Beth

From: Orjiako, Oliver
Sent: Thursday, October 30, 2014 1:20 PM
To: Euler, Gordon; Alvarez, Jose; O’Donnell, Mary Beth
Cc: Cook, Christine
Subject: FW: correction to previous e-mail regarding 10-29-2014 Open House - for the record

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

More ...FYI

From: LaRocque, Linnea On Behalf Of Barnes, Ed
Sent: Thursday, October 30, 2014 12:59 PM
To: Orjiako, Oliver
Cc: Tilton, Rebecca; O’Donnell, Mary Beth
Subject: FW: correction to previous e-mail regarding 10-29-2014 Open House - for the record

From: Carol Levanen [mailto:cnldental@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 30, 2014 10:04 AM
To: Silliman, Peter; Carol Levanen; Susan Rasmussen; Leah Higgins; Rick Dunning; Rita Dietrich; Jerry Olson; Fred Pickering; Jim Malinowski; Frank White; Benjamin Moss; Lonnie Moss; Melinda Zamora; Nick Redinger; Curt Massie; arcus Becker; Zachary McIsaac; Clark County Citizens United Inc.; Madore, David; Mielke, Tom; Barnes, Ed
Subject: correction to previous e-mail regarding 10-29-2014 Open House - for the record

Dear Peter,

My previous email regarding the 2016 update of the Comprehensive Plan Open Houses indicated the second open house on 10-30-2014 will be located in La Center, when the actual location is in a Ridgefield fire station. The proximity of the location to La Center communities is confusing as to where the actual formal lines meet. This change does not affect the other information in the email. Please attach this e-mail to the previous e-mail with this correction. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Carol Levanen, Ex. Secretary, Clark County Citizens United, Inc.
<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>Konnie Stahl</td>
<td>13416 NE 73rd Ave</td>
<td>98660</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Hansen</td>
<td>7208 WITSQUILL</td>
<td>98061</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denise Wisniewski</td>
<td>2820 NE 41st Ave</td>
<td>98639</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dede.wisniewski@gmail.com">dede.wisniewski@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry Winters</td>
<td>5420 Idle St</td>
<td>98661</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Deerfeeder@juno.com">Deerfeeder@juno.com</a></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pam Roberts</td>
<td>6306 NE 144th St</td>
<td>98686</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pmmaryrobert@aol.com">pmmaryrobert@aol.com</a></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terral &amp; Chloe Ege</td>
<td>9610 Nwo 14th Ave</td>
<td>98665</td>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Wilson</td>
<td>315 Nwo 194th St</td>
<td>98642</td>
<td><a href="mailto:wilsont4357@yahoo.com">wilsont4357@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Cramer</td>
<td>6217 NE Salmon Crkst.</td>
<td>98666</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Cramaer522@msn.com">Cramaer522@msn.com</a></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gino Ceravolo</td>
<td>1721 NE 209th Street</td>
<td>98642</td>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristi Rayne</td>
<td>3834 NE 4th St, recently moved to WA</td>
<td>98029</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kristirayne@wsmail.com">kristirayne@wsmail.com</a></td>
<td>YES</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>Russell Carr</td>
<td>1550 NE 72ND AVE</td>
<td>94635</td>
<td>rec 1130 e com 935+40 0</td>
<td>□ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Harrington</td>
<td>PO Box 114 TOKORSO</td>
<td>98570</td>
<td></td>
<td>□ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat Kadow</td>
<td>2905 S ST</td>
<td>98663</td>
<td></td>
<td>□ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Double</td>
<td>2210 N. 179TH ST</td>
<td>98642</td>
<td></td>
<td>□ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat Pittsenger</td>
<td>4457 E 8TH AVENUE, P.O.</td>
<td>98624</td>
<td></td>
<td>□ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Meuser</td>
<td>3202 NE BOXETT AVENUE</td>
<td>98675</td>
<td></td>
<td>□ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleon Tribe</td>
<td>15701 NE 57TH ST</td>
<td>98066</td>
<td></td>
<td>□ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Tribe</td>
<td>17919 NE 29TH AVE RIDGEFIELD</td>
<td>98042</td>
<td></td>
<td>□ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Rubin</td>
<td>6582 NE 139TH ST</td>
<td>98086</td>
<td></td>
<td>□ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Frapper</td>
<td>19012 NE 172ND AVE</td>
<td>98042</td>
<td></td>
<td>□ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Brezow</td>
<td>3835 NE 14TH AVE</td>
<td>98042</td>
<td></td>
<td>□ NO</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>Keith Harrington</td>
<td>16203 NE 61 AVE</td>
<td>98686</td>
<td>8W <a href="mailto:harrington@ymail.com">harrington@ymail.com</a></td>
<td>X/YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darlene Netzke</td>
<td>6208 NW 196TH ST</td>
<td>98642</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>X/YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet Aspaas</td>
<td>4602 NE 73RD Circle</td>
<td>98461</td>
<td><a href="mailto:janetaspaa52@comcast.net">janetaspaa52@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>X/YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myrna Sigy</td>
<td>10601 NE 359 ST</td>
<td>98629</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ml0y@tds.net">ml0y@tds.net</a></td>
<td>X/YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Swanson</td>
<td>4501 NE 290 20th</td>
<td>98629</td>
<td></td>
<td>X/YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delores Swanson</td>
<td>4501 NE 290 20th</td>
<td>98629</td>
<td></td>
<td>X/YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fran Scott</td>
<td>15500 NE 72ND</td>
<td>98686</td>
<td></td>
<td>X/YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debi Patton</td>
<td>18910 NE 10 AV</td>
<td>98442</td>
<td></td>
<td>X/YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Schubert</td>
<td>2308 NE 72ND</td>
<td>98686</td>
<td></td>
<td>X/YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Heerstein</td>
<td>10000 NE 114th Circle</td>
<td>98622</td>
<td><a href="mailto:herbekeind@outlook.com">herbekeind@outlook.com</a></td>
<td>X/YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Hale</td>
<td>2613 NE 219th PL</td>
<td>98602</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dave@hficonsultants.com">dave@hficonsultants.com</a></td>
<td>X/YES</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>Victoria M. Pedersen</td>
<td>P.O. Box 1425, Brush Prairie, WA</td>
<td>98606</td>
<td><a href="mailto:backroadexplorer@live.com">backroadexplorer@live.com</a></td>
<td>□ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo L. Ques</td>
<td>5204 NE 31st Ct, Camas</td>
<td>98607</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Ques179@gmail.com">Ques179@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>□ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Vandervis</td>
<td>5915 NE 74 Cir, Nolita</td>
<td>98661</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Kathyandel@comcast.net">Kathyandel@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>□ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Heishl</td>
<td>7005 NE 144th St</td>
<td>98686</td>
<td><a href="mailto:EJCLH@comcast.net">EJCLH@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>□ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna Falk</td>
<td>PO Box 793, 4010 NE 397 Cir</td>
<td>98629</td>
<td><a href="mailto:candy@grandma.com">candy@grandma.com</a></td>
<td>□ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celeste Brad Wallway</td>
<td>6719 NE 182 Ave, Vancouver, WA</td>
<td>98682</td>
<td></td>
<td>□ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doris White</td>
<td>14118 NE 35th Ave, Vancouver, WA</td>
<td>98686</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dorisbob@comcast.net">dorisbob@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>□ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Keeser</td>
<td>17415 NE 92 Ave P6</td>
<td>98604</td>
<td></td>
<td>□ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Carlson</td>
<td>17906 NE 87th Cir, Vancouver, WA</td>
<td>98682</td>
<td><a href="mailto:CKcarlson50@comcast.net">CKcarlson50@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>□ NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<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>Todd Milner</td>
<td>7318 NE 110th St</td>
<td>98662</td>
<td><a href="mailto:smilner@comcast.net">smilner@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raffi Hamadeh</td>
<td>1409 S.E. Parkcrest,</td>
<td>98663</td>
<td><a href="mailto:r.s.hamadeh@comcast.net">r.s.hamadeh@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert McCue</td>
<td>13403 NE 62nd St</td>
<td>98606</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rmaurits@comcast.net">rmaurits@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverly Legako</td>
<td>13403 NE 62nd St</td>
<td>98606</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bmaurits@comcast.net">bmaurits@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Howell</td>
<td>11604 NE 102 Ave</td>
<td>98662</td>
<td><a href="mailto:h04ty551@comcast.net">h04ty551@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard</td>
<td>13403 NE 62nd St</td>
<td>98606</td>
<td><a href="mailto:harriet@comcast.net">harriet@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug Mays</td>
<td>17801 NE 65th Cir</td>
<td>98602</td>
<td><a href="mailto:michellendoug@comcast.net">michellendoug@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Moates</td>
<td>18017 NE 87th Cir</td>
<td>98682</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bamoaters@comcast.net">bamoaters@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth Cairo</td>
<td>15419 NE 50th Ave</td>
<td>98686</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kcraio@comcast.net">kcraio@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>NO</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>Jim Youde</td>
<td>14201 NE 50th Ave. Vanc, WA</td>
<td>98686</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jyoude@coi.com">jyoude@coi.com</a></td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floy Greenrup</td>
<td>3403 NE 167th St. Ridgefield</td>
<td>98642</td>
<td></td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tara Black</td>
<td>17414 NE 50th Ave. Vanc, WA</td>
<td>98686</td>
<td>tprentz @msn.com</td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Caudby</td>
<td>3819 NE 39th Court Vanc, WA</td>
<td>98661</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bgeggies@hotmail.com">bgeggies@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lori Neumann</td>
<td>9800 NW 20th Ave. Vanc, WA</td>
<td>98665</td>
<td><a href="mailto:skyward.2@comcast.net">skyward.2@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Harvey</td>
<td>4703 NW 94th St.</td>
<td>98665</td>
<td></td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheryl Slaydon</td>
<td>1719 NE 209th St. Ridgefield</td>
<td>98642</td>
<td>Shiprapid.com @ comcast.net</td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Scott</td>
<td>18218 NW 28th Ave. Ridgefield</td>
<td>98642</td>
<td>mcevanscott108@mic</td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mel Rodde</td>
<td>8401 NE 187th St.</td>
<td>98642</td>
<td></td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Krieg</td>
<td>31308 Brickle Rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carole Krieg</td>
<td>12800 NE 83rd St</td>
<td>98682</td>
<td></td>
<td>☑ YES</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>Rex Hapala</td>
<td>3020 Spruce Ave</td>
<td>98667</td>
<td><a href="mailto:exxHapala@comcast.com">exxHapala@comcast.com</a></td>
<td>✧ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Wood</td>
<td>14910 NE 46th St.</td>
<td>98662</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kwood@pacific.com">kwood@pacific.com</a> (already)</td>
<td>✧ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Nauman</td>
<td>26100 NE 212th Av</td>
<td>98604</td>
<td>jerryNauman@<a href="mailto:322@Gmail.com">322@Gmail.com</a></td>
<td>✧ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill &amp; Sandra Sterling</td>
<td>7717 NE 169th St</td>
<td>98662</td>
<td></td>
<td>✧ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry &amp; Mary Ann Angelo</td>
<td>14703 NE 17th Ave.</td>
<td>98686</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lawmaryann1@hotmail.com">lawmaryann1@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td>✧ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon Martell</td>
<td>5301 NE 326th Av</td>
<td>98607</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Fordgal97@hotmail.com">Fordgal97@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td>✧ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Jones</td>
<td>16904 NE 88th St</td>
<td>98682</td>
<td></td>
<td>✧ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pam Pratt</td>
<td>18018 NE 234th St</td>
<td>98604</td>
<td></td>
<td>✧ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilly Graves</td>
<td>12700 NE 93rd Ave</td>
<td>98662</td>
<td><a href="mailto:GillyGraves325@yahoo.com">GillyGraves325@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>✧ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikki Graves</td>
<td>11111</td>
<td>11111</td>
<td></td>
<td>✧ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>13215 SE Mill Plain C-8 #351</td>
<td>98684</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Lizzyleanship@yahoo.com">Lizzyleanship@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>✧ YES</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>Les Wood</td>
<td>2217 NE 179th St</td>
<td>98642</td>
<td><a href="mailto:swood54@yahoo.com">swood54@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlene Hapala</td>
<td>6015 NE 78th St</td>
<td>98665</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Hapalahapala@AOL.com">Hapalahapala@AOL.com</a></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Watrin</td>
<td>1311 NE 90th Ct</td>
<td>98662</td>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Hodges</td>
<td>15218 NE 369th St</td>
<td>98629</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hodgesjeffrey@msn.com">hodgesjeffrey@msn.com</a></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorrie Larwick</td>
<td>12605 NE 132 Ave</td>
<td>98606</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lorrie.jane@wa.net.com">lorrie.jane@wa.net.com</a></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joemelio</td>
<td>700 Bux 8208669</td>
<td>98682</td>
<td><a href="mailto:joe@hintondevelopment.com">joe@hintondevelopment.com</a></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Bauer</td>
<td>4515 Washington St</td>
<td>98603</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mary.schwarz.bauer@outlook.com">mary.schwarz.bauer@outlook.com</a></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>2720 NE 189th St</td>
<td>98642</td>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Schutte</td>
<td>13208 NE 72nd Ave</td>
<td>98656</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gary.laura51@yahoo.com">gary.laura51@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candi Fowler</td>
<td>18313 NE 24th Ave</td>
<td>98142</td>
<td><a href="mailto:candianddevm@ymail.com">candianddevm@ymail.com</a></td>
<td>YES</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>Jude Wall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salina Temple</td>
<td>13815 NE 10 Ave</td>
<td>98642</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy Notari</td>
<td>2010 NE 14th St</td>
<td>98607</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Frections</em></td>
<td>6315 NE 47th lck</td>
<td>98631</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna &amp; Linda</td>
<td>5401 NE 15th St Van</td>
<td>98686</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam McLean</td>
<td>3401 NE 20th AV</td>
<td>98604</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug &amp; Keri Lightfoot</td>
<td>23700 NE 175th</td>
<td>98006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Sullivan</td>
<td>22110 W, 179th St</td>
<td>98632</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.C. &amp; Fabian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Veysey</td>
<td>1816 NE 25th St</td>
<td>98642</td>
<td>Veysey <a href="mailto:VIV@MSN.com">VIV@MSN.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray &amp; Betty Sudler</td>
<td>13915 NE 22nd Ave</td>
<td>98626</td>
<td>rbshldn @ pacifier.com</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<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>Lisa Schmidt</td>
<td>1815 NE 72nd Circle</td>
<td>98665</td>
<td>Get Marketing <a href="mailto:Matters@gmail.com">Matters@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don McIsaac</td>
<td>25515 NE 46th Wy</td>
<td>98666</td>
<td><a href="mailto:donaldmcisaac@msn.com">donaldmcisaac@msn.com</a></td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie Rainsbury</td>
<td>40 N Ghorum</td>
<td>98642</td>
<td></td>
<td>☑ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn Pugh</td>
<td>15809 NE 29th Ave</td>
<td>98666</td>
<td></td>
<td>☑ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Natarajan</td>
<td>120 W 24th St-Vane.</td>
<td>98660</td>
<td><a href="mailto:GVAAT@comcast.net">GVAAT@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Raro</td>
<td></td>
<td>98645</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Spr1922@outlook.com">Spr1922@outlook.com</a></td>
<td>☑ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cammy Deard</td>
<td>20031 NE Boul</td>
<td>98604</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Campgroc@gmail.com">Campgroc@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>☑ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gretchen Starke</td>
<td></td>
<td>98684</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gstarke@pacific.net">gstarke@pacific.net</a></td>
<td>☑ NO</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>Sharon Ireton</td>
<td>24717 NE Alvos Rd.</td>
<td>98604</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sharon.ireton@aol.com">sharon.ireton@aol.com</a></td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Battle Ground</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ NO</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>Richard Bingle</td>
<td>2123 S NE 87 Ave</td>
<td>98644</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hank Puck</td>
<td>19312 NE 42 Ct</td>
<td>98642</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hankd42@q.com">hankd42@q.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank White</td>
<td>Yacolt, WA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lloyd Handlos</td>
<td>Brush</td>
<td>98606</td>
<td><a href="mailto:wram11@q.com">wram11@q.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Morse</td>
<td>P.O. Box 1770, Woodland, WA 98671</td>
<td>98671</td>
<td><a href="mailto:danjmorse@icloud.com">danjmorse@icloud.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuck Farrell</td>
<td>16801 SE Fisher Dr, Vancouver, WA 98663</td>
<td>98683</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cfarrell@fjarch.com">cfarrell@fjarch.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Laycock</td>
<td>34204 NE 79th Ave, LaCenter, WA 98629</td>
<td>98629</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ginger Burr</td>
<td>817 NW 375 St, LaCenter, WA 98629</td>
<td>98629</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gbur2000@yahoo.com">gbur2000@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ike Nickerson</td>
<td>Dept. of Transportation, WA</td>
<td>98602</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Buff</td>
<td>16513 NE 38th Ct, WA 98642</td>
<td>98642</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken G. Guild</td>
<td>2217 NE 179th St, Unit 69, WA</td>
<td>98642</td>
<td>samkenny6@com</td>
<td></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>Marshall Himes</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mhimes43@gmail.com">mhimes43@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>98606</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kori Yunog</td>
<td></td>
<td>98629</td>
<td><a href="mailto:KTMcor1@TDS.net">KTMcor1@TDS.net</a></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Reager</td>
<td>PO Box 937</td>
<td>98607</td>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David F. Hoffman</td>
<td>8422 S 31st St.</td>
<td>98607</td>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda J. Hoffman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles L. Gates</td>
<td>PO Box 85472</td>
<td>97234</td>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Kueck</td>
<td>6600 NE 251st E</td>
<td>98604</td>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred Marcan Bakk</td>
<td>PO Box 886 la Center C</td>
<td>98629</td>
<td><a href="mailto:fmrbakkerc@tds.net">fmrbakkerc@tds.net</a></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicki Schwarz</td>
<td>2528 NW 179th St.</td>
<td>98642</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jonandvicki@saw.net">jonandvicki@saw.net</a></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brady &amp; Marcia F &amp;</td>
<td>14615 NE 37th St. la Center</td>
<td>98629</td>
<td><a href="mailto:marciafellman@yahoo.com">marciafellman@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barb &amp; Gary Wills</td>
<td>18615 NE 88th St.</td>
<td>97034</td>
<td>garybarb@<a href="mailto:wells@aois.com">wells@aois.com</a></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Wellner</td>
<td>#23 Sunsetridge Dr.</td>
<td>97034</td>
<td>wellnerJcom@com</td>
<td>YES</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>Vonnie &amp; Roger Shedd</td>
<td>301 NE 219st</td>
<td>98642</td>
<td><a href="mailto:vsheedel@gmail.com">vsheedel@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>✓ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Lemer</td>
<td>c/c in. By</td>
<td>98604</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee &amp; Pam Herron</td>
<td>18019 N.E. 25th Ave</td>
<td>98642</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmen Schley</td>
<td>35401 345 E 31st Ave</td>
<td>98019</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob &amp; Cherrie Moline</td>
<td>209 N.E. Cartey Rd. Ridgefield</td>
<td>98062</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kmoline@q.com">kmoline@q.com</a></td>
<td>✓ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Shorpe York</td>
<td>28901 NE 66th Ave</td>
<td>98604</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Fincher</td>
<td>P.O. Box 1376, Ridgefield</td>
<td>98642</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Stacy</td>
<td>ON FILE</td>
<td>98629</td>
<td><a href="mailto:py31114@live.com">py31114@live.com</a></td>
<td>✓ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy Pye</td>
<td>ON FILE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Walsh</td>
<td>28118 NE 122 Ave</td>
<td>98604</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron &amp; Denise Gardner</td>
<td>P.O Box 578, La Center</td>
<td>98629</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ NO</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>Robert A. White</td>
<td>6906 NE 159</td>
<td>98626</td>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Espino</td>
<td>26821 NE 1015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connie Cusio</td>
<td>PO Box 15512, Len</td>
<td>98655</td>
<td><a href="mailto:CUSIO@HOTMAIL.COM">CUSIO@HOTMAIL.COM</a></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold Kramerzell</td>
<td>16530 NE 92</td>
<td>98604</td>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lloyd H. Nelson</td>
<td>2177 NW 229 1/2 St</td>
<td>98692</td>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon Schlack</td>
<td>2614 NW 179th St</td>
<td>98642</td>
<td>JON AND <a href="mailto:VICKI@SAW.NET">VICKI@SAW.NET</a></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich Janepus</td>
<td>39403 NW 9th Ave</td>
<td>98671</td>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allin &amp; Nichole Gwinn</td>
<td>1203 NE 249th St</td>
<td>98642</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nicholeowen@live.com">nicholeowen@live.com</a></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcie Augustine</td>
<td>14405 NE Salmon Creek Ave</td>
<td>98686</td>
<td><a href="mailto:MARIC@139GCT.COM">MARIC@139GCT.COM</a></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Rasmussen</td>
<td>6206 NE 139 St</td>
<td>98686</td>
<td><a href="mailto:RASMUSSEN68@GMAIL.COM">RASMUSSEN68@GMAIL.COM</a></td>
<td>NO</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>Rick Biedry</td>
<td>28002 NE 2nd Ave</td>
<td>98647</td>
<td><a href="mailto:biedry563@msn.com">biedry563@msn.com</a></td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Stowe</td>
<td>2085 S. 26th Ave</td>
<td>98642</td>
<td><a href="mailto:don.stowe@ci.ridgefield.wa.us">don.stowe@ci.ridgefield.wa.us</a></td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Brannfors</td>
<td>30646 NE Taylor Valley Rd</td>
<td>98629</td>
<td><a href="mailto:edbrannfors@tds.net">edbrannfors@tds.net</a></td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe E. Welt</td>
<td>1288 S. 66th Ave</td>
<td>98642</td>
<td></td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzanne Knowles</td>
<td>1208 NE 166th St.</td>
<td>98642</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Knowles9498@comcast.net">Knowles9498@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teresa Mail-Dwy</td>
<td>32907 NW 41st Ave</td>
<td>98642</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Hodauly@gmail.com">Hodauly@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace Anderson</td>
<td>7601 NE 179th Bly</td>
<td>98604</td>
<td></td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue Angeles</td>
<td>39403 NE 5th Ave</td>
<td>98679</td>
<td></td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrie Greene</td>
<td>28401 NE 2nd Ave Ridgefield</td>
<td>98642</td>
<td></td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Biddle</td>
<td>6615 NE 124th St. Vancouver</td>
<td>98634</td>
<td><a href="mailto:biddle8@live.com">biddle8@live.com</a></td>
<td>☑ YES</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>Dennis</td>
<td>22702 NE 257th Ave</td>
<td>98604</td>
<td><a href="mailto:DHTNER.DW@GMAIL.COM">DHTNER.DW@GMAIL.COM</a></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td>9607 NE 299th B.G.</td>
<td>98604</td>
<td><a href="mailto:BJBESTUL@TJINS.COM">BJBESTUL@TJINS.COM</a></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanna Raynor</td>
<td>16520 NE 12th Ave</td>
<td>98642</td>
<td><a href="mailto:KARVIKE@COMCAST.NET">KARVIKE@COMCAST.NET</a></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cliff Wiegandt</td>
<td>7004 NE 1820 Ave. Vanc. WA 98682</td>
<td>98682</td>
<td><a href="mailto:CLIFF.WIEGANDT@HILTON.COM">CLIFF.WIEGANDT@HILTON.COM</a></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil and Millie Thomas</td>
<td>22908 NE 73rd Ave. Belleview WA 98604</td>
<td>98604</td>
<td><a href="mailto:PhilMille@COMCAST.COM">PhilMille@COMCAST.COM</a></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy and Brooks Owen</td>
<td>21118 NE 29th Ave</td>
<td>98642</td>
<td>Judy and <a href="mailto:mick@comcast.net">mick@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria and Ted Woods</td>
<td>1915 NE 28th St. Ridgefield WA 98642</td>
<td>98642</td>
<td><a href="mailto:TTELWOODS11437@HOTMAIL.COM">TTELWOODS11437@HOTMAIL.COM</a></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Lawhead</td>
<td>21411 NW 6th Ave</td>
<td>98642</td>
<td><a href="mailto:GLEYW@MCI.COM">GLEYW@MCI.COM</a></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Val Alexander</td>
<td>2404 NW 20th Ave Ridge Rd</td>
<td>98641</td>
<td><a href="mailto:SYOTEVIDGE@YES.NET">SYOTEVIDGE@YES.NET</a></td>
<td>Yes</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>Carl Anderson</td>
<td>700 N.E. 179th St.</td>
<td>98642</td>
<td><a href="mailto:CarlRAnderson@Juno.com">CarlRAnderson@Juno.com</a></td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Pasmann</td>
<td>2604 316th St.</td>
<td>98647</td>
<td></td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pete Bartel</td>
<td>3131 S 31st Way Rd.</td>
<td>98647</td>
<td></td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Hernandez</td>
<td>5916 N.E. 150th St.</td>
<td>98686</td>
<td><a href="mailto:david.hernandez@live.com">david.hernandez@live.com</a></td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Rubel</td>
<td>P.O. Box 339 Ridgefield</td>
<td>98642</td>
<td><a href="mailto:reisbides@comcast.com">reisbides@comcast.com</a></td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrance Murray</td>
<td>Ridgefield</td>
<td>98681</td>
<td><a href="mailto:newmedte@hotmail.com">newmedte@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Yoshin</td>
<td></td>
<td>98681</td>
<td></td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorothy Krahn</td>
<td>P.O. Box 482 Camas</td>
<td>98607</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dagrazul@gmail.com">dagrazul@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerry McClain</td>
<td>P.O. Box 674 Battle</td>
<td>98604</td>
<td></td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Thomas</td>
<td>6335 SW Burdine Ave. 34269</td>
<td>97289</td>
<td><a href="mailto:edward.thomas@gmail.com">edward.thomas@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kay Daleke</td>
<td>40011 NE 135th Dr. Amboy WA</td>
<td>98601</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bdalke@scattervreak.com">bdalke@scattervreak.com</a></td>
<td>✗</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>
</tbody>
</table>
| Sheryl Manley | 6515 NE 249th Way  
Battleground, WA 98604 | 98604 | Sherylmanley@live.com | ✔️ YES |
| Larry Sanford | 17600 NW 67th Ave  
Ridgefield, WA 98642 | 98642 | lsf1976@msn.com | ✔️ YES |
| L Kopp | 40801 N E. 10th Ave  
Amboy, WA 98602 | 98602 | | |
| Tom Sharie Yorke | 28901 NE 66th Ave  
Battleground, WA 98604 | 98604 | tomsharie@tds.net | ✔️ YES |
<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>Don &amp; Celeste King</td>
<td>221F NE Rainbow Ridgefield</td>
<td>98642</td>
<td>ibemrs <a href="mailto:king@ya9hoo.com">king@ya9hoo.com</a></td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Pye</td>
<td>Box 247 LACENTER</td>
<td>98629</td>
<td>pye man can @ hotmail.com</td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM

October 2014

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Cas Luiva

Address: 1704 NE 293 St. - Mount Vernon 98275

Open house location: ☐ October 29, Gaiser Middle School, 3000 NE 99th Street, Vancouver
☑ October 30, Clark County Fire & Rescue, 911 N. 65th Avenue, Ridgefield

Comment:

This facility is too small for the large number of rural landowners wanting to attend. Many came of intent because there was no parking. Seating was limited at the room was full of people having to stand. There is only one alternative available for the public to consider. There needs to be many more options available for the public to consider. We need zoning in the rural lands. The subject is what the rate are and what the lot sizes are. Please have another open house for those who had to leave.

E-mail address: ____________________________

Other ways to comment:

Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

E-mail your comment to us:
comp_plan@clark.wa.gov

Comments are due November 18, 2014.

Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM
October 2014

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Gary Lawheed
Address: 21414 NW 67th Ave Ridgefield, WA 98642

Open house location: □ October 29, Gaiser Middle School, 3000 NE 99th Street, Vancouver
☒ October 30, Clark County Fire & Rescue, 911 N. 65th Avenue, Ridgefield

Comment:

Support more of Ao-20 - Ao-10 - Cities have been given some expenses in 2007. Time to throw screw loud owner a bone.

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: ________________________________

Other ways to comment:

Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

E-mail your comment to us:
comp.plan@clark.wa.gov

Comments are due November 18, 2014.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
October 30th, 2014

Dear,

Board of Clark County Commissioners

My name is Mike Roth, I run a large dairy farm in Idaho, a dairy farm that operated from 1920 to 1996 in Clark County wa. We moved the farm to Idaho because this area changed from large scale farming into smaller micro type farms and the supporting industry for large farming had moved on to more realistic large scale farming areas.

In 1991 we were able to complete a cluster subdivision(Monet's Garden) on a portion of our land in the AG zoning. I think the code allowed for 8 one acre home sites per 20 acres of AG land. Versus today's code allowing 1 home site per 20 acres of land. With the adoption of the comp plan in 1994 the ability to cluster in resource lands went away.

We have waited 20 years for a comp plan amendment allowing a better use of our remaining Ag land only to find the 3 alternatives presented by Clark County to be of no relief at all!

I am under the impression that Clark County was to have a meaning full public process to determine the rural zoning and it appears Clark County has already decided that no changes to the rural zoning or only expanding city UGB is acceptable?

I would like to see some new alternatives allowing smaller lot sizes and clusters in the resource zones.

My suggestions are:

5 acre Ag zoning

Bring back the cluster subdivision for resource zones, these make for some of the nicest neighborhoods in Clark County!

Thank you

Sincerely

Mike Roth

17400 NE 88th Street

Vancouver Wa 98682
October 30th, 2014

Attention: Clark County Board of Commissioners

RE: Rural Comp plan changes

My name is Nick Redinger, 15706 NE 129th Street, Brush Prairie wa 98606.

This is my public testimony to be placed in the record.

I have been a licensed Broker in Clark County since 1993, specializing in the sale of vacant land.

I talk with local and out of town Buyers often regarding the availability of 1-5 acre home sites, there is a large demand for this type of home site and a diminishing number of available ready to build sites. I see a lack of new submittals for subdivision or cluster type developments, I would attribute this to an overly expensive regulatory process and the lack of readily zoned residential land.

Prior to the adoption of the 1994 comp plan, Clark County had a large supply of residential zoned land, after the adoption Clark County went from 2.5, 5, 10 and 20 acre zoning to 5,10,20,40 and 80 acre zoning.

I am disappointed with the 3 alternatives Clark County has proposed. I thought we were planning for growth for the rural area? As proposed very little to no changes will occur in the rural area. Changing the UGB around a city does very little to providing a rural lifestyle. All you are doing is creating density out in the rural area. The comp plan does not prevent Clark County from allowing citizens to move to the rural area, in fact it encourages opportunity for rural residential type zoning.

After 20 years of no changes to the comp plan I would expect Clark County to come up with a realistic plan versus what is being proposed. If you want a thriving rural community, changes to the existing zoning needs to occur. A few simple changes like changing zoning to R1,2.5 and 5 acre home sites, allow for cluster subdivisions to be done in the resource lands with a greater density allocated for creating remainder parcels, allow flexibility in the code for the remainder parcel design, to encourage the remainder to be farmed or trees grown or other farming activities. Create a 5 acre Ag zoning, most farming in Clark County today is a home on smaller acreage.

On the regulatory side, abolish the large lot subdivision ordinance, replace with state allowed five acre segregations. The finished product will be much better than what we are currently getting using the large lot ordinance. There was a need for this ordinance when no environmental laws were in place but times have changed and we have enough laws in place to protect the environment.

Make the short plat process simpler and more cost effective.

REDINGER 1/2
Bring back the cluster subdivision in resource zones. I have so many examples over the years where a large land owner just wanted to create some smaller lots for their family or to sell and continue farming the remainder of their property but are unable to do so under our current code.

As proposed the 3 alternatives do very little to improve the quality of life for rural citizens, please revise or create additional alternative models for the future of our rural county.

Sincerely

Nick Redinger

15706 NE 129th Street

Brush Prairie wa 98606
From: susan rasmussen
Sent: Friday, October 24, 2014 3:54 PM
To: cnldental@yahoo.com

Sent from Windows Mail

From: susan rasmussen
Sent: Friday, October 24, 2014 3:52 PM
To: axel.swanson@clark.wa.gov

The Superior Court Orders that Carol and I refer to are written by Judge Poyfair, April 4, 1997; No. 96-2-00080-2, Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Order. Our attorney was Glenn Amster of Lane Powell Spears Lubersky. On pg. 6, Poyfair writes;

"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. By trying to comply with the Board's errant decision, the County violated a GMA planning goal.

Through no fault of the County's, 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 Plan's land use densities. 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 of the terms of the GMA."

The BERK Study (6/2012), recommends the following tools be developed;

"Smaller parcel size for resource use only. This would allow a smaller parcel
to be created but only for resource uses. This would recognize the trend for smaller agricultural and forestry operations and allow for flexibility in ownership options."

The Situation Assessment written in the BERK Study says farming in Clark County is moving away from the traditional notions of agricultural production. Small parcels sizes don’t seem to be a relevant constraint to farming. The constraint for new farmers is access to land per se, not land of a particular size. This may be due to the mis-match of parcel sizes with the ag-20 zone where only 17% of properties meet that parcel size. Their farm assessment shows primary growth of very small farms, and small farms (less than 5 acres).

Carol and I have purchased maps from GIS that show the parcelizations. We have counted the many nonconforming lots that have been in existence prior to 1994. In many sections throughout the county, we have 100% nonconformance of parcel size to their zoning in both forestry and agriculture.

We attended Oliver’s work session with the planning commission. He stated on several occasions that he wishes to, “Clean up the maps.” He was talking about looking at what is actually on the ground regarding urban mixed use. Poyfair’s court orders were written in 1997. The rural and resource lands deserve the same attention.

Best regards,
Susan Rasmussen

Sent from Windows Mail
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COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM

October 2014

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. **PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.**

Name: Hollis Jarvis

Address: 2006 NE 37th St, SoCenter

Open house location: □ October 29, Gaiser Middle School, 3000 NE 99th Street, Vancouver
□ October 30, Clark County Fire & Rescue, 911 N. 65th Avenue, Ridgefield

Comment:

my 20 acres is surrounded by
500 feet places & it would
like to go to 5 acre parcels
also i'll take 10 if a cent
go to 5.

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address:

Other ways to comment:

Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

Comments are due November 18, 2014.

Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.

We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM

October 2014

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Kay Dalke
Address: 7001 NE 185th Avenue Amboy WA 98601

Open house location: □ October 29, Gaiser Middle School, 3000 NE 99th Street, Vancouver
☑ October 30, Clark County Fire & Rescue, 911 N. 65th Avenue, Ridgefield

Comment:

Did you take into consideration how parcels that were in existence as 5A land in 2007—reduce those timber parcels designated Clark County timber industry center in 1992 for relief for unemployed timber workers and Clark County lost informed that the funds were not available in Clark County because it was not considered a "timber" county.

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: bdalke@scarrercreek.com

Other ways to comment:

Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

E-mail your comment to us:
comp.plan@clark.wa.gov

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

Comments are due November 18, 2014.

Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM
October 2014

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Ginger Burr
Address: 819 NW 379 Street, LaCenter

Open house location: ☐ October 29, Gaiser Middle School, 3000 NE 99th Street, Vancouver
☐ October 30, Clark County Fire & Rescue, 911 N. 65th Avenue, Ridgefield

Comment:

Has the County made a mistake?
I bought my property in 1994 and have always used it for Agriculture. I recently found out I am zoned FR40. I should be Ag20. Every dept has me as Ag. Every 5 years I am audited to verify my Ag status. Please, please review satellite images, Assessor Dept, any dept to verify my Ag status.
Thank you. My land use has always been Ag.
Ginger Burr

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below.
E-mail address: GBurr2000@yahoo.com

Other ways to comment:
Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments
E-mail your comment to us:
comp.plan@clark.wa.gov

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

Comments are due November 18, 2014.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
Dear Clark County Board of Commissioners,

I am submitting this letter for the public record.

My name is Seth McCauley, I am a local Realtor in Clark County. I have gathered this information from the market. In regards to the zoning of the rural parts of Clark County, I have consistently seen a strong desire for one, two and a half, and five acre parcels from potential land buyers. It would benefit current land owners as well as the market for people who want to live in the rural areas but don’t want, or more commonly cannot afford 20 acres.

The alternatives currently presented do not address these changes that would benefit land owners, potential buyers, as well as Clark County as a whole. I would like to see new alternatives proposed addressing smaller zoning in the rural section of Clark County.

Very Respectfully,

Seth McCauley
Real Estate Broker
Windermere Stellar
1804 NE 88th Circle,
Vancouver, WA 98665
(971) 322-4679
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM

October 2014

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Edward Thomas

Address: 6235 SE Burlingame Ave #106 Portland OR 97239

Re: Large Property in FNE La Center (No address)

Open house location:  
☐ October 29, Gaiser Middle School, 3000 NE 99th Street, Vancouver
☐ October 30, Clark County Fire & Rescue, 911 N. 65th Avenue, Ridgefield

Comment:

I and my family are fully against the proposed transition FR-40 to FR-20 zoning due to the tax burdens on our land would receive from the new division on the tax maps. We are try to preserve old growth trees and cannot support added tax burdens. The county already cut off 3.18 acres of our land with a county road development (that destroyed a developed well) and setbacks result in an increase in tax of the smaller parcel due to the different zoning.

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address:

Other ways to comment:

Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

E-mail your comment to us:
comp.plan@clark.wa.gov

Comments are due November 18, 2014.

Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process. We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM

October 2014

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Phil and Millie Thomas

Address: 20708 N.E. 72nd Ave., 2611 NE 98659

Open house location: □ October 29, Gaiser Middle School, 3000 NE 99th Street, Vancouver
              ✔ October 30, Clark County Fire & Rescue, 911 N. 65th Avenue, Ridgefield

Comment:
When the property was made into 20 acres
our farm (at 1003 N.E. 72nd Ave., Vancouver) was
20 acres, 5 acres. It was then changed to 20 acres.

Why can't it be put back in 5 acres? We have
no intention of changing it's farm status in the
next 20 years but due to growth in the future it
might need to be rezoned. That would save the
county effort and expenses.

Changing it to 10 acres is O.K. as that
won't change it's farm designation.

Millie Thomas

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: Phil Millie @comcast.net

Other ways to comment:
Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

E-mail your comment to us:
comp.plan@clark.wa.gov

Comments are due November 18, 2014.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM

October 2014

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: STEVEN & SANDRA KULZ

Address: 14115 NE 10TH AVE, RIDGEFIELD, WA 98642

Open house location: ☐ October 29, Gaiser Middle School, 3000 NE 99th Street, Vancouver
☐ October 30, Clark County Fire & Rescue, 911 N. 65th Avenue, Ridgefield

Comment:

I'M REQUESTING THAT MY PROPERTY ON 10TH AVE. ACCOUNT NUMBER 181921000 BE ZONED TO I-L. IT IS CURRENTLY B-P, MY ADJOINING PARCEL #181921000 IS ALL READY ZONED I-L. ALL OTHER PROPERTY IN THIS AREA, EXCEPT ONE, ARE ZONED I-L. THIS ONE PARCEL BELONGS TO MY NEIGHBOR, HE IS ALSO REQUESTING HIS PARCEL BE ZONED I-L.

S. Kulz 11-14-14

Sandra Kulz 11-17-14

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: slskulz@comcast.net

Other ways to comment:

Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

Comments are due November 18, 2014.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM
October 2014

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Mark Brislawn

Address: 14405 NE Salmon Creek Ave.

Open house location: 
☐ October 29,aiser Middle School, 3000 NE 99th Street, Vancouver
☐ October 30, Clark County Fire & Rescue, 911 N. 65th Avenue, Ridgefield

Comment:
I am requesting parcel # 18192800 and 1819820000 located on 10th Ave. are rezoned to I-L. My neighbor and I currently have a island of R-P parcels surrounded by I-L. We feel this is a bad fit for future development in this area. Thank you for yours consideration.

[Signature]

Attached is a copy of my neighbors request.

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: Mark@BeizBomb.com

Other ways to comment:

Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

E-mail your comment to us:
comp.plan@clark.wa.gov

Comments are due November 18, 2014.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM
October 2014

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: [Handwritten Name]

Address: 12014 NE 245 St #440, #4

Open house location: ☑ October 29, Gaiser Middle School, 3000 NE 99th Street, Vancouver
☐ October 30, Clark County Fire & Rescue, 911 N. 65th Avenue, Ridgefield

Comment:

The rural lands have been ignored, and the smaller existing parcels need to be included in an alternative. 3 and the economies of the rural lands need to be recognized in a 5th alternative. The CCR does not reflect the county to add an additional alternative that better suit the rural areas in their SEIS.

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: [Handwritten E-mail Address]

Other ways to comment:
Submit a comment on the web: www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments
E-mail your comment to us: comp.plan@clark.wa.gov
Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

Comments are due November 18, 2014.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process. We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
October 28, 2014

VIA EMAIL

Carol Levanen, Ex. Secretary
Clark County Citizens United, Inc.
P.O. Box 2188
Battle Ground, WA 98604

RE: Comprehensive Growth Management Act Review

Dear Carol:

I understand you are meeting with Commissioner David Madore tomorrow. Per our discussion earlier today, this letter conveys a legal perspective on upcoming action by the Clark County Commissioners. Please feel free to share this with Commissioner Madore.

This upcoming review of the Comprehensive Growth Management Plan (GMP) is of great importance to Clark County and has obvious legal significance. The State Environmental Protection Act (SEPA) imposes certain requirements on this process. While the ultimate decision regarding the appropriate course resides with the Commissioners, it is incumbent upon the Clark County administrative staff to provide to the Commissioners with an appropriate Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). It is my belief that the staff has failed to meet this obligation to date, thus impairing the ability of the Commissioners to make an informed decision on all available options.

Under the terms of SEPA, the staff is to present a "reasonable number and range" of alternatives to the Commissioners for consideration, WAC 197-11-440. Currently, County administrative staff preparing decision documents for the Commissioners have offered a total of one rural rezoning alternative to the status quo,¹ in addition to one alternative that affects only the citise of La Center and Battle Ground. This effectively hampers the Commissioners in terms of their authority and decision options, is contrary to a good public process, and violates Washington law. The EIS process (by the terms of the Washington Administrative Code and the Revised Code of Washington) is supposed to provide both the Commissioners and the public with "sufficient information for a reasoned choice among alternatives." Solid Waste Alternative Proponents v. Okanogan County, 66 Wn. App. 439, 442 (1992); see also WAC 197-11-440(5). One choice hardly accomplishes this legislative and judicial intent.

¹ http://www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/alternatives.html
I believe the most legally defensible position is for the Commissioners to task the County staff with preparing an analysis of a reasonable range of at least four significant alternatives to the status quo, for a total of five alternatives upon which to judge future growth options for Clark County. Absent such a reasonable range of alternatives, I believe the CCCU has a strong position to litigate further process by Clark County as contrary to the spirit and intent of SEPA and Washington case law under SEPA.

I understand CCCU is prepared to offer, at a minimum, two alternative approaches to add to the upcoming GMP review so as to provide a responsible range of options that reflects genuine urban growth expectations over the course of the next 20 years. Not only are these alternatives appropriate under the terms of SEPA and the spirit of the EIS process, they are simply helpful to the Commissioners and allow them to exercise their inherent and legally granted power to rule on issues of public importance such as this.

I believe CCCU should ask that the Commissioners insist that the new alternatives to be proposed by CCCU be thoroughly analyzed by the County administrative staff in a neutral manner alongside the existing alternative, and be presented to the Commissioners as part of their decision regarding amendment of the GMP.

Should you have any questions about the legal basis of this perspective, please do not hesitate to call on me at any time.

Sincerely,

Zachary O. McIsaac

ZOM:tm
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM
October 2014

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: ______________________________________________________________

Address: ______________________________________________________________

Open house location: X October 29, Gaiser Middle School, 3000 NE 99th Street, Vancouver
□ October 30, Clark County Fire & Rescue, 911 N. 65th Avenue, Ridgefield

Comment:

to bad your main speaker wasn't speaking plain english.

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: _________________________________________________________

Other ways to comment:

Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

E-mail your comment to us:
comp_plan@clark.wa.gov

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

Comments are due November 18, 2014.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM
October 2014

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Edith E

Address: 14502 NE HAWSON AVE Mailing P.O. Box 269 Brush Prairie WA 98606

Open house location: X October 29, Gaiser Middle School, 3000 NE 99th Street, Vancouver

☐ October 30, Clark County Fire & Rescue, 911 N. 65th Avenue, Ridgefield

Comment:

we are very much in favor of the change
of our forest land of 20 acres a changed from
the 40 ac. min to the 20 ac. min.
we bought before it was changed to 40.
also would like to be able to decide it!

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address:

Other ways to comment:

Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

E-mail your comment to us:
comp.plan@clark.wa.gov

Comments are due November 18, 2014.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM

October 2014

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: SUSAN RASMUSSEN

Address: ________________________________________________________________

Open house location: ☑ October 29, Gaiser Middle School, 3000 NE 99th Street, Vancouver

☐ October 30, Clark County Fire & Rescue, 911 N. 65th Avenue, Ridgefield

Comment:

"Poor selection of alternative plans! Only #2 impacts the rural lands. This is insufficient! The rural treasure lands do not have enough options represented for growth in the rural treasure lands."

Next to look at the historical patterns of development on the ground in the rural treasure lands. 17% of the parcels conform to their zoning. This is not a true reflection of what is on the ground.

Would you like to:

E-mail address: ____________________________________________

Other ways to co

Submit a commen

www.clark.wa.gov

E-mail your comm

comp.plan@clark.v

Comments are di

Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process. We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.

Susan Rasmussen
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM

October 2014

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: 064A Fabijanicew

Address: #179393000

Open house location: ☑ October 29, Gaiser Middle School, 3000 NE 99th Street, Vancouver
☐ October 30, Clark County Fire & Rescue, 911 N. 65th Avenue, Ridgefield

Comment:
This parcel is along I-5 and has huge noise level from freeway.
Can you change it to mixed use zone?

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: 064A Equity Group.com

Other ways to comment:
Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

E-mail your comment to us:
comp.plan@clark.wa.gov

Comments are due November 18, 2014.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Jerry Winters
Address: 5420 Idaho St

Open house location: ☒ October 29, Gaiser Middle School, 3000 NE 99th Street, Vancouver
☒ October 30, Clark County Fire & Rescue, 911 N. 65th Avenue, Ridgefield

Comment:

At the open house the only job creation land I saw was BG 80A & Ridgefield 40A7 where are jobs going to be created
I have 20A zoned A20 w/ Industrial overlay, My Frontage is 132 Ave which will become 137 Ave 503 Bypass, it need to be rezoned to Industrial. More jobs!
20 A is 132 Ave & 119 St one side Van ucb one side Lagiers Not Farmed Open space.

For the Record! Thanks

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: deerfeeder@juno.com

Other ways to comment:
Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

E-mail your comment to us:
comp.plan@clark.wa.gov

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

Comments are due November 18, 2014.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM

October 2014

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Christopher Rubin

Address: 8502 NE 139th St

Open house location: ☐ October 29, Gaiser Middle School, 3000 NE 99th Street, Vancouver
☐ October 30, Clark County Fire & Rescue, 911 N. 65th Avenue, Ridgefield

Comment:

The proposed plan "Transportation Arterial Atlas" displays 3 new streets intersecting with 139th St. This street is currently a busy street. It is on the urban growth boundary. The proposed streets will cause 139th to become busier than it currently is. My property is designated rural. I would like to propose that no "new" streets intersect w/ 139th. They should stay in the ypa and exit on to the east (72nd) and west (50th Ave). My quality of life has already been disrupted! I do not want to have 2 new streets intersecting in a rural area!

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: ________________________________

Other ways to comment:

Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

E-mail your comment to us:
comp.plan@clark.wa.gov

Comments are due November 18, 2014.

Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM

October 2014

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Matt Graves
Address: PO Box 70052, Vancouver, WA 98685

Open house location: October 29, Gaiser Middle School, 3000 NE 99th Street, Vancouver
☐ October 30, Clark County Fire & Rescue, 911 N. 65th Avenue, Ridgefield

Comment:
I would like to see the option of cluster lots for land zoned in A6-20. If the land is developed, the majority of it can be dedicated to AG.

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: mattfranxx@gmail.com

Other ways to comment:
Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments
Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

Comments are due November 18, 2014.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES INPUT FORM

October 2014

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: ROBERT R. & JANICE A. FETTI

Address: 3402 NW 217TH WAY RIDGEFIELD, WA 98642

Open house location: □ October 29, Gaiser Middle School, 3000 NE 99th Street, Vancouver
✓ October 30, Clark County Fire & Rescue, 911 N. 65th Avenue, Ridgefield

Comment:

We are the only ones on our side of 31st that have to have 20 acres. We have 5 homes just down our drive way alone.

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address:

Other ways to comment:

Submit a comment on the web:
www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016-update/comments

Submit a comment in writing:
Clark County Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

E-mail your comment to us:
comp.plan@clark.wa.gov

Comments are due November 18, 2014.

Thank you for taking the time to participate in the Comprehensive Plan process. We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that your Comprehensive Plan includes issues of importance to our community.
O’Donnell, Mary Beth

From: Anderson, Colete
Sent: Friday, October 31, 2014 1:36 PM
To: Alvarez, Jose
Cc: 'cfarrell@fjarch.com'; Mitch Kneipp (City of Washougal); O’Donnell, Mary Beth
Subject: Parcels 130538000 and 130544000

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Jose

('via phone')

Mr. Farrell is requesting a zoning designation of R1-6 for both parcels noted above. Parcel 130538000 appears to have two zoning designations (R1-15 and R1-6). Parcel 130544000 is currently zoned R1-15. We discussed that both parcels would have Urban Holding 10 overlay and that he would need to apply to the City of Washougal to discuss future annexation plans.

Would you please add Mr. Farrell’s request into the record?

Thank you!

Colete Anderson
Clark County Community Planning
360-397-2280 ext.4516
www.clark.wa.gov/planning

Like the Commission on Aging on Facebook!
O'Donnell, Mary Beth

From: Mitch Kneipp <Mitch.Kneipp@cityofwashougal.us>
Sent: Monday, November 10, 2014 4:22 PM
To: Anderson, Colete; Alvarez, Jose
Cc: 'cfarrell@fjarch.com'; O'Donnell, Mary Beth
Subject: RE: Parcels 130538000 and 130544000

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

I'd like to point out for consistency that the City of Washougal does NOT have an R1-6 zoning designation.

Mitch Kneipp

From: Anderson, Colete [mailto:Colete.Anderson@clark.wa.gov]
Sent: Friday, October 31, 2014 1:36 PM
To: Alvarez, Jose
Cc: 'cfarrell@fjarch.com'; Mitch Kneipp; O'Donnell, Mary Beth
Subject: Parcels 130538000 and 130544000

Jose

Mr. Farrell is requesting a zoning designation of R1-6 for both parcels noted above. Parcel 130528000 appears to have two zoning designations (R1-15 and R1-6).
Parcel 130544000 is currently zoned R1-15. We discussed that both parcels would have Urban Holding 10 overlay and that he would need to apply to the City of Washougal to discuss future annexation plans.

Would you please add Mr. Farrell's request into the record?

Thank you!

Colete Anderson
Clark County Community Planning
360-397-2280 ext.4516
www.clark.wa.gov/planning

Like the Commission on Aging on Facebook!

This e-mail and related attachments and any response may be subject to public disclosure under state law.
FOR THE PUBLIC RECORD; and SEIES Clark County comprehensive plan updates

Dear Commissioners;

3rd night’s open house in Ridgefield was outright insulting to the rural communities, and their citizens. I saw folks driving around the firehouse two and three times looking for places to park. I saw folks give up and drive away. Inside, the conditions were about as bad as they could get. Seating was provided for less that half. The majority of folks were left standing. Most of them were seniors. Oliver wasn’t prepared to speak with a microphone. Didn’t bother with welcoming the citizens. No introductions were made. Folks were at a loss as to who was making the presentation and the specifics for the evening’s agenda. One lady finally intervened and stopped him. She politely asked who he was, what his position is with the county, what made him qualified to speak before the citizens.

Needless to say, things proceeded downhill from there. Despite Oliver saying he wasn’t going to take questions, people were raising hands and demanding answers. One question from a senior lady asked about the many non-conforming lots, and the massive downzoning that had occurred 20 yrs. ago. I asked why we are only presented with three alternatives? Oliver said, “That is a very good question. Ask the commissioners. That was their decision.” Many folks couldn’t hear and were tired of standing. People were leaving. This was not a successful open house.

The rural citizens are skeptical of the planners, and rightfully untrusting. They don’t care much for the planner’s insulting attitudes directed at them, and demonstrated in the single alternative plan that even acknowledges rural lands. This attitude assumed by the planners and directed towards the rural communities couldn’t be camouflaged last night. They shouldn’t have been caught entirely unprepared in addressing the many concerns of the rural citizens.

There is a high degree of professionalism, humbleness and modesty that citizens rightfully expect from their county planners. By law, their work must not be biased. Remarkably, the work of the Clark County planning
staff doesn’t support any of these highly valued attributes. Thus, the work is done without any regard to integrity at every level of performance.

Ike, the lead fellow from the Dept. of Commerce for the Western Washington comp. plan updates, was in attendance last night. He has oversight about how the county is proceeding on the updates to the comp. plan and compliance to GMA, SEIS regulations. He witnessed last night’s events.

Best to you, and Happy Halloween to you and your families,
Susan Rasmussen
Sent from Windows Mail

From: susan rasmussen
Sent: Thursday, October 30, 2014 1:09 PM
To: Silliman Peter, david.madore@clark.wa.gov, tom.mielke@clark.wa.gov, ed.barnes@clark.wa.gov, cnldental@yahoo.com, Leah Higgins, Rick Dunning, Rita Dietrich, Jerry Olson, Fred Pickering, Jim Malinowski, Frank White, Benjamin Moss, Lonnie Moss, Melinda Zamora, Nick Redinger, Curt Massie, Marcus Becker, Zachary McIsaac, Clark County Citizens United Inc.

Dear Commissioners,

Last night, the planners presented another open house. This was well attended. However, there were no opportunities made available to the public to have open discussions, questions answered, and concerns voiced. It is my understanding that these open houses provide the appropriate forums in which the citizens may openly collaborate. These presentations are falling way short of their goals.

It was very evident at your last work session with Oliver that nobody is at the table to represent the interests and futures of the rural communities and their citizens. According to the Rural Development Council, this methodology is obsolete. The rural communities and their citizens need representation for their interests and future designs. This community requires equal standing among the local jurisdictions. This ensures that the rural communities get their fair share of good family-wage jobs. These jobs help to create the solid foundation that supports a diverse, and robust rural economy. In turn, a hearty rural economy sustains the all important rural character (per GMA). According to the Dept. of Commerce, (Terry Lawhead), the responsibility of representation for rural interests falls to the County by default.

The rural communities and their citizens are continually ignored. This is not only immoral, it is unlawful. Last night, Gordy Euler told me the three alternative plans came directly from the Commissioners. Gordy said, “Talk to them if you don’t like the plans.” I am appealing to the Commissioners to assume the controls of this plan...you are the bosses. Navigate towards a future with hearty growth in mind... for jobs, housing, rural lifestyles, hobby farms, very small to small farms, and small family-forestry farms.

All of this is supported in written details in the Situation Assessment, Berk Report, 2012. This report clearly shows the changing face of agriculture in Clark County and how it has evolved over the past 20 years. Farming in Clark County is no longer agriculture in the traditional sense of large farms. Present and future trends need to be acknowledged and the proper changes to the comprehensive plan need to reflect this.
Hello Commissioner:

This is outright insulting and need to stop. If Susan and Carol organized the disruption at the Open House meeting in Ridgefield, they did not succeed. Staff was very professional and answered questions relating to the plan update and a handful of citizen came afterwards to compliment county staff.

Best Regards,

Oliver

---

From: LaRocque, Linnea On Behalf Of Barnes, Ed
Sent: Monday, November 03, 2014 9:05 AM
To: Orjiako, Oliver
Cc: Tilton, Rebecca; O'Donnell, Mary Beth
Subject: RE: No humility, No Professionalism=No Integrity

---

From: susan rasmussen [mailto:sprazz@outlook.com]
Sent: Friday, October 31, 2014 10:48 AM
To: Silliman, Peter; Madore, David; Mielke, Tom; Barnes, Ed; cnldental@yahoo.com; Leah Higgins; Rick Dunning; Rita Dietrich; Jerry Olson; Fred Pickering; Jim Malinowski; Frank White; Benjamin Moss; Lonnie Moss; Melinda Zamora; Nick Redinger; Curt Massie; Marcus Becker; Zachary McIsaac; Clark County Citizens United Inc.
Subject: Re: No humility, No Professionalism=No Integrity

FOR THE PUBLIC RECORD; and SEIES Clark County comprehensive plan updates

Dear Commissioners;

Last night’s open house in Ridgefield was outright insulting to the rural communities, and their citizens. I saw folks driving around the firehouse two and three times looking for places to park. I saw folks give up and drive away. Inside, the conditions were about as bad as they could get. Seating was provided for less than half. The majority of folks were left standing. Most of them were seniors. Oliver wasn’t prepared to speak with a microphone. Didn’t bother with welcoming the citizens. No introductions were made. Folks were at a loss as to who was making the presentation and the specifics for the evening’s agenda. One lady finally intervened and stopped him. She politely asked who he was, what his position is with the county, what made him qualified to speak before the citizens.
Needless to say, things proceeded downhill from there. Despite Oliver saying he wasn’t going to take questions, people were raising hands and demanding answers. One question from a senior lady asked about the many non-conforming lots, and the massive downzoning that had occurred 20 yrs. ago. I asked why we are only presented with three alternatives? Oliver said, “That is a very good question. Ask the commissioners. That was their decision.” Many folks couldn’t hear and were tired of standing. People were leaving. This was not a successful open house.

The rural citizens are skeptical of the planners, and rightfully untrusting. They don’t care much for the planner’s insulting attitudes directed at them, and demonstrated in the single alternative plan that even acknowledges rural lands. This attitude assumed by the planners and directed towards the rural communities couldn’t be camouflaged last night. They shouldn’t have been caught entirely unprepared in addressing the many concerns of the rural citizens.

There is a high degree of professionalism, humbleness and modesty that citizens rightfully expect from their county planners. By law, their work must not be biased. Remarkably, the work of the Clark County planning staff doesn’t support any of these highly valued attributes. Thus, the work is done without any regard to integrity at every level of performance.

Ike, the lead fellow from the Dept. of Commerce for the Western Washington comp. plan updates, was in attendance last night. He has oversight about how the county is proceeding on the updates to the comp. plan and compliance to GMA, SEIS regulations. He witnessed last night’s events.

Best to you, and Happy Halloween to you and your families,
Susan Rasmussen
Sent from Windows Mail

From: susan rasmussen
Sent: Thursday, October 30, 2014 1:09 PM
To: Sillman Peter, david.madore@clark.wa.gov, tom.mielke@clark.wa.gov, ed.barnes@clark.wa.gov, cnldental@yahoo.com, Leah Higgins, Rick Dunning, Rita Dietrich, Jerry Olson, Fred Pickering, Jim Malinowski, Frank White, Benjamin Moss, Lonnie Moss, Melinda Zamora, Nick Redinger, Curt Massie, Marcus Becker, Zachary Mclsaac, Clark County Citizens United Inc.

Dear Commissioners,

Last night, the planners presented another open house. This was well attended. However, there were no opportunities made available to the public to have open discussions, questions answered, and concerns voiced. It is my understanding that these open houses provide the appropriate forums in which the citizens may openly collaborate. These presentations are falling way short of their goals.

It was very evident at your last work session with Oliver that nobody is at the table to represent the interests and futures of the rural communities and their citizens. According to the Rural Development Council, this methodology is obsolete. The rural communities and their citizens need representation for their interests and future designs. This community requires equal standing among the local jurisdictions. This ensures that the rural communities get their fare share of good family-wage jobs. These jobs help to create the solid foundation that supports a diverse, and robust rural economy. In turn, a hearty rural economy sustains the all important rural character (per GMA). According to the Dept. of
Hi Peter,

The lady that asked Oliver at the meeting as to what the county was going to do with all of the 5 acre lots in the rural area, was Kay Dalke. She was a Bank Executive and her husband owned and operated Bill’s Saw Shop in Amboy, until they retired and sold the shop. Bill’s Saw Shop was the primary, and maybe the only logging supply in Clark County, specializing in chain saws, logging equipment, chainsaw and small engine repair and sales of small equipment. She and he are very well known in the community. Susan said she was just shaking, when she left that meeting.

Best Regards, Carol
From: susan rasmussen [mailto:sprazz@outlook.com]
Sent: Saturday, November 01, 2014 6:06 PM
To: Madore, David; Mielke, Tom; Barnes, Ed; Rick Dunning; Jim Malinowski; Jerry Olson; Leah Higgins; Lonnie Moss; Marcus Becker; Curt Massie; Rita Dietrich; Clark County Citizens United Inc.
Subject: Fw: Clark County Comp. Plan, resulting impacts

For the Public Record in the SEIS scoping report for the 2016 Comp. plan updates

Sent from Windows Mail

From: susan rasmussen
Sent: Saturday, November 1, 2014 5:31 PM
J: susan rasmussen

Hello Ike,

Thank you for attending the open house in Ridgefield Thursday evening and for giving your attention to Carol and myself regarding the comp. plan updates for our county.

The significant turnout of rural citizens that came to the open house is very telling. This update is of great importance to the rural land owners throughout Clark County. Our properties have been frozen since 1994. Most land owners are coming forward and demanding relief in the form of options, some kind of flexibility. Most land owners experienced massive downzoning referenced by the comments early in the open house by Mrs. Kay Dalke. The 1994 comp. plan abolished our options, destroyed historical cultural practices allowing family members to reside as well as work on the family farm, and wiped out historical patterns of rural development. This is significant as it directly impacts the bottom lines all family farms, and forestry operations throughout Clark County.

The particular actions stemming from the 1994 Clark County Comp. plan regarding massive downzoning of rural and resource lands, have had direct and harsh consequential impacts to every landowner in Clark County. These impacts not only taint the rural communities and their citizens, but local and regional economies as well that largely depend on the already financially fragile resource industries. It isn’t coincidental that the negative social and economic impacts directly correspond with the downward trend of large commercial farm and forestry activities. More importantly, over time the cumulative negative economic
and social impacts directly undermine and further weaken the fragile resource-related economic foundation that, in turn, supports the all-important, “rural character,” (per GMA).

Any economist will agree that this isn’t the kind of situation that supports a sustainable, robust economy. This recipe won’t sustain any economy. By their very nature, resource industries are highly susceptible to unstable market conditions, and highly volatile market fluctuations. It is imperative that the resulting impacts of the massive downzoning be addressed. The harsh realities of the social and economic impacts, directly tied to the 1994 Clark County land use plan, have proven to undermine rather than enhance a sustainable rural economy. Therefore, the county’s present land use plan does not support, “rural character,” per GMA.

Many barriers were crafted and put into place as ordinances that forced landowners into locking up their land into undesired very large parcels. Most of these large parcels do no conform to historical neighboring development patterns that were already in place prior to the adoption of the 1994 plan. This has resulted in a mere 17% of the lots being in conformance to their zoning size (Berk Study, 2012).

The Berk Study goes further, and makes recommendations to the following:

“Smaller parcel size for resource only. This would allow a smaller parcel to be created but only for resource uses. This would recognize the trend for smaller agricultural and forestry operations and allow for flexibility in in ownership options.”

The Clark County Comp. Plan was obsolete upon adoption. By 1990, many large commercial dairy farms had already migrated out of the area. The county had app. 20 that remained operational. Their commercial viability already was questionable due to many prime issues:

1. Many supporting businesses of this industry were no longer located within the county,
2. The rising costs of transporting this highly perishable commodity out of the county to the nearest processing plant. (Portland, Centralia, Tillamook)
3. Nearly all high quality feed required for dairy cattle had to be imported into the county. (high quality alfalfa hay, and high protein grain supplements)
4. Highly restrictive environmental regulations were not only unpredictable, but very expensive to implement. Engineering, and grant funding to help offset these major expenses was in little to no supply. ($100,000. for a manure holding pond)
5. Nearly every large dairy farm had more than one seasonal stream, creek, or river that bisected the farm. This fact compounded the environmental constraints.
6. The environmental regulations from ESA required removing valuable farm, and timber lands from production in order to meet the requirements of dedicated buffering zones.
7. The Federal Clean Water regulations, NPDES permits, ESA, and the Clark County code regulations were becoming increasingly more impactful to the economic bottom lines of every commercial farm and forestry operation in Clark County.
8. The inherent volatile economics of the resource based industries (farming, timber).
9. The rapid conversion of rural and resource lands was already occurring. The cities and the rapid population expansion was already advancing into the rural lands.
10. As large farming operations were migrating out of the rural lands, families were migrating into rural Clark County seeking to live a rural lifestyle on very small to small farms. Retired people were also settling here. The average age of a Clark County farmer is 55.
11. The present and future farming trends of Clark County, documented in the Berk Study 2012, clearly demonstrates a need to accommodate, "very small to small farms." This fact is further upheld in the U. S. Farm Census Report. Small farms are 5 acres.

Lewis County was commended in the Courts for recognizing the present and future needs of the large dairy industry in their county comp. plan. They wisely acknowledged the outward migration. They wisely acknowledged how this migration would ultimately impact the county's large parcels of resource lands. They employed analysis regarding the present and future trends of this industry. The planners used this analysis and astutely made adjustments to the resource lands. These adjustments correctly recognized the unique local circumstances, and the ability to employ discretion and discernment to those valued local circumstances (per GMA). This is important. Those local circumstances provide the only true guidance tools that compose the community’s needs, desires, and trends. The techniques and policies used ultimately supported justification of Lewis County’s land use trend towards smaller resource parcels. Lewis County planned accordingly...not by a preconceived agenda. This resulted in a well-crafted plan that truly reflected the community’s uniqueness.

My questions to you like...

1. Why did the Clark County 1994 comp. plan wrongly ignore the migration out of the many large dairy farms?
2. Why haven’t updates been made to the county resource lands to reflect the social and economic impacts of the land use plan?
3. Why haven’t updates been done to reflect Clark County’s unique local, present and future trends that clearly demonstrate trends towards, “very small to small farms?”
4. Why haven’t the Superior Court Orders written by Judge E. Poyfair, Cause No. 96-2-00080-2, April 4, 1997 been recognized by the county planners?
   “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 of the terms of the GMA.”

My best to you,
Susan Rasmussen,
for the Board of Directors,
Clark County Citizens United, Inc.

From: susan rasmussen
Sent: Monday, October 20, 2014 11:58 AM
To: ike.nwankwo@commerce.wa.gov

Hello Ike,
Thank you for giving me your time this morning and discussing our issues with you. The court case I referenced is No. 96-2-0080-2, Judge Poyfair, April 4, 1997, Superior Court of Washington for Clark County: Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Order:
Pg. 3, lines 9-13: “However, none of the alternatives for planning addressed in the environmental review document discussed the 36,000 acres of agri-forest resource land.” There has never been an EIS done on the 36,000 acres.

Pg.4, lines 23-3: “The Board erroneously interpreted and applied the GMA when it failed to require the agri-forest resource lands meet the statutorily mandated criteria for resource lands. Furthermore, there is no substantial evidence in the record to support the designation of agri-forest lands as resource lands under the GMA.”

Pg. 5, #6: “The County failed to comply with SEPA’s requirement for additional environmental review when a proposal changes substantially from the one addressed in the initial EIS. 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 was clearly erroneous.”

Pg. 6, #7: “Rural Land Densities. The county’s rural and resource development regulations are inconsistent with the GMA. The GMA requires counties to determine that planning goals are utilized and are a part of the consideration supporting its decisions. One of the planning goals requires a variety of residential densities and housing types, which the Clark County Comm. 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 a uniform lot density violates the planning goal requiring a variety of residential densities”. ...“This Board decision, however, compelled the county to downzone substantial portions of the rural areas in order to meet the Board’s apparent requirements.” (This resulted in the creation of thousands of non-conforming lots)

Pg. 6: “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 of the terms of the GMA.” Clark County Citizens United, Inc. is requesting that this Superior Court Order be respected and implemented in the current updates to the county’s comp. plan.

Best Regards,
Susan Rasmussen for the Board of Directors,
Clark County Citizens United, Inc.
Hello,

Please find attached written testimony received during the public comment portion of the Board's November 4, 2014 hearing from Carol Levanen.

Thank you,
Rebecca

Rebecca Tilton, Clerk of the Board
Board of Clark County Commissioners
1300 Franklin Street
PO Box 5000
Vancouver, WA 98666-5000
PHONE: 360-397-2232, ext. 4305 | E-MAIL: Rebecca.Tilton@clark.wa.gov
Clark County Board of Commissioners
P.O. Box 5000
Vancouver, Washington 98666

Re: Rural Representation and the 2016 Comprehensive Plan (For the public record)

In RCW 36.70A.035 Public participation, the GMA directs counties (1) The public participation requirements of this chapter shall include notice procedures that are reasonably calculated to provide notice to property owners and other affected and interested individuals... In RCW 36.70A.140 Comprehensive plans - Ensure public participation, it states, Each county and city that is required or chooses to plan under RCW 36.70A.040 shall establish and broadly disseminate to the public a public participation program identifying procedures providing for early and continuous public participation in the development and amendment of comprehensive land use plans and development regulations implementing such plans. The procedures shall provide for broad dissemination of proposals and alternatives, opportunity for written comments, public meetings after effective notice, provision for open discussion, communication programs, information services and consideration of and response to public comments.

Ridgefield, with 4,783 people, La Center, with 2,800 people, and Yacolt, with 1,565 people, (2010 US Census), have been able to give early and continuous participation in the Comprehensive Plan update. A representative from each city sits at the table with commissioners to discuss their wants and needs. Clark County Citizens United, Inc. representatives, speaking for approximately 6,000 rural landowners, equal to Ridgefield's and La Center's population combined, come forward in the process and are told to speak to Futurewise, a Seattle environmental group, to discuss what to do with rural lands. Are rural people invisible in Clark County? Do those living in three fourths of the county land mass, not count? The GMA, often discusses the importance of property owners participation, yet staff and the commissioners discussions have centered on the cities.

The proposals brought by staff, for three alternatives presented in the SEIS, were created long before rural people could consider possible changes to the 2016 Comprehensive Plan. Staff hang their hat on the Rural Task Force and a survey that went to a select rural population, who all said smaller lot sizes. But, staff defined that to mean only changes to resource lands with parcel sizes of 10 and 20 acres, ignoring the rural areas. Their excuse is that they don't want an appeal.

After 20 years, the county commissioners can no longer ignore the needs and wants of rural people and the rural economy. They can no longer ignore that almost 100% of the rural land parcels are much smaller than allowed in their zones and the changing face of agriculture and forestry in the county and nation. The commissioners must balance the rural land needs with the cities in the 2016 Comprehensive Plan. Cities are not required to have people come forward, en mass, to support their position, nor should rural representatives. This in not the intent of the GMA.

Clark County Citizens United, has presented often, for the wants and needs of rural people. We ask the Board of Commissioners to reconsider the staff proposal, to better meet those concerns.

Sincerely,
Carol Levanen, Ex. Secretary
Clark County Citizens United, Inc.
P. O. Box 2188, Battle Ground, Washington, 98604

October 28, 2014
From: susan rasmussen
Sent: 11/7/2014 2:33 PM
To: Wilson, Jeff (COM)
Cc: cnldental@yahoo.com; Leah Higgins; donaldmcisaac@msn.com; Jerry Olson; Jim Malinowski; Nick Redinger; Lonnie Moss; Marcus Becker; david.madore@clark.wa.gov; ed.barnes@clark.wa.gov; tom.mielke@clark.wa.gov; Silliman Peter; Curt Massie; Rick Dunning; Rita Dietrich; Zachary McIsaac; Fred Pickering; Frank White; Benjamin Moss; Melinda Zamora
Subject: Clark County comp. plan

Hello Jeff,

I’m hoping that you are able to provide guidance here on several issues that we are having regarding the updates to Clark County’s comprehensive plan.

Our issues of concern;

1. Are the planners required to provide only one “alternative” that addresses concerns for the rural and resource lands?
2. Are the planners required to address the issues in the Superior Court Orders, No. 96-2-00080-2? In particular, Judge Poyfair’s orders as written:

“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 of the terms of the GMA.”

Judge Poyfair was correct in his Superior Court Orders written in 1997. Only 17% of rural parcels comply with their zoning size. This has never been corrected. We have inventoried thousands of parcels in the county’s rural and resource lands. We have documented 100% nonconforming lots in many sections. The first question posed to the county planner (Oliver Orjiako), at the open house Oct. 30 concerned the many nonconforming lots (Mrs. Dahlke). We have been trying to work with the county planners to bring them into compliance with the Superior Court Orders of this case. We are continually rebuffed. Clark County planner Gordy Euler indignantly says, “What difference does it make?”

Jeff, do you have any suggestions here to help us get the attention of the county planners and get them to respond to the needs and concerns of the rural communities, and their citizens? How can we best get them to respond to the Superior Court Orders and make the necessary corrections to the comp. plan updates that reflect the orders written by Judge Poyfair?

Any guidance you may have to offer would be greatly appreciated. Despite a long phone conversation with Ike Oct. 20, a personal conversation at the open house Oct. 30 in Ridgefield (with Carol Levanen), and several emails...I can’t seem to get his attention. He may not have an understanding of our court action since he asked at the Ridgefield open house, “Where is the appeal?” I gave him a hard copy of the Superior Court Orders Oct. 30.

Sincerely,
Susan Rasmussen, on behalf of the Board of Directors,
O'Donnell, Mary Beth

From: LaRocque, Linnea on behalf of Barnes, Ed
Sent: Monday, November 10, 2014 8:47 AM
To: Orjiako, Oliver
Cc: Tilton, Rebecca; O'Donnell, Mary Beth
Subject: Clark County comp. plan

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

I'm not sure you need this one.

From: susan rasmussen [mailto:sprazz@outlook.com]
Sent: Friday, November 07, 2014 2:46 PM
To: Jeff.Wilson@commerce.wa.gov
Cc: cnlidential@yahoo.com; Leah Higgins; donaldmcsaac@msn.com; Jerry Olson; Jim Malinowski; Nick Redinger; Lonnie Moss; Marcus Becker; Madore, David; Barnes, Ed; Mielke, Tom; Silliman, Peter; Curt Massie; Rick Dunning; Rita Dietrich; Zachary McIsaac; Fred Pickering; Frank White; Benjamin Moss; Melinda Zamora
Subject: Re: Clark County comp. plan

Hello Jeff,
We appreciate your attention to our concerns.

Sincerely,
Susan Rasmussen,
Clark County Citizens United, Inc.

Sent from Windows Mail

From: Jeff.Wilson@commerce.wa.gov
Sent: Friday, November 7, 2014 2:40 PM
To: susan rasmussen
Cc: cnlidential@yahoo.com, Leah Higgins, donaldmcsaac@msn.com, Jerry Olson, Jim Malinowski, Nick Redinger, Lonnie Moss, Marcus Becker, david.madore@clark.wa.gov, ed.barnes@clark.wa.gov, tom.mielke@clark.wa.gov, Silliman Peter, Curt Massie, Rick Dunning, Rita Dietrich, Zachary McIsaac, Fred Pickering, Frank White, Benjamin Moss, Melinda Zamora

Ms. Rasmussen,

Thank you for writing regarding the planning efforts in Clark County. I am trying to catch up on your emails and schedule some time with Ike to discuss your questions. We have not had an opportunity to connect in any detail due to scheduling conflicts, however I hope he and I can discuss next week. I appreciate your patience to allow Ike and I to talk. I will ensure that Ike responds to as soon as we are able to connect.

Regards,
Jeff Wilson
Clark County Citizens United, Inc.

Sent from Windows Mail

From: susan rasmussen
Sent: Friday, November 7, 2014

Sent from Windows Mail
Following comments were submitted online:

Parcel No:

Subject: Rural Character IGNORED

Comments:
The GMA gives much value to rural character, and each county's unique characteristics...that is why much discretion is given to local jurisdictions in defining their area's "rural character." Rural Character means to acknowledge the historical existing and preferred patterns of land use and development. Clark County's comp. plan has ignored existing patterns of land use throughout the rural and resource lands. Judge Edwin Poyfair was correct in the Superior Court Orders written in 1997, No. 96-2-00080-2: "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 of the terms of the GMA."

When will the Superior Court Orders be respected, and the necessary corrections made to the rural and resource lands?

Submitted by:
Peter Rasmussen

Email: sprazz@outlook.com

Address:

Ridgefield, WA
Following comments were submitted online:

Parcel No:

Subject: U-H and U-R overlays

Comments:
Many parcels zoned UR and UH have been in that condition nearly 20 years. In these situations, and there are many, the county is using the overlay designations not as a planning tool, but rather a land use zone. This is against GMA. The county needs to provide relief to those many land owners and remove the overlays. The rural parcel sizes should all be examined. The rural parcels should go down to 1-2.5, and 5 acre lots. Properties south of NE 219th shouldn't be larger than 2.5 acres. Predominant parcel sizes should be examined throughout Clark County...use this as a standard and apply this to all resource and rural lands.

Submitted by:
susan rasmussen

Email: sprazz@outlook.com

Address:

Ridgefield, WA
O'Donnell, Mary Beth

From: Orjiako, Oliver
Sent: Wednesday, November 05, 2014 8:51 AM
To: Euler, Gordon; Alvarez, Jose; O'Donnell, Mary Beth
Cc: Cook, Christine
Subject: FW: Write your Commissioner/Ruud Van der Salm

Just FYI

-----Original Message-----
From: Madore, David
Sent: Tuesday, November 04, 2014 4:15 PM
To: Orjiako, Oliver
Subject: FW: Write your Commissioner/Ruud Van der Salm

-----Original Message-----
From: ruudster19@aol.com
Sent: Friday, October 24, 2014 7:59 AM
To: Cnty Board of Commissioners General Delivery; Mielke, Tom; Madore, David; Barnes, Ed
Subject: Write your Commissioner

Internet Form Results:

FORM: emailform.asp
FORM submitted at 10/24/2014 7:59:26 AM

First Name: Ruud
Last Name: van der Salm
Phone: UNANSWERED
Email: ruudster19@aol.com
Address: 3707 NE 100th Circle
City: Vancouver
State: WA
Subject: Proposed zone changes to AG 20
Message: Dear Commissioners,

Upon receiving our surveys in the fall of 2013, I wrote the following to Clark County
(commplan@clark.wa.gov):

"To Whom it may concern,

I received your survey regarding the size of AG-20. As a land owner we would like to have the option of
being zoned AG-10. However, what are the end results of such a switch. Would we see a higher property
valuation (even in Current Use)? The higher the taxes on AG land and the more encroachment, the more
pressure to move agriculture operations out of the county. We've been here since 1981 and we would like to stay here.

The second question is "I would prefer the flexibility of clustering new lots in a corner of my property." What does this mean exactly and what options would it give us and at what cost?"

I never received a reply and thus did not fill out our survey cards.

In January, Mr. Madore asked Mr. Van Nortwick if there was any way to avoid property tax increases with the proposed zone changes.

"(Mr Madore) asked Van Nortwick if there were any alternatives.

"No," Van Nortwick said. "Because, David, what you are doing is you're making their property more valuable. And when you make their property more valuable, the percent of the total value of the county goes up, and that's why it shifts over. You're only going to get that property tax shift if you actually increase the value of their property," Van Nortwick said.

Madore asked whether it's fair to increase taxes based on the potential for the property to be subdivided.

"Yes," Van Nortwick said. "Because the potential is what people are paying for. People buy lots because of the potential to buy a home.""

To me it looks like these proposed zone changes will benefit those who want to stop farming in Clark County and the developer/construction industry. This proposal would tax those farms wanting to continue their business in Clark County more. Am I wrong in this assessment?

Sincerely,

Ruud van der Salm

Clark County Form Mailer, 2014
Dear Ruud Van der Salm:

Your email correspondence was forward to me so it can be included in the 2016 comp plan index. County staff will index your comment. I will however, suggest that you also contact the County Assessor (Peter Van Nortwick) at the County Assessor’s Office. The phone number is 397-2391. He or someone in his shop will be able to answer your questions relating to property tax and the potential tax implications of the proposed changes in Agriculture and Forest zones. The county is proposing to reduce the minimum parcel size in Agriculture from 20 to 10 and in Forest Tier II from 40 to 20. I hope this is helpful. Please, let me know if you have any further questions. Thanks.

Kind Regards,

Oliver
Jose/Mary Beth:

This is both for the SSR list and the comp plan index. Thanks.

Gordy

-----Original Message-----
From: Cnty 2016 Comp Plan
Sent: Thursday, November 06, 2014 9:40 AM
To: Orjiako, Oliver; Euler, Gordon
Subject: FW: 2016 Comp Plan comments submitted

Comp Plan Inbox comment below

-----Original Message-----
From: NoReply@Clark.Wa.Gov [mailto:NoReply@Clark.Wa.Gov]
Sent: Wednesday, November 05, 2014 2:27 PM
To: Cnty 2016 Comp Plan
Subject: 2016 Comp Plan comments submitted

Following comments were submitted online:

Parcel No: 182609000

Subject: Requested zoning changes

Comments:
The current proposal 2 has our parcel going from AG-20 to AG-10. We believe our parcel (6AC) should be zoned Rural-5, as are many surrounding parcels in the area. Please consider changing the proposed zoning in our area for parcels under 10AC to Rural-5 from AG-10. The parcel is too small to farm and Rural-5 gives us more flexibility for use. Thank you.

Submitted by:
Kurt and Peggy Olds

Email: pegolds11@gmail.com

Address:
Hi,

Property ID: 196181000
Address: 15500 NE 72ND AVE

I received notification that my property, which is currently zoned UR-10, may be rezoned to R-5. I would like to express my opinion that with all of the growth that has gone on around our property, I hope that this will pass and the property will be rezoned to R-5 (or even smaller). What do I need to do to help ensure that this change will occur?

Thanks for your time.
Russell E Carpio
Russell:

Thanks for the inquiry. Urban reserve is technically an overlay, even though there is an urban reserve zoning section (Section 40.210.040) in the county code. The proposal for the comprehensive plan update is to make urban reserve a true overlay. This means all parcels will have a rural zoning designation with an urban reserve (UR) overlay.

The bottom line is that nothing is going to change, land use-wise, with regard to your property. Your parcel would be zoned R-5 with a UR-10 overlay, and for land use you would continue to be subject to the urban reserve section of the code.

Gordy Euler
Clark County Community Planning

From: Cnty 2016 Comp Plan
Sent: Wednesday, November 12, 2014 12:43 PM
To: Orjiako, Oliver; Euler, Gordon; Alvarez, Jose
Subject: FW: 2016 Comp Growth Plan - Property ID 196181000

From the comp plan inbox. For your response.

MB

From: rec1130@comcast.net [mailto:rec1130@comcast.net]
Sent: Friday, November 07, 2014 12:26 PM
To: Cnty 2016 Comp Plan
Subject: 2016 Comp Growth Plan - Property ID 196181000

Hi,

Property ID: 196181000
Address: 15500 NE 72ND AVE

I received notification that my property, which is currently zoned UR-10, may be rezoned to R-5. I would like to express my opinion that with all of the growth that has gone on around our property, I hope that this will pass and the property will be rezoned to R-5 (or even smaller). What do I need to do to help ensure that this change will occur?

Thanks for your time.
Russell E Carpio
O'Donnell, Mary Beth

From: LaRocque, Linnea on behalf of Barnes, Ed
Sent: Monday, November 10, 2014 9:29 AM
To: Orjiako, Oliver
Cc: Tilton, Rebecca; O'Donnell, Mary Beth
Subject: FW: Clallam County Code: 31.06 WESTERN REGIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

From: Carol Levanen [mailto:cnidental@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, November 10, 2014 9:19 AM
To: Susan Rasmussen; Leah Higgins; Rick Dunning; Rita Dietrich; Jerry Olson; Fred Pickering; Jim Malinowski; Frank White; Benjamin Moss; Lonnie Moss; Melinda Zamora; Nick Redinger; Curt Massie; Marcus Becker; Zachary McIsaac; Carol Levanen; Clark County Citizens United Inc.; Silliman, Peter; Madore, David; Mielke, Tom; Barnes, Ed
Subject: Fw: Clallam County Code: 31.06 WESTERN REGIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

----- Forwarded Message -----
From: susan rasmussen <sprazz@outlook.com>
To: "cnidental@yahoo.com" <cnidental@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, November 8, 2014 9:20 PM
Subject: Clallam County Code: 31 06 WESTERN REGIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

Clallam County Code: 31.06 WESTERN REGIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

http://www.codepublishing.com/WA/ClallamCounty/mobile/index.pl?pg=ClallamCounty31/ClallamCounty3106.html#31.06.110

Sent from Windows Mail
Chapter 31.06
WESTERN REGIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

Sections:
31.06.010 RPC vision statement.
31.06.020 RPC belief statements.
31.06.030 Mission statement.
31.06.040 Vision.
31.06.050 Transportation - Inventory and analysis.
31.06.060 Transportation policies.
31.06.070 Public facilities and services.
31.06.080 Public facilities and services - Policies.
31.06.090 Rural land - Vision.
31.06.100 Rural land - Principles.
31.06.110 Rural land - Classifications.
31.06.120 Rural land - Definitions.
31.06.130 Rural land - Use matrix.
31.06.140 Rural land - Private property rights and critical area protection.

SOURCE: ADOPTED:
Ord. 583 11/07/95

AMENDED SOURCE: ADOPTED:
Ord. 725 08/06/02
Ord. 804 12/19/06
Ord. 852 07/21/09

31.06.010 RPC vision statement.
The Western Clallam County Regional Planning Commission (RPC) is a planning commission formulated by joint agreement of Clallam County and the City of Forks. Its mandate is to create a comprehensive land use plan for an area in Western Clallam County that is defined by the borders of the Quillayute Valley School District, as detailed in the attached map. This comprehensive plan will be submitted directly to the Clallam County Commissioners and the Forks City Council. The RPC serves as the first cooperative planning venture between Clallam County and the City of Forks.

31.06.020 RPC belief statements.
The residents of the RPC planning area believe that:

(1) Independence, private property rights and freedom from government intrusion are strongly valued within the RPC planning area. Land use regulation should incorporate these values and only compromise them when: (a) highly significant objectives essential to the public health, safety or welfare cannot be attained in any other manner, or (b) the other beliefs expressed herein cannot be furthered in any other manner.
(2) Development should be encouraged and facilitated by land use regulation that is simple, user friendly, and inexpensive in application for both government and property owners.

(3) The rural character of the RPC planning areas should be encouraged.

(4) Regulations that reduce the value or use of private property shall be minimized. All land owners shall be fully compensated for any such regulation.

(5) Proper planning should promote the efficient construction and use of capital facilities.

(6) Large development projects can place a strain on municipal services to the detriment of other users. Large developments should mitigate these impacts.

(7) Segregation of land uses into generally defined and flexible Residential, Commercial and Industrial zoning classifications is a desirable means of preventing incompatible adjacent land uses and stabilizing property values.

(8) Home-based industries are an essential part of the economic vitality of the planning area and should be permitted in all zoning classifications to the extent compatible with surrounding land uses.

(9) Land use regulation should not impose burdens upon existing land uses due to the subsequent development of adjacent, incompatible land uses.

(10) The “grandfathering” of land uses is fundamental to the protection of private property rights and is of the highest importance to the people of the RPC planning area. Existing land uses shall not be rendered invalid nonconforming uses by changes in land use regulation.

(11) Public lands make up a large part of the RPC planning area. How this land is managed impacts the citizens and communities of the area significantly. Local citizens shall be entitled to full participation and representation on the uses of public lands in their region in order to help ensure a more stable economy and environment for the local communities to preserve the local culture, heritage and customs.

31.06.030 Mission statement.

The Regional Planning Commission’s mission is to formulate a comprehensive land use plan that strikes a responsible balance between private property rights, economic diversity and the quality of the environment.

31.06.040 Vision.

The Regional Planning Commission Comprehensive Plan will serve as the foundation for land use regulation that will be simple, minimally intrusive and inexpensive to apply. This regulation will facilitate economic development. The Comprehensive Plan will also serve to encourage the rural character of the RPC planning area and to segregate the planning area into residential, commercial and industrial uses in a manner that is compatible with existing land uses but also stabilizes property values and promotes compatibility of adjacent land uses. The Comprehensive Plan will promote the efficient construction and use of local government capital facilities and the availability of affordable,
quality housing for all. The Comprehensive Plan shall also serve as a tool to increase local input in the federal land use decision making process.

31.06.050 Transportation – Inventory and analysis.

(1) GMA Goals.

(a) Encourage efficient multimodal transportation systems that are based on regional priorities and coordinated with County and City comprehensive plans.

(b) Ensure that those public facilities and services necessary to support development shall be adequate to serve the development at the time the development is available for occupancy and use without decreasing current service levels below locally established minimum standards.

(2) Definition. The transportation system is composed of air, water, and land transportation facilities and services, including highways and streets, paths, trails and sidewalks, transit, airports, and ports.

(3) Circulation System. The transportation and circulation system should function to serve the land use patterns established by the Comprehensive Plan. For example, rural areas should be served by a transportation system designed for rural uses while urban areas should be served by a circulation system designed to serve urban uses. The transportation system should also focus on connections, either between urban centers such as from Forks to Port Angeles, or from Clallam Bay to Forks, or between different “modes” of travel, such as automobiles to public transit. Some parts of the circulation system in this area serve County-wide and State-wide interests, such as Highway 101, Burnt Mountain Road, LaPush Road, and the Quillayute Valley Airport. It is imperative that the County-wide and State-wide interests are considered when making land use or facility decisions affecting these systems.

(4) Land Use Coordination. In the past, land use planning and transportation planning were not always coordinated. Impacts from growth on transportation facilities were seldom considered. Transportation planning was little more than remediating existing conditions rather than preventing deterioration of service. Conversely, roads and highways were built in rural areas which encouraged the conversion of these areas into higher densities or commercial centers. The Clallam County Comprehensive Plan indicates that the transportation system should be consistent with the land use plan.

(5) Level of Service. Level of service standards measuring the degree of traffic congestion are used to serve as a gauge to judge the performance of the transportation system. Level of service is ranked from “A” (free flowing, uncongested) to “F” (highly congested, failing). When land use assumptions are made based on expected population growth and subsequent traffic demand, transportation engineers determine whether the transportation system can accommodate the increased demand by using level of service (LOS) standards. Level of service standards are based on average daily traffic (ADT), posted speed limits and characteristics of the area that the road serves (rural, suburban, and urban).

The minimum level of service established in the County-wide Comprehensive Plan for County roads is LOS “C.” Minimum level of service for State Highways is LOS “D,” as prescribed by the Peninsula
Regional Transportation Planning Organization (PRTPO) These minimum standards indicate a traffic condition where flow of traffic is generally stable, but speeds are controlled by volume of traffic. This condition confines the drivers speed and freedom to maneuver and results in a poor level of comfort for the driver. Figure 2 indicates that all County roads are currently operating at or above these standards.

The forecast of future traffic on County roads in this Plan are based on two (2) methods: projected population growth and build-out potential based on proposed land use designations and their corresponding allowed densities. The latter is determined by first, examining the number of existing residences, businesses and other traffic generating entities within the region, and relating this to the average daily traffic counts for the road(s) serving the area. Next, using Clallam County Assessor records, the number of potential residences, business and other traffic generating entities are determined by figuring out how many “potential” parcels may exist under the allowed minimum lot sizes of the proposed land use designations. The increase from existing developments to potential developments directly correlates with the potential increase in average daily traffic. The forecast of traffic and its potential impact on adopted LOS standards is used to determine if the transportation system is capable of handling the demand. If the system is not capable of handling the demand, the Comprehensive Plan must identify how the system will be improved and financed, or the land use plan must be revised to ensure that the minimum “level of service” standards are met.

Figure 3 indicates that the current system is designed to handle the projected twenty (20) year population growth of this region for rural County roads. Even at build-out, only Highway 101 near the Forks Urban Growth Area would experience demand placing it below adequate level of service. Table 1 lists those rural County roads which will approach the minimum standard (C) by the year 2010 or if full build-out is to be realized.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road Name</th>
<th>Current LOS</th>
<th>LOS Year 2010</th>
<th>Current ADT</th>
<th>ADT Year 2010</th>
<th>ADT Based on Build-out</th>
<th>From Mile Post</th>
<th>To Mile Post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burnt Mountain Rd.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1,931</td>
<td>5,314</td>
<td>5,314</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hwy 101</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>9,300</td>
<td>19,654</td>
<td>19,654</td>
<td>189.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hwy 101</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>4,950</td>
<td>10,461</td>
<td>10,461</td>
<td>191.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaPush Rd.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1,344</td>
<td>3,865</td>
<td>3,865</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mora Rd.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>2,914</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow Lane</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,763</td>
<td>6,763</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(6) Road Standards. Level of service standards are an essential part of transportation planning, but they fail to provide a complete inventory of transportation needs and deficiencies. Design standards
relating to road and lane width are set forth in RCW 35.83.030 and RCW 43.32.020. Those standards are as follows:

Table 2
- Design Standards for County Roads

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADT</th>
<th>Below 150</th>
<th>150 – 400</th>
<th>401 – 750</th>
<th>751 – 1,000</th>
<th>1,001 – 2,000</th>
<th>2,001 – plus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Road Width</td>
<td>20 – 24 ft.</td>
<td>24 ft.</td>
<td>26 ft.</td>
<td>28 ft.</td>
<td>34 ft.</td>
<td>40 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Width</td>
<td>10 ft.</td>
<td>10 ft.</td>
<td>10 ft.</td>
<td>10 ft.</td>
<td>11 ft.</td>
<td>12 ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 lists County roads with standard width deficiencies. As demonstrated, most of the roadways with width deficiencies have acceptable or better LOS ratings. This clearly describes the discrepancy between LOS standards and road width standards. For example, although Erickson Road is currently at LOS "A" and would remain that way even at full build-out, it is clearly deficient in road width (fourteen (14) feet). LOS measures how free-flowing a roadway segment is, but fails to recognize whether the road meets minimum safety standards.

Table 3
- Deficient Road Widths with Corresponding LOS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road Name</th>
<th>Pavement Width</th>
<th>Current ADT</th>
<th>Current LOS</th>
<th>LOS Based on Build-out</th>
<th>Road Width Deficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>David Mansfield Rd.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erickson Rd.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heckle Rd.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucken Rd.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnolia Rd.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moriarty Rd.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walgren Rd.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(7) Private Roads. The transportation system in the West End Planning Region also includes private streets and easements, often unimproved, design to serve lots within short plats and surveys. A mechanism to upgrade these roads to land division and fire protection minimum standards should be in place to assist property owners developing property which does not directly abut a public street.

(8) Alternative Solutions. Solutions to transportation deficiencies may include incentives to change patterns of transportation behavior, such as car pooling rather than single occupancy vehicles, and enhancements to alternative modes of transportation that would be efficient and less costly to maintain, such as transit or bicycle lanes.

31.06.060 Transportation policies.

http://www.codepublishing.com/WA/ClallamCounty/mobile/index.pl?pg=... 11/12/2014
(1) Highway 101. Preserve and enhance the Highway 101 corridor for regional mobility to improve its functionality for business, area residents, tourists, nonmotorized transportation, freight and services.

(a) Encourage the Washington State Department of Transportation to retain all of their properties adjoining Highway 101 for future use as rest stops, scenic pullouts, roadside parks and future transit pullouts.

(b) Work with the Washington State Department of Transportation and other agencies to ensure that Highway 101 meets the goal that the corridor function regionally for the mobility of goods, services and passengers. Included in this goal would be review of State access policy to ensure the direct access to the highway from individual properties is minimized.

(c) Adopt regulations prohibiting access to Highway 101 when access to County/City roads is available or when shared access points are available.

(d) Highway 101 should have adequate shoulders for bicyclists. Current deficiencies should be corrected to encourage bicycle commuting. Storage facilities for bicycles should be available in conjunction with transit shelters along the corridor.

(e) Park-and-ride lots and transit shelters should be conveniently located along the Highway 101 corridor in the Forks Urban Growth Area and at intersections of County arterials and Highway 101.

(f) Passing lanes should be planned along the highway corridor in rural areas.

(g) The proliferation of stoplights on Highway 101 should be discouraged. New development should be encouraged to locate at existing intersections where stoplights are already in place.

(2) Rural Roads. The County has agreed to allow the City of Forks to plan for the Forks Urban Growth Area. This includes establishing goals and policies for the transportation system. In lieu of this, the following policies will deal with rural County roads in the West End Planning Region and those arterial roads that connect the UGA with the rural areas of the region.

(a) The County should not pursue new County roads outside of the Forks Urban Growth Area except in those circumstances where roads are built within subdivisions with private funds and then turned over to the County for maintenance.

(b) Road systems in rural and resource areas should be at rural and resource land standards which preserve the essential character of the land use.

Improvements should be made to regionally significant roads such as LaPush Road, Burm Mountain Road, Mora and Quillayute Road, in order to accommodate alternative modes of transportation including bicycles and transit, thus encouraging the reduction of single occupancy vehicle use and enhancing recreational opportunities in the West End Planning Region.

(c) The following road improvements have been identified based on LOS standards, improved circulation, and road width safety standards.

(i) Quillayute Road (Sol Duc River Bridge painting, engineering, construction);
(ii) Quillayute Road (Quillayute Weather Station to Mina Smith Road – regrade, drain, widen existing road and pave, engineering, right-of-way, construction).

(3) Road Standards. Improvements to County roads should consider the rural character of the West End Planning Region. Needed safety improvements should be the minimum necessary to address the safety problem, particularly in rural areas where country roads enhance the character of the area, as well as being a deterrent to speeding. In rural areas, limit the number of access points to County roads in order to limit impediments to traffic and to maintain open space qualities.

(a) When County roads are rebuilt in this area, forecasts of future traffic should be based on the following principles:

(i) If the road is on the regional transportation network (see Peninsula Regional Transportation Planning Organization – PRPTO), the road should be designed to accommodate transportation growth rates within the PRPTO plan.

(ii) If the County road is not on the regional transportation network, the road should be designed based on 50 percent of the potential build-out as indicated in the land use plan.

(b) Private road standards should allow for flexibility while meeting minimum safety requirements for emergency vehicles, except in those circumstances where it is in the best public interest to develop a public road. Right-of-way standards, improved widths, and surfacing of private roads should not be required at the same standard as public roads. The use of Road Improvement Districts (RIDs) should be encouraged to equitably share the cost of upgrading private roads to land division and fire protection standards.

(4) Paths, Trails and Sidewalks.

(a) Non-motorized travel should be promoted within the West End Planning Region for multipurpose recreation, when it is determined to be cost effective. The County should continue work on the design, construction, and maintenance of the Olympic Discovery Trail (ODT) and other trail systems, including Kugel Creek Bicycle Loop, the Snyder-Jackson Trail connecting the Forest Service ranger stations via Rugged Ridge, the Pacific Northwest Trail, Elk Creek Mountain Bike Loop, Clallam Bay-Sekiu Trail, Sekiu to Owens Park, the Coastal Tsunami Evacuation Route, and other trails as identified by community members and other trail groups and work to provide connector trails between the ODT and these systems to provide companion facilities such as rustic campgrounds.

(b) The following are the designated bicycle routes. All roads on a designated bicycle route should have a minimum improved shoulder width of three to five feet, depending on the speed limit of the road. However, in all such improvements, the additional costs associated with meeting bicycle requirements should only be funded if the benefits of such improvements outweigh the costs when compared to both current and projected bicycle use.

- Highway 101 - Burnt Mountain
- LaPush Road - Sol Duc Valley, Cooper Ranch and Clark Road Loop
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Mora Road  Sol Duc Hotsprings Road

(5) Multimodal.

(a) First priority for transit service and facility improvements should be for designated urban growth areas, rural centers (including tourist commercial designations), and routes along the regional transportation system.

(b) Park-and-ride lots and transit shelters should be conveniently located along the Highway 101 corridor in Forks, Beaver, Sappho and Quillayute Prairie Airport, and at the intersections of County arterials or collectors and Highway 101. Design park-and-ride lots with transit shelters and bicycle storage facilities on site.

(6) Airports.

(a) Ensure that land uses adjacent to the Quillayute Prairie Airport are compatible with the continued use of the airport for air transportation needs of the region.

(b) If developed for commercial use, provide adequate roadway connections between the Quillayute Prairie Airport and the existing major arterial streets, roads and highways serving the airport. Ensure that there are public transportation connections to the Quillayute Prairie Airport.

(7) Level of Service. The minimum acceptable level of service (LOS) standard for County roads in both rural and urban areas shall be LOS "C," using standard rating methodology.4

(8) Financing.

(a) Place high priority on investment and expenditure of limited public funds on the transportation system in urban growth areas and limit investment and expenditure in rural areas to arterial development connecting communities and neighborhoods.

(b) The existing transportation system should be maintained before expenditure of limited public funds on expanded facilities.

(c) Traditional funding sources should continue to be the primary funding source pay for improvements to County roads in the region.

(d) The County shall require new development to rectify and/or compensate for impacts to transportation facilities not meeting minimum safety standards or for developments expected to increase demand, such as average daily traffic (ADT), by more than 50 percent over current demand.

(9) Emergency Transportation Planning. The Clallam County Emergency Officer should coordinate with State and private timber land owners to draft an emergency road use compact. The intent of such a compact would be to provide alternative routes in the case of bridge failure or other road system failures that could potentially leave West End residents stranded from road access to the rest of the County and State.

31.06.070 Public facilities and services.
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(1) GMA Goals.

(a) Ensure that those public facilities and services necessary to support development shall be adequate to serve the development at the time the development is available for occupancy and use without decreasing current service levels below locally established minimum standards.

(b) Encourage development in urban areas where adequate public facilities and services exist or can be provided in an efficient manner

(c) Encourage the retention of open space and development of recreational opportunities, conserve fish and wildlife habitat, increase access to natural resource lands and water, and develop parks.

(2) Overview. It is more cost efficient to provide some public facilities and services when the population is concentrated, such as in an urban growth area. Through the designation of urban growth areas, Clallam County and other service providers can plan more cost effective and efficient services.

Growth increases the demand for new and/or improved public facilities and services. New residential growth may impact school facilities by having more school aged children without a corresponding increase in school facilities. Development can increase traffic levels on County roads and transit systems. Connections to water and sewer systems diminish the available capacity for future growth.

The overall purpose of this growth management plan is to identify urban areas where public facilities and services keep pace with growth so that service levels are not diminished; and plan for where facilities and services will be located.

(3) Definition. The Growth Management Act defines public facilities as streets, roads, highways, sidewalks, street and road lighting systems, traffic signals, domestic water systems, storm and sanitary sewer systems, parks and recreation facilities, and schools. Public services include fire protection and suppression, law enforcement, public health, education, recreation, environmental protection, and other governmental services.

(4) Schools. The West End regional planning area is serviced by the Quillayute Valley School District No. 402. Facilities include one elementary school with grades kindergarten through five, one middle school which includes grades six to eight, one high school with grades nine through twelve, and one alternative school. These facilities are currently located within the incorporated City of Forks. With 1,680 students currently being instructed and a projected annual growth rate of two (2) percent, there may be a need for future increases in school capacity over the twenty (20) year planning period. Due to the large rural nature of the West End Planning Region, location of future facility sites may need to be considered outside of the Forks urban growth area.

(5) Water. The City of Forks provides water for the City and some outlying residents in the immediate vicinity. The City's reservoir storage capacity is 1.9 million gallons. With an estimated peak load of 800,000 gallons, the City has the capability to expand service to over twice its current customers. This exceeds the requirements of the Forks urban growth area far beyond the twenty (20) year planning period.
(6) Sewer. Only a small portion of the City of Forks is serviced by a municipal sewer system. Rural areas in the West End Region are served by both community and private septic systems.

(7) Parks and Recreation. Recreational opportunities are abundant in the West End Planning Region. The Olympic National Park forms the eastern boundary of the region and includes a strip along the Pacific Coast to the west. The Sol Duc, Calawah and Bogachiel Rivers all have boat launch facilities located throughout these river systems. Resort facilities like the ones located at Bear Creek and Three Rivers provide sports fishermen and recreationalists with ample opportunities to enjoy the outdoors in a resort type atmosphere. However, it is believed that these will be insufficient to meet the growing demand for such facilities as the tourist oriented sector of the economy continues to grow. Ball parks and other sports facilities are located at Beaver and within the incorporated City of Forks. Tillicum Park within the City of Forks provides fifteen (15) acres of ball fields, tennis courts and other recreational facilities serving the local community. There are no golf courses in the region. Resort facilities and golf courses are recognized as the only significant deficiencies over the twenty (20) year planning period.

(8) Fire Protection and Suppression. Fire protection in the West End Planning Region is provided by Clallam County Fire Protection District #1. Volunteer forces operate from stations in Forks, Beaver and Three Rivers. Response to emergency medical calls is provided by the hospital district which operates from Forks Community Hospital. The fire district has a mutual aid agreement with District #6, the Washington State Department of Natural Resources, and the U.S. Forest Service. The district also provides structure protection for Olympic National Park. Fire protection districts, like hospital and library districts, are junior taxing districts. Funding for these junior taxing districts comes from property taxes.

(9) Public Health. The Forks Community Hospital located in the City of Forks provides a broad range of basic health services in the West End planning area. However, no transitional senior care facilities exist on the West End. Additional care is provided through Clallam County’s Home Health Care Program and the Quilalitule Tribal Indian Health Services. These facilities are needed to care for area residents through the twenty (20) year planning period. It is foreseeable that the projected growth will require further expansion in this area of service.

(10) Other Governmental Services. Clallam County provides no other direct governmental facilities within the West End planning area. Due to remote geographic conditions, consideration has been made in the past for satellite offices for some of the County’s services, such as law enforcement, health and community development. At this time, the most efficient use of these facilities is to continue basing them within Port Angeles.

One alternative to facility expansion is to pursue electronic networking technology as a means of expanding governmental resources and services to the residents of the West End and enhance interaction between those residents and the County seat in Port Angeles. As the population grows in the West End, the need for satellite facilities and increased services needs to be closely monitored.

(11) Financing. New development often pays for the cost of extending new public facilities and services. For example, if a development is proposed on a County road that is not adequate to handle additional traffic, the County is able to require the developer to pay the costs of improving the County...
road (called "mitigation"). Water and sewer systems are similarly financed. If a developer proposes to extend water and sewer to a property, it is the responsibility of the developer to pay the costs for extending those services.

Another way that development pays for the cost of extending new public facilities is through development fees. For example, the City of Forks requires anyone who hooks up to the sewer or water system to pay a connection fee. This fee is put into a special account for the eventual planning and upgrade of the system. This connection fee is in addition to requiring the developer to extend the actual collection or distribution lines.

This method of payment for public facilities and service extension is based on three (3) principles: (a) setting level of service standards for public facilities and services; (b) ensuring that public facilities and services necessary to support development are adequate to serve the development at the time the development is available for occupancy and use (called "concurrency"); and (c) requiring development to pay fees for the new facilities rather than rely solely on property taxes or grants to fund development of these public facilities.

31.06.080 Public facilities and services -- Policies.

(1) Schools.

(a) Expansion of existing school facilities should be encouraged within the Forks urban growth area where public facilities and services (e.g., water, sewer, transportation, fire and police) can be provided in an efficient manner.

(b) School facilities necessary to support development should be adequate to serve the development at the time the development is available for occupancy and use, or a financial commitment is in place to complete the improvements within six years without decreasing current service levels below established minimum standards.

(c) The County, City of Forks, State of Washington and the Quillayute Valley School District should work cooperatively to identify funding sources needed for improvements to school facilities caused by new development.

(2) Water.

(a) Public water systems should be provided within designated urban growth areas, rural centers, and tourist commercial areas. Public or municipal water systems (i.e., PUD and the City of Forks) should be limited in rural lands to those areas that can demonstrate water quantity limitations, water quality problems or hydraulic continuity to rivers and streams.

(b) Extension or existence of public water service in designated rural areas or resource lands shall not result in or be justification for higher density than that anticipated by a regional or subarea comprehensive plan.

(c) Level of service and facility standards should be developed by the water service provider, with standards set based on expected land use densities established by this Plan.
(d) Water systems necessary to support development shall be adequate to serve the development at the time the development is available for occupancy and use.

(3) Sewer. Please see County-wide Comprehensive Plan policies for specific reference to sanitary waste disposal within and outside of urban growth areas.

(4) Parks and Recreation.

(a) Identify and provide for increased recreational and public access opportunities to natural resource lands and water where appropriate.

(b) Encourage further development of public access to freshwater areas, particularly the Quillayute, Sol Duc, Bogachiel and Calawah Rivers.

(c) Methods of ensuring public access to public lands should be developed that do not adversely impact private land owners and commercial forestry operations.

(d) Parks and recreational facilities necessary to support development shall be adequate to serve the development as identified in the County Capital Facilities Plan, as now or hereafter amended.

(5) Fire Protection and Suppression. Fire protection and suppression facilities in urban areas should receive first priority. Fire flow (e.g., fire hydrants) in rural areas should not be required of new development or extension of public water systems except for commercial/industrial uses and public facilities.

(6) Other Governmental Services.

(a) Clallam County and other governmental service providers should continually monitor the population growth, age and other demographic characteristics of the population to determine the need for new or expanded services.

(b) Clallam County should work cooperatively with the City of Forks in pursuing a suitable location for a County courthouse annex should the need arise.

(c) Clallam County should actively pursue electronic networking technology as an alternative means of providing extension of public services and expanding the availability of governmental resources to the residents of the West End.

31.06.090 Rural land – Vision.

The mission of the Regional Planning Commission is to formulate a comprehensive land use plan that strikes a responsible balance between private property rights, economic diversity and the quality of the environment. The plan will serve as the foundation for land use regulations that will be simple, minimally intrusive, and inexpensive to apply. These regulations will facilitate economic development within the Forks urban growth area. The Comprehensive Plan will also serve to maintain the rural character of the areas outside of the urban growth area.
The characteristics of rural areas that residents currently enjoy should be maintained in the Plan. Large lot sizes and minimal nuisances like noise, lights, odor, or traffic should be found in rural areas. Small, home-based businesses and industries should be supported and encouraged.

The land base for private land use in this region is limited. Table 4 below demonstrates the actual acreage and percentage of lands within the planning area (Note: commercial forest lands in these tables indicate State and private lands. The Olympic National Forest has also been designated as commercial forest lands).

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural Lands</td>
<td>15,133</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Forest</td>
<td>142,892</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Forest Lands</td>
<td>118,884</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Park Lands</td>
<td>15,323</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forks UGA</td>
<td>4,787</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>1,052</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Neighborhood Conservation</td>
<td>2,591</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Low</td>
<td>7,543</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quillayute Residential</td>
<td>1,268</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourist Commercial</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Center</td>
<td>1,671</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribal</td>
<td>949</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31.06.100 Rural land – Principles.

The following principles guide the designation of rural lands and the permitted uses within the Western regional planning area:

(1) Tourist-related businesses should be supported throughout rural areas, including such uses as bed and breakfast inns, tourist shops, recreational activities and convenience services;

(2) Home-based business and home-based industry should be supported throughout rural areas;
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(3) Timber harvesting and agriculture are traditional activities and should be permitted throughout rural areas;

(4) Recognize the limited amount of private land for development and allow for greater flexibility in development regulations while still protecting adjacent landowners from impacts caused by land uses which may be objectionable;

(5) Residential structures should allow all types of housing opportunities with rural character protected by minimum lot size and maximum residential densities;

(6) Mini-day care centers or home schools should be permitted throughout rural areas;

(7) Commercial uses which are normally associated with rural areas should be permitted, such as horse arenas, commercial greenhouses, kennels and veterinarian clinics;

(8) Nuisances, e.g., noise, light, or odor, created by commercial or industrial uses in rural areas should be contained on-site through protection measures such as fencing, limited hours, reduction in traffic volumes, lighting standards, etc.;

(9) Accessory uses to the principal uses should be permitted in all zones;

(10) Planned unit developments or cluster subdivision options, where density of a parcel is transferred to a portion of a property, should be allowed in those circumstance where property is limited by natural constraints, such as wetlands, shoreline setbacks, geologic hazardous areas, and in areas designated rural low; provided, that lot sizes are not reduced below 2.4 acres;

(11) Major industrial and commercial development should be primarily focused into the Forks urban growth area, with some development as outlined allowed in rural areas;

(12) Rural centers and tourist commercial zones should be designated to allow for a mixture of commercial and residential uses in rural areas. These zones are where communities have been established historically and allowed for a variety of land uses.

31.06.110 Rural land — Classifications.

The following land use classifications outside of the Forks urban growth area and commercial forest designations are proposed:

(1) Rural Center. A land use classification intended for areas with a mixture of land uses, including commercial, residential and industrial.

(a) Standards.

Minimum Lot Size – One-half acre;

Maximum Residential Density – Based on health regulations;

Setbacks – Per existing Zoning Code;

(b) Permitted Uses. See matrix in CCC 31.06.130;
(c) Location. Proposed for Sappho, Beaver, Three Rivers, Quillayute Prairie Airport.

(2) Tourist Commercial. A land use classification intended for areas primarily devoted to providing services to the traveling public.

(a) Standards.

Minimum Lot Size – One-half acre;

Maximum Residential Density – Based on health regulations;

Setbacks – Per existing Zoning Code;

(b) Permitted Uses. See matrix in CCC 31.06.130;

(c) Location. Proposed for Bear Creek, Bogachiel River Bridge.

(3) Quillayute Residential. A land use classification intended primarily for areas with existing lots less than one acre in size outside of the Forks urban growth area.

(a) Standards:

Minimum Lot Size – One-half acre;

Maximum Residential Density – Based on health regulations;

Setbacks – Per existing Zoning Code;

(b) Permitted Uses. See matrix in CCC 31.06.130;

(c) Location. Proposed for Salmon Drive area, Whitcomb-Dimmel, Lake Pleasant and Quillayute River, and Quillayute Prairie

(4) Rural. A land use classification in areas where residential one-acre lots in rural areas are either currently the predominant land use or are proposed.

(a) Standards

Minimum Lot Size – One acre;

Maximum Residential Density – One dwelling unit per 2.4 acres;

(b) Permitted Uses. See matrix in CCC 31.06.130;

(c) Location. Proposed for various areas.

(5) Rural Neighborhood Conservation. A land use classification intended for those areas and persons who desire to live in a low density rural setting with limited encroachment of commercial and industrial activities.

(a) Standards.

Minimum Lot Size – One acre (one-half acre if clustered);
Maximum Residential Density – One dwelling unit per five acres subject to optional innovative zoning techniques triggered either by the size of the parcel (cluster technique) or by the varying character of the many existing neighborhoods found within this zoning district (overlay technique);

(b) Permitted Uses. See matrix in CCC 31.06.130

(c) Location. Proposed for various areas.

(6) Rural Low. A land use classification intended to provide homesites in rural forestry areas with limited encroachment of commercial and industrial activities.

(a) Standards.

Minimum Lot Size – 2.4 acres (flexible zoning allowed);

Maximum Residential Density – One dwelling unit per 4.8 acres;

(b) Permitted Uses. See matrix in CCC 31.06.130

(c) Location. Proposed for various areas.

31.06.120 Rural land -- Definitions.
For the purpose of this chapter, certain terms or words herein shall be interpreted as specifically defined in this chapter. All other words in this chapter shall carry the meanings as specified in Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary of 1980.

(1) "Accessory dwelling unit" means a separate dwelling unit within a single-family dwelling that complies with the standards set forth in this chapter and is accessory in nature to the main dwelling on the property. Accessory dwelling units are not computed when calculating density or minimum lot size.

(2) "Accessory improvements" means an improvement which is subordinate to or incidental to the main use of a parcel. Such improvements shall be, but are not limited to, fences, garages, storage sheds, walkways, driveways, utilities, sewage disposal systems, landscaping, off-street parking, guest houses and small buildings for workshop. Improvements which are detached from a dwelling unit located on the parcel and intended for overnight sleeping uses are an accessory improvement to a residential use.

(3) "Accessory uses" means a use which is normally subordinate to or incidental to the main use on the lot.

(4) "Agriculture" means improvements and activities associated with the raising and harvesting of crops and livestock.

(5) "Bed and breakfast inns" means a dwelling which is constructed or converted partially or entirely into an overnight, short-term boarding house which does not detract from the residential appearance of the structure.
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(6) "Church" means a building or buildings intended for religious worship including ancillary activity and improvements such as religious education, assembly rooms, kitchen, reading room, recreation hall and may include a residence for church staff. This definition does not include schools devoted primarily to nonreligious education.

(7) "Club" means an association of persons for a common object, jointly supported and meeting periodically in a given place.

(8) "Commercial use" means any premises devoted primarily to the wholesaling or retailing of a product or service for the purpose of generating an income.

(9) "Conditional use" means an activity or structure which is allowed by this chapter in one or more land use classifications. Conditional uses are those uses often not compatible within the zone in which they might be located because at times they may create a nuisance which might not be capable of being mitigated. A conditional use permit requires a public hearing, notice to adjacent property owners and is either approved, approved with conditions or denied by the County Board of Adjustment (or Hearing Examiner), appealable to the Board of County Commissioners.

(10) "Day care center" means a person or agency that provides care for thirteen (13) or more children during part of the twenty-four (24) hour day.

(11) "Density" means the number of dwelling units per gross acre of land.

(12) "Duplex" means a building containing two (2) dwelling units and not otherwise defined as an accessory dwelling or guest house.

(13) "Dwelling unit" means any building or any portion thereof which is intended or designed to be used, rented, leased, let or hired out to be occupied for living purposes having independent living facilities for one family including permanent provisions for living, sleeping, eating, cooking, sanitation and including accessory structures and improvements.

(14) "Greenhouse or nursery" means a structure or land devoted to the cultivation and sale of plants.

(15) "Grocery store" means a structure devoted primarily to the sale of staple foodstuffs and household commodities.

(16) "Guest house" means living quarters which are located on the same parcel with a principal single-family dwelling for the impermanent use by personal guests of the occupants of the principal single-family dwelling and which may not be rented or used as a permanent residential dwelling.

(17) "Home-based industry" means a commercial, manufacturing or processing business located on a parcel together with an existing dwelling. The industry is located in a fully enclosed building separate from the dwelling and no larger than 2,000 square feet, limited to no more than two (2) part-time or full-time employees other than the owner. An attached garage is considered as a building separate from the dwelling.

(18) "Home enterprise" means a revenue-generating enterprise which is located in a dwelling and is subordinate to and incidental to the residential use of the dwelling.
(19) "Home school" means a person or agency providing instruction during part of the twenty-four (24) hour day to twelve (12) or fewer persons in a home.

(20) "Horse arena" means an outside area or facility greater than 2,000 square feet in area for the commercial boarding, care, instruction or riding of horses.

(21) "Industrial use" means any premises devoted primarily to the manufacturing of semi-finished products, finished products and the processing of materials, to a degree that exceeds the definitions of home-based industries and home enterprises. This definition includes accessory facilities such as, but not limited to, storage facilities, transfer facilities, warehousing, heavy vehicular storage and repair, log storage and sorting.

(22) "Kennels" means an establishment which is designed to accommodate the temporary boarding of six (6) or more household pets owned by persons other than the owner of the premises.

(23) "Labor camp" means facilities which are designed to provide overnight sleeping, waste disposal and one cooking facility to serve the entire facility for the construction industry, timber management, etc.

(24) "Medical service facility" means a medical physicians clinic or outpatient care clinic where overnight accommodations are not provided.

(25) "Mineral extraction" means activities involved in the extraction of minerals from the earth for industrial, commercial, or construction uses, excluding water. For the purpose of this chapter, removal of solid materials from the earth is not deemed mineral extraction until the activity collectively results in more than three (3) acres of land being disturbed or that results in pit walls more than thirty (30) feet high and steeper than one horizontal to one vertical. This definition does not include disturbances greater than three (3) acres of land if the accumulative area that has not been rehabilitated according to the State’s reclamation requirements outlined in Chapter 78.44 RCW is less than three (3) acres. Farming, road construction, mineral exploration testing and site preparation for construction shall not be deemed mineral extraction activities.

(26) "Mini-day care center" means a person or agency providing care during part of the twenty-four (24) hour day to twelve (12) or fewer children in a facility.

(27) "Minimum lot size" means the smallest parcel upon which a dwelling may be placed or constructed; provided, that roads and open spaces, dedicated to the public, and tidelands shall be excluded when calculating lot size.

(28) "Mobile home park" means a lot or parcel of land occupied by two (2) or more mobile homes on a rent or lease basis, and approved by Clallam County pursuant to County regulations.

(29) "Motel" means a structure which provides overnight, short-term boarding to transient guests and not defined as a bed and breakfast inn facility.

(30) "Multiple-family dwelling" means a building containing three (3) or more dwelling units.

(31) "Outdoor oriented recreation use" means improvements and land use activities which are intended to provide for recreation activity which is carried on outside of buildings or which involves the
use and enjoyment of features of the surrounding environment to include but not be limited to campgrounds, boat launching facilities, golf courses, and ballfields.

(32) "Permitted use" means an activity or structure which is allowed in a zone pursuant to this chapter without conditions or formal action by the County, except as required by other chapters of the Clallam County Code. A permitted use includes uses and improvements which are customarily accessory to the use.

(33) "Professional offices" means a structure accommodating the following professional offices: medical, dental, chiropractic; accounting, consulting, cosmetologist, real estate offices or such other offices of persons required to be licensed by the State of Washington following completion of required training.

(34) "Public building" means a building which is used or owned by a governmental agency.

(35) "Race track" means an area devoted to the racing of motor and nonmotorized vehicles or animals, and all improvements normally associated with racing such as off-street parking, patron seating, and a fixed race track.

(36) "Recreational vehicle park" means a lot occupied by two (2) or more recreation vehicles as defined by State health laws for the purpose of lease or rent for overnight occupation.

(37) "Research facility" means an improvement devoted to or supporting research activities and having minimal nuisance characteristics related to odor, noise, glare and radiation. Research is an activity devoted to the obtaining of knowledge and does not include any product retailing or wholesaling activity. Testing for surface and subsurface minerals is not a research activity.

(38) "Retail use" means a land use devoted primarily to the sale of a product or service to the general public.

(39) School. For the purposes of this chapter, a "school" is a building where instruction is given to persons to enhance their knowledge or skills. Buildings where instruction is given primarily on religious matters are not deemed to be schools.

(40) "Single-family dwelling" means a dwelling unit detached from any other dwelling unit and intended for occupation by one family and including accessory improvements and uses. This definition includes manufactured homes such as mobile homes, modular homes and other homes manufactured in components or as one complete dwelling unit.

(41) "Solid or liquid waste disposal" means a facility typically owned and operated by a public entity for disposal of solid or liquid waste, including transfer stations, sewage facilities and biosolids.

(42) "Special use" means an activity, use or structure which is allowed in one or more land use classifications. Special uses are those uses normally compatible within the zone in which they are located but may at times create a nuisance which might be mitigated through issuance of the special use permit or denied if: (a) unable to be mitigated; or (b) found to be incompatible with other uses in the zone in which it is locating; or (c) is inconsistent with this chapter; or (d) is inconsistent with the comprehensive plan. A special use permit requires notice to adjacent property owners and is either
approved, approved with conditions or denied by County planning staff, appealable to the Board of County Commissioners.

(43) “Storage facility” means a building or fenced open yard used solely for the storage of goods and materials; provided, that automobile wrecking or salvage facilities are excluded from this definition.

(44) “Tavern” means any establishment with special space and accommodation for sale by the glass and for consumption on the premises, of beer and/or wine.

(45) “Timber harvesting” means limited improvements and activities associated with the growing and harvesting of trees that will have only minimal impact on neighboring residential uses when undertaken in rural land use zones. Such activity includes timber harvesting; land preparation for tree planting; road construction; tree thinning; brush control; temporary storage of logs, materials, vehicles and equipment supporting timber growing on-site; temporary chipping and barking of timber harvested on site utilizing portable equipment; and minor extraction of gravel and rock necessary to support timber management activity on-site (and not otherwise defined as mineral extraction).

(46) “Timber management activity” means improvements and activities associated with the growing and harvesting of trees. Such activity includes land preparation for tree planting, road construction, tree thinning, brush control, log storage and sorting yards, tree nursery facilities, research activity related to timber growing, improvements required for environmental impact mitigation, temporary chipping and barking activity utilizing portable equipment, storage of materials, vehicles and equipment supporting timber growing, harvesting and transportation activities, staging areas and facilities, timber transshipment facilities, log scaling facilities, the extraction of gravel and rock necessary to support timber management activity and all other silviculture and associated practices which are recognized by and consistent with the regulations of the Washington State Forest Practices Act of 1974.

(47) “Tourist shop” means a facility devoted primarily to the sale of a product or service to the traveling public, including antique or curio shops, crafts, memorabilia.

(48) “Unclassified use” means an activity or land use not listed as permitted, special or conditional use, or prohibited in this Plan.

(49) “Utility” means a fixed, conveyance type improvement serving two or more ownerships. Said improvement conveys power, gas, water, sewage, surface drainage, and communication signals. This definition does not include intercounty or interstate transmission facilities.

(50) “Vehicular repair” means a structure or land use devoted to the repair of motor vehicles and not otherwise defined as a home-based industry.

(51) “Wrecking yard or junk yard” means an open area where scrap materials or motor vehicles are bought, sold, exchanged, recycled, stored, disassembled or handled, but which cannot be used again for the purpose for which it was originally intended.

31.06.130 Rural land – Use matrix.
The attached rural land use matrix identifies a range of land uses which may be permitted within one of the rural land use zones. Although there are six rural land use zones, the three zones of rural, rural moderate and rural low have been identified as similar in nature and therefore the permitted uses are proposed to be identical. There are three types of permitted land uses: permitted outright, special use, and conditional use. See definitions in CCC 31.06.120 for explanation of these terms.

Table 6
– Rural Land Use Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Rural Center</th>
<th>Tourist Commercial</th>
<th>Quillayute Residential</th>
<th>Rural Neighborhood Conservation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accessory dwelling units</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bed and breakfast inn</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>Conditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churches</td>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>Conditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clubs</td>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>Conditional (Lodges)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial greenhouse</td>
<td>Special</td>
<td>Special</td>
<td>Special</td>
<td>Conditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial storage facility</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>Special</td>
<td>Conditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day care center</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>Special</td>
<td>Family day care permitted; child day care center conditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplex dwellings</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>Conditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas stations</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>Prohibited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grocery stores</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>Special</td>
<td>Prohibited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home enterprise</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home-based industry</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>Conditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horse arena</td>
<td>Special</td>
<td>Special</td>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor camps and staging areas</td>
<td>Special</td>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>Prohibited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial use</td>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>Prohibited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical service facility</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>Special</td>
<td>Prohibited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mineral extraction</td>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>Conditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mini-day care center or home school</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>Private schools with less than 50 students Conditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile home parks</td>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>Prohibited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motel</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>Prohibited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple-family dwelling</td>
<td>Special</td>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>Prohibited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor-oriented recreation use</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>Special</td>
<td>Special</td>
<td>Conditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned unit developments</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>Prohibited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power generation facilities greater than five megawatts</td>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>Prohibited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional office</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>Special</td>
<td>Prohibited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public buildings and facilities</td>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>Conditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race track</td>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>Prohibited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research facilities</td>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>Prohibited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>Prohibited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail store</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>Prohibited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock crushing and asphalt plants</td>
<td>Special</td>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>Prohibited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RV parks</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>Conditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>Special</td>
<td>Special</td>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>Prohibited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-family dwellings</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>Conditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid or liquid waste disposal</td>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>Prohibited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tavern</td>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>Prohibited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timber harvesting</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timber management activity</td>
<td>Special</td>
<td>Special</td>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>Conditional (small scale); otherwise Prohibited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourist shops</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>Prohibited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified use</td>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>Prohibited unless authorized as a similar use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities and fire protection</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>Conditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicular repair</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>Prohibited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinarian clinic and kennels</td>
<td>Special</td>
<td>Special</td>
<td>Special</td>
<td>Conditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrecking yard</td>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>Prohibited</td>
<td>Prohibited</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
31.06.140 Rural land – Private property rights and critical area protection.

Residents in the West End Planning Region have historically enjoyed a rural lifestyle that, due to their remote location and traditional occupations, has been largely free from government regulations and intrusion. Industries such as commercial forestry and cattle farming have helped to foster a strong sense of independence throughout the West End community. This sense of independence is further strengthened by the remoteness of the region. The opportunities and options available in more metropolitan areas are not as readily available in the West End, making self-sufficiency more of an imperative.

In recent years, regulations aimed at protecting environmentally sensitive areas from degradation have been implemented throughout the region. While there is little debate over the need to protect environmentally sensitive areas, the methods employed to achieve this end are considered by many to be excessive and burdensome to affected property owners.

The West End Planning Commission feels it is both possible and necessary to strike a balance between the protection of valuable environmental amenities and private property rights. The following policy is designed to help achieve this goal:

Zoning ordinances, when applied to real property subject to the Clallam County Critical Areas Ordinance, the Shoreline Management Act, or the Floodplain FIRM Map/Management Plan (e.g., wetlands, steep slopes, floodplains, etc.), shall permit the transferring of densities from that portion of the parcel subject to the applicable ordinance to the remaining non-critical area portion of the property. However, no density will be allowed on the noncritical area acreage that would exceed the density allowed for the entire parcel (both critical area portions and noncritical area portions). In addition, all densities shall be subject to prevailing health codes.

While this policy shall apply to all land use designations, it will only be utilized with lands designated as being subject to the Clallam County Critical Areas Code, the Shoreline Management Act, and/or the Floodplain FIRM Map/Management Plan.

An example of this transferring of densities would be as follows:

Developer owns a parcel of land that consists of a total of 15 acres in a zoning district that allows a maximum residential density of one dwelling unit per five acres. Under the zoning code, the property could be divided to create three lots for future single-family development. However, 10 acres are located within the FIRM 100-year floodplain, and one acre is designated as steep slopes (i.e., landslide hazard areas). Transferring of densities would allow the developer to still create three lots; provided, that each lot contains adequate potential building sites outside of the floodplain and steep slope areas, and that the land division complies with all applicable public health codes.

1 The PRTPA consists of representation from four (4) counties (Clallam, Jefferson, Kitsap and Mason), nine (9) cities, four (4) transit agencies, eighteen (18) port districts, ten (10) Tribal Nations, the Washington State Department of Transportation, and the private sector. The PRTPA has been working for the last four (4) years to develop a Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The goal of the PRTPA is to coordinate the regional transportation planning activities for the Olympic and Kitsap Peninsulas.
2 Based on 1990 U.S. Census information.

3 Build-out analysis indicates what would happen if development was to occur at the maximum allowed density. It is useful in determining the adequacy of a facility in a "worst case scenario," but does not represent conditions likely to occur.

4 The standard rating methodology for Clallam County roads is the Highway Capacity Manual – Florida Model.

5 Based on 1990 U.S. Census figures.
Pacific County has 5, 10 and 25 acre forest. Agriculture is confined to cranberry bogs and allows 5 and 10 acre zones
http://www.co.pacific.wa.us/pdfs/Comprehensive%20Plan.pdf
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PACIFIC COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

RESOLUTION NO. 98-089

A RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE PACIFIC COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN
AND RESCINDING CONFLICTING RESOLUTIONS AND DOCUMENTS

WHEREAS, the Board of Pacific County Commissioners (Board) passed Resolution 90-123 on October 30, 1990, and thereby agreed to implement the requirements of the Growth Management Act (GMA) as contained in SHB No. 2929 (Washington Laws, 1990 1st Ex. Sess., Ch. 17), subject to adequate funding from the State of Washington;

WHEREAS, Chapter 36.70A RCW requires the County to adopt a Comprehensive Plan that meets specified GMA goals and addresses the mandated GMA elements;

WHEREAS, the Pacific County Planning Commission and Pacific County Department of Community Development have produced a Comprehensive Plan that meets the specified GMA goals and addresses the mandated GMA elements;

WHEREAS, during review of the Comprehensive Plan, the Pacific County Planning Commission completed an extensive public review process that exceeds the requirements of Resolution 96-032, the Pacific County Enhanced Public Participation Strategy;

WHEREAS, the Pacific County Planning Commission compiled a public records of 234 items including studies, documents, and correspondence that was carefully considered during review of the Comprehensive Plan;

WHEREAS, the Pacific County Planning Commission relied upon best available science in specifying Comprehensive Plan content, goals, and policies;

WHEREAS, the Comprehensive Plan has been reviewed by affected State and local agencies and found to be in compliance with the requirements of the GMA;

WHEREAS, the Pacific County Planning Commission completed a thorough SEPA public review process, conducted an extended threshold determination and scoping process, and completed both a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and a Final EIS;

WHEREAS, the Board has conducted a closed record hearing to consider the recommendations of the Pacific County Planning Commission along with other public comment pertaining to the Comprehensive Plan;
WHEREAS, a number of pre-existing land use policies and plans that conflict with the goals and policies in the GMA and Comprehensive Plan should be rescinded to avoid conflict or confusion; now therefore,

IT IS HEREBY RESOLVED that the Board of Pacific County Commissioners adopts the 1998 Pacific County Comprehensive Plan as amended, accepts the draft Environmental Impact Statement, adopts the Final Environmental Impact State, adopts the attached findings of fact and conclusions of law, and accepts the attached record compiled by the Pacific County Planning Commission;

IT IS FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board of Pacific County Commissioners rescinds the following conflicting resolutions, plans and/or studies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Cove-Grayland Comprehensive Plan</td>
<td>84-049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Beach Comprehensive Plan</td>
<td>89-028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willapa Bay Water Resources Management Plan</td>
<td>91-070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seaview SubArea Comprehensive Plan</td>
<td>95-047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim Urban Growth Areas</td>
<td>95-081</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IT IS ALSO FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board of Pacific County Commissioners finds that the 1989 Dunes Management Plan has never been adopted, and is therefore neither in force, nor in conflict with the GMA and/or this Comprehensive Plan.

PASSED by the Board of Pacific County Commissioners in regular sessions at South Bend, Washington, by the following vote, then signed by its membership and attested by its Clerk in authorization of such passage the 13th day of October, 1998:

2 YEA; 1 NAY; 0 ABSTAIN; and 0 ABSENT.

BoD of PACIFIC
COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
PACIFIC COUNTY, WASHINGTON

Jon C. Kaino, Jr. – Chairperson

ATTEST:

Kathy Taylor

Clerk of the Board

Norman "Bud" Cuffel - Commissioner

Pat Hamilton – Commissioner
From: NoReply@Clark.Wa.Gov
Sent: Monday, November 10, 2014 9:21 PM
To: Cnty 2016 Comp Plan
Subject: 2016 Comp Plan comments submitted

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Following comments were submitted online:

Parcel No: 222536000

Subject: AG 20 to AG 10

Comments:
We support the proposed zoning change from AG 20 to AG 10. The main reason is that we would like to be able to leave our property to two family members rather than one. My great grandfather, JR Anderson, homesteaded our property. Thank you.

Submitted by:
Peggy and Brett Hansen

Email: plh27@tds.net

Address:
6618 NE JR Anderson Rd.
La Center, WA 98629
Following comments were submitted online:

Parcel No: 986027183

Subject: Property Owner Comment

Comments:
We’re the owners of 4 adjoining twenty acre parcels, 986027183, 986027184, 986027185, 226268000. We are extremely pleased that you are proposing to change our AG 20 to AG 10. We feel 10 acre zoning is more than sufficient to provide profitable opportunities for small specialty farms near urban areas. Dave and Valerie Larwick

Submitted by:
Valerie and Dave Larwick

Email: larwick@tds.net

Address:
16104 N.E. 259th St.
Battle Ground, WA
O'Donnell, Mary Beth

From: Steve Nylund <steve@deltamotion.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 12, 2014 10:27 AM
To: Cnty 2016 Comp Plan
Subject: Growth Plan Update - Prop ID: 248067000
Attachments: Proposed Zoning Change for Prop ID 248067000.pdf

Clark County Planning Group,

I received a notice of a proposed change in zoning from FR-40 to FR-20 that would apply to my tree farm in the Dole Valley area (ID# 248067000).

I want to convey my strong support for this proposed change in zoning. This property is a family tree farm, and the proposed zoning will give my family more options in the future, especially if one or more of my children would like to live on the property someday.

When I looked at the private parcels that are at least 50% contained within a nine square mile area centered on my property (see map below and attached), I counted the following:

- 40 acres or more: 4 parcels including mine (from 40 to 47 acres – orange on map)
- 20 to 39 acres: 9 parcels (from 20 to 39 acres – blue on map)
- 10 to 29 acres: 15 parcels (from 10 to 29 acres – yellow on map)
- Less than 10 acres: more than 130 parcels (down to 0.41 acre – green and violet on map)

Since there are so many small parcels in the immediate area, a smaller designation would be appropriate. In fact, 5, 6, or even .5 or 10 acres would be an even better designation for this property if that were possible. (Six acres might be the perfect size for a micro tree farm, allowing for a home site and five acres in forest). However, FR-20 is much preferable than FR-40 and I appreciate and support this decision.

Thank you all for your work on this Comprehensive Growth Management Plan.

Best regards,
Steve Nylund / Manager
SJIN+ LLC (Steve and Julie Nylund family tree farm)
19712 NE 174th Street,
Brush Prairie, WA 98606
360-896-4161
Map showing properties that are at least 50% contained within a nine square mile area centered on parcel 24806700:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Color</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Number of parcels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>40 acres or more</td>
<td>4 parcels (from 40 to 47acres)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>20 to 39 acres</td>
<td>9 parcels (from 20 to 39 acres)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>10 to 29 acres</td>
<td>15 parcels (from 10 to 29 acres)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green, Violet</td>
<td>Less than 10 acres</td>
<td>more than 130 parcels (down to 0.41 acre)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>N/A - Not Private property (State Forest Land)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TO: Clark County Commissioners

P. O. Box 9810, Vancouver, WA 98666

RE: Clark County Comprehensive Growth Management Plan

Property Parcels 196324000 and 196324005 at above address.

We hereby request that these two parcels be included in the adjacent Urban Growth area via a boundary line adjustment.

This is a logical revision to the Comprehensive Plan for the following reasons:

> This would be a natural, unobstructed extension of the current Urban Growth Boundary, with 146th Street a logical northern boundary for the UGB.

> These parcels are in our common ownership with adjacent parcels which are within the Urban Growth Boundary and are zoned R1-7.5.

> These properties are in the path of development, with residences to the north and east, and the Pleasant Valley Schools on the west across 50th Avenue.

> If single homes were built on these 2.5-acre parcels, it would be difficult to later develop the properties to compatible uses within the UGB.

> Existing roads can be improved to facilitate traffic flow into the north edge of the UGB and south of Salmon Creek.

Thank you,

James G. Youde
Judith Youde

14201 NE 50th Avenue, Vancouver, WA 98686
Dear Planning Commissioners:

We are in agreement with the proposed changes to reduce the current zoning R-20 to R-10. We feel we can be just as good stewards of our land with the decrease in acreage. We are surrounded by smaller lot sizes and believe we should also have the right to reduce the size of our property to be in keeping with the rest of our neighbors. Thanks for your consideration of this matter.

Sincerely, Wayne and Patricia Torjusen
Sent from my iPad
For the index.

From: Cnty 2016 Comp Plan
Sent: Wednesday, November 12, 2014 12:51 PM
To: Euler, Gordon; Orjlako, Oliver
Subject: FW: HARRASSMENT AND BROWBEATING FOR MORE TAX $ PARCEL #265517000

This is the woman who left the hostile voice message last Friday.

From: David & Linda [mailto: gutntag@tds.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 11, 2014 2:14 PM
To: Cnty 2016 Comp Plan
Subject: HARRASSMENT AND BROWBEATING FOR MORE TAX $ PARCEL #265517000

Thank you. Your e-mail was successfully sent.
The following message was sent to Representative Richard DeBolt of the 20th District

TO: Representative Richard DeBolt


FROM: LINDA BODALY gutntag

STREET ADDRESS: 11105 NE 379th St La Center, WA 98629

EMAIL: gutntag@tds.net

PHONE: (360) 694-7934

SUBJECT: clark county tax ID# 265517000 tax increase for quote "growth management plan" or should I say the democrat "war on old women"

I have been harassed by this bunch for the last 2 years, the only reason I purchased this place and allowed these morons to collect about $ 6,000 in excise tax is because it was one parcel under AG-- I run a farm moved here to be LEFT ALONE not to receive flyers telling me how they can improve my life (just like OBAMACARE --we the voters are too STUPID to know what they're up to) trying to take my land for URBAN RESERVE AND HOLDING --- CHANGES SO THEY CAN TELL ME WHAT TO DO---SMALLER LOTS SO THEY CAN TAX ME MORE--- I thought that I lived in the US and not Nazi Germany---frankly at this point
I think Nazi Germany was more up front in their dealings than this bunch-- it is disheartening to see our country go to hell any assistance in this matter would be appreciated thank you

RESPONSE: You have requested a response from Representative Richard DeBolt
Verbatim voice message left 11/06/14, 9:59 am from property owner Linda Bodaly: 265517-000

You have harassed me for the past two years regarding trying to go ahead and correct my zoning. I did not request a correction for zoning. The only reason I bought the place is because it had the zoning it had. I don’t need your assistance, I don’t really give a damn what the hell you’re planning, it’s not my plan for my property. I worked and paid for it, and I guess this is the war on women since I’m 68 years old and you people have been picking on me for the last two years. Let me tell you, you will get an email, you will get a letter, also addressed to the Clark County Commissioners and my state reps.

Good bye
O'Donnell, Mary Beth

Sent: Friday, November 07, 2014 10:21 AM
To: Albrecht, Gary; Alvarez, Jose; Anderson, Colete; Euler, Gordon; Hermen, Matt; Kamp, Jacqueline; McCall, Marilee; Lebowsky, Laurie; Niten, Jeff; O'Donnell, Mary Beth; Orjiako, Oliver
Cc: Snell, Marty; Keltz, Mary; Silliman, Peter
Subject: FW: Voice Message from Day Main Menu Tel: 3602633542
Attachments: 976AC483-28EB-41BA-97C1-853102642855.WAV

All:

Thought you should be aware of this. Parcel #265517000 is 26.7 acres zoned AG-20; the owner according to Maps-online is Linda Bodaly. I'm guessing she got a postcard re the proposed change from AG-20 to AG-10, and it sounds like she got a postcard for the rural preference census as well since she refers to being 'harassed' for the last two years.

Gordy

From: sa.CXEUM
Sent: Thursday, November 06, 2014 9:59 AM
To: Euler, Gordon
Subject: Voice Message from Day Main Menu Tel: 3602633542

Sender's comments are located in WAV file at end of message.
November 16, 2014

Clark County Community Planning
1300 Franklin Street-1st Floor
Vancouver, Washington 98660

Re: Growth Plan Update for Parcel # 265517000

As I mentioned in my voice mail and email I DO NOT want rezoning of my property. The reason I purchased this land was because it had the current zoning and was one parcel. I spent my life's savings and don't recall the county or any of my neighbors asking if they could contribute to the purchase price with 25% or 50% nor do I recall being told that there will be an attempt to rezone especially with the explanations of:

. Smaller minimum lot sizes
. Changes in uses allowed in specific areas (of course not mentioned as to what) surprise later
. Urban reserve and urban holding (that's my favorite) goes back to who paid for the land
. Proposed road classification, unexplained

This is a classic land grab, attempt to raise property taxes, redistribution and government control. Typical move one would expect from the Nazis or Communists, people moved to the US to get away from these tactics. I would like to retire in peace; you can pry it from my cold dead hands until then LEAVE ME ALONE.

Linda M Bodaly

cc: Clark County Commissioners
Comments on the Pleasant Highlands Proposed Circulation Plan
Dated November 13, 2014

The below named individuals join together and ask that the Pleasant Highlands Proposed Circulation Plan be modified to preserve NE 129th Street as a dead-end street with the present outlet on NE 72nd Avenue.

The community served by NE 129th Street and its feeder dead-end roads (NE 66th Avenue, NE 68th Avenue, NE 71st Avenue, and NE 126th Street) is an established community that has existed for many years. The community has a great desire to preserve the quality of life enjoyed for over 30 years by the community.

On November 15, 2012, after learning about a Sub-area plan being proposed that showed NE 129th Avenue becoming a through street from NE 50th Avenue to NE 72nd Avenue, several landowners in our community attended a Clark County Planning Commission Meeting where we expressed our concerns. In response to our concerns, the Clark County Planning Commission unanimously voted against recommending that NE 129th Street become a through street and sent the matter back to the planners. At that time, Jeff Niten promised to contact us when the planners began to look at future road plans for this area.

Towards the end of October, 2014, some members (not all) of our community received a notice of a "Road Plan Update." The body of the notice stated that Clark County was revising its Comprehensive Growth Management Plan and spoke about new roads being added to county plans. Some of us looked on the Clark County website at the Comprehensive Growth Management Plan alternatives, the zoning plans, and the identified road plan on the web site. We saw no proposed road changes for our immediate area. However, upon attending an open house on October 30, 2014, we learned that what the Clark County Planning Commission had unanimously rejected in 2012 was now back on the proposed plans in a document called the Proposed Arterial Atlas Amendments map.

In the comments from the Pleasant Highlands Neighborhood Association dated September 30, 2006 to the Draft EIS for the CGMP for Clark County, August 2006, the association stated: "It is crucial that developments of the magnitude allowed by the sheer size of the developable land east of NE 50th Avenue and NE 139th Street be compatible with current quiet Residential land use." During the comment period prior to the adoption of the Comprehensive Growth Management Plan, the community served by NE 129th Street sent in its own petition with 33 signatures asking that the lots accessed by NE 129th Street be zoned at R1-20. We received no response from the county. We chose to live in this neighborhood because of its quiet residential character. We continue to urge the county to protect the quiet residential characteristic of this community.

For the reasons stated on the record in 2012 and for the reasons that the land in our community is already developed, that livability is impacted when traffic is directed through established neighborhoods, that it already is difficult trying to get on to 72nd Avenue, that such difficulty would be greatly increased if the road became a through street, that our community has existed for over 30 years and we wish to maintain our community's qualities for future generations, all of which we explained in a meeting with Laurie Lebowsky and Matt Hermen on November 6, 2014, we request that the proposed plan to make NE 129th Street a through street between NE 50th Avenue and NE 72nd Avenue be changed so that NE 129th Street will dead-end on its west terminus at or near NE 61st Avenue with the sole outlet remaining on NE 72nd Avenue.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Printed Name</th>
<th>Mailing Address</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1611 NE 69th Ave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13021 NE 66th Ave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>360 574 1956</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13621 NE 66th Ave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13113 NE 66th Ave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Printed Name</td>
<td>Mailing Address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nancy Cress</td>
<td>6420 NE 129th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Telephone: 360-517-7308</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Michael Cress</td>
<td>6400 NE 124th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Telephone: 573-736-88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Michael Cress</td>
<td>1284 NE 16th Ave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Telephone: 761-777-1167</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Kirby Robinson</td>
<td>12711 NE 66th Ave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:robinson@kirby796656.com">robinson@kirby796656.com</a></td>
<td>Telephone: 949-8522</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Jack L. Robinson</td>
<td>13711 NE 66th Ave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Telephone: 360-574-4476</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>半軸</td>
<td>1325 66th Ave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Telephone: 360-574-4476</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Lila A. Cress</td>
<td>1242 NE 124th St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Telephone: 860-734-6769</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Janice J. Cress</td>
<td>4115 NE 124th St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Telephone: 560-601-5253</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Printed Name</td>
<td>Mailing Address</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michael C. Blessley</td>
<td>12708 NE 68th Ave, 98186</td>
<td>(360) 576-6111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Valerie K. Blessley</td>
<td>12708 NE 68th Ave, 98186</td>
<td>(360) 576-8111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12014 NE 68th Ave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8824 NE 68th St.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>505 5th Ave. W.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>750 7th Ave. W.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Printed Name</td>
<td>Mailing Address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lynne Libby</td>
<td>1300 NE 129th Ave.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:lyndalibby@comcast.net">lyndalibby@comcast.net</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phone: 903-994</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cindy Symes</td>
<td>6511 NE 129th St.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:csymes@end.com">csymes@end.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phone: 360-374-2782</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paige Amory</td>
<td>6514 NE 129th St.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:paiges@gmail.com">paiges@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phone: 360-749-3386</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ken Christiansen</td>
<td>1211 NE 127th St.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:kchristiansen@uml.com">kchristiansen@uml.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phone: 503-304-2573</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pamela M. Schweigert</td>
<td>13018 NE 24th Ave.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:pmschweigert@uml.com">pmschweigert@uml.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phone: 206-524-1075</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Printed Name</td>
<td>Mailing Address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kay E. Towne</td>
<td>1300 NE 66th Ave.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:townekay@comcast.net">townekay@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>Telephone: 971-522-7716</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Jackson C. Towne</td>
<td>1300 NE 66th Ave.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jacksontowne@comcast.net">jacksontowne@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>Telephone: 503-756-7613</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Connie Cobb</td>
<td>12621 NE 66th Ave.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cocoraco@msn.com">cocoraco@msn.com</a></td>
<td>Telephone: 360-546-1016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Roland Cobb</td>
<td>12621 NE 66th Ave.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cocoraco@msn.com">cocoraco@msn.com</a></td>
<td>Telephone: 360-546-1016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Charles R. Stuart</td>
<td>6614 NE 129th St.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rstuart98@yahoo.com">rstuart98@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>Telephone: 360 573 3897</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Irene D. Stuart</td>
<td>6614 NE 129th St.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Telephone: 360 573 3897</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Telephone: 253-721-7967</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thank you for coming.

Please plan that 129th Street dead and somewhere around 61st Ave. for 72nd Ave.

Contact Name: JAMES GRAFFY
Email: jjgraffy@aol.com
Phone No.: 360-609-2523
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRINT NAME</th>
<th>MAILING ADDRESS</th>
<th>PRINT - E-MAIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jane E. Michael</td>
<td>13113 NE 60th Ave, Vancouver, WA 98686</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson &amp; Kay Towne</td>
<td>13000 NE 60th Ave, Vancouver, WA 98686</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay S. Amerly</td>
<td>6514 NE 129th St, Vancouver, WA 98686</td>
<td><a href="mailto:clark.amery@axl.com">clark.amery@axl.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel Cobb</td>
<td>12621 NE 66th Ave, Vancouver, WA 98686</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rachel.cobb@gmail.com">rachel.cobb@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curtis Cobb</td>
<td>12621 NE 66th Ave, Vancouver, WA 98686</td>
<td><a href="mailto:roccocabo@msn.com">roccocabo@msn.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bobbi Cobb</td>
<td>12621 NE 66th Ave, Vancouver, WA 98686</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Richard Stuart</td>
<td>6614 NE 129th St, Vancouver, WA 98686</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rstuart@yahoo.com">rstuart@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Gold</td>
<td>12819 NE 66th Ave, Vancouver, WA 98686</td>
<td><a href="mailto:renegade894@Gmail.com">renegade894@Gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis &amp; Linda Stewart</td>
<td>13003 NE 68th Ave, Vancouver, WA 98686</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lindastewart2@msn.com">lindastewart2@msn.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darren &amp; Lyndal Libby</td>
<td>13012 NE 68th Ave, Vancouver, WA 98686</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lyndalibby@comcast.net">lyndalibby@comcast.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Groffy</td>
<td>6713 NE 129th St, Vancouver, WA 98686</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jjgroffy@aol.com">jjgroffy@aol.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy Bode</td>
<td>6615 NE 129th St, Vancouver, WA 98686</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ns4092@gmail.com">ns4092@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Magnusson</td>
<td>7103 NE 129th St, Vancouver, WA 98686</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dmagnusson@gmail.com">dmagnusson@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For the index.

-----Original Message-----
From: Cnty 2016 Comp Plan
Sent: Wednesday, November 12, 2014 12:48 PM
To: Euler, Gordon; Orjiako, Oliver
Subject: FW: 2016 Comp Plan comments submitted

From comp plan inbox.

-----Original Message-----
From: NoReply@Clark.Wa.Gov [mailto:NoReply@Clark.Wa.Gov]
Sent: Monday, November 10, 2014 9:26 PM
To: Cnty 2016 Comp Plan
Subject: 2016 Comp Plan comments submitted

Following comments were submitted online:

Parcel No:

Subject: Growth Plan

Comments:
We live at 19000 NE 42nd Ct Ridgefield and would like to see the growth plan changed to allow as small of lot size as possible. The proximity to the freeway and accessibility to main roads in Clark county make this area a prime candidate for future development.

Submitted by:
Rod Nelson

Email: rodnelson@me.com

Address:
believe that the Clark County planners could benefit from reading this document. Despite its age, some basic elements for guidance remain relevant today; importance of rural citizen participation in balancing rural needs and planning their future, and recognizing the existing rural conditions and trends in land use patterns and existing densities: “Fundamental to a successful outcome.”

Pg. 5, “Initiate Community Visioning and Ongoing Citizen Participation. The importance of this step to overall program success cannot be underestimated. Citizen participation is necessary if the rural element is to address real community needs. The best source of information about rural community needs is the citizens who live and work in rural communities.”

Pg.6, “Your Community’s rural planning will also be more effective and focused when developed around a clear vision of the future. In other words, the citizens of your community need to define what they want and the purposes to be served by your community’s rural areas. They also need to reach consensus about what qualities are most important to preserve and which should change.”

“Inventory Existing Conditions, Trends and Resources. As with any planning effort, knowledge about existing conditions, trends, problems and opportunities is fundamental to a successful outcome. This information is in fact, the foundation on which future decisions will be made. Much of the information collected as a part of your land use inventory, capital facilities inventory and critical/resource lands inventories will be important in assessing alternatives for rural area land uses, patterns and services. Land use patterns, existing densities, the availability of various facilities, environmental constraints or hazards, wildlife habitats, vegetative cover, natural features, resources, roads and other infrastructure will affect the choices you make for the future of your rural areas. Information about soils and their ability to support resource uses will be important information in rural area planning.”
Pg. 7, "Prime soils should perhaps be set aside for agricultural operations whether large operations or smaller intensive specialty farming."

Pg. 8, "Citizens can express values and goals at public meetings, through attitude surveys and by other means, these expressions need to be captured into a set of clear statements which are specific enough to provide guidance."

Pg. 9, "The Optimal Patterns for Rural Development" section describes a number of different development patterns you wish to incorporate into your alternatives."

Pg. 9, "Select the Preferred Alternative. After public review and comment of the alternatives, refine the preferred rural area policy and strategy. Again, it should include an implementation strategy which incorporates and addresses comments and concerns expressed at public meetings."

Pg. 42, "Inventory local character. Because of this diversity, the first step in defining rural character for a given community is to inventory features of that local character. Typical land use patterns, building architectural features and distinctive natural features should be inventoried."

"Define what the community values. A more difficult task is to define specifically which elements of the community's rural character are most valued by the community."

Pg. 46, "Use more flexible performance-based regulatory techniques to match rural needs. Hardin County, Kentucky, has received national recognition for its innovative program for guiding development. Their planning commission set out to "devise a set of land use controls appropriate for a rural community, where the development pace is relatively modest, the developers are mostly from the community, and values and goals are distinctly different from those in urban areas." The resulting system is more palatable for rural residents than a more rigid zoning system. Because it is well matched to the community's needs, it has helped to build a supportive constituency for planning."

Pg. 50, "Recommendations for Setting Rural Densities:"

"Choose densities which can be supported by a rural level of services."
"Perhaps the best yardstick for appropriate densities for these types of rural development is to consider the traditional densities within small towns within your county."

Sent from Windows Mail

From: cnlental@yahoo.com
Sent: Friday, November 14, 2014 10:54 AM
To: david.madore@clark.wa.gov, tom.mielke@clark.wa.gov, ed.barnes@clark.wa.gov, Silliman Peter, susan rasmussen, Leah Higgins, Rick Dunning, Rita Dietrich, Jerry Olson, Fred Pickering, Jim Malinowski, Frank White, Benjamin Moss, Lonnie Moss, Melinda Zamora, Nick Redinger, Curt Massie, Marcus Becker, Zachary McIsaac, cnlental@yahoo.com, Clark County Citizens United Inc.

Dear Commissioners,
As CCCU researches rural economics and planning, we have come upon interesting publications. Board member, Frank White, passed on a book written by Columnist, investigative journalist and novelist, Elizabeth Nickson. She has been a national columnist for Canada's Globe and Mail and National Post. She was European bureau chief of Life Magazine and a reporter for Time magazine, and has written for many international publications, including the Sunday Times Magazine (London), the Guardian, Tatler, Vogue, and Harper's magazine. She lives on Salt Spring Island in Washington state, in the Pacific Northwest.

The documentary book regarding the environmental movement and rural economies is called, Eco-Fascists, and should be read by every local government head. She apologizes for the brash name, but she wanted the reader to understand the impact of what she is reporting. She particularly discusses her attempt at using Transfer of Development Rights, on her 28 acres in Washington state. The information is an eye opener and clearly demonstrates why this development concept doesn't work.

She discusses the U.S. and International organizations involved in the environmental lock up of rural lands and rural economies, as she travels across the nation and locally. She goes to the communities to see first hand, the economic devastation that has occurred in rural communities, in the name of environmental protection. I have highlighted important passages and would be happy (and Frank) to share this book, to educate you over the destruction of the rural lands via environmental and over regulation on the local level.

My thoughts go to the international trend. What better way to destroy a nation and get control of it, but to highly restrict the economic viability of that nation. In one chapter she discusses in her research, that when many rural communities go down, meth takes over in that community. What better way to destroy some of our best fighting and patriotic young men, than to impoverish them and then addict them to a drug that destroys them forever. When you destroy the economy, it's people, control the land, and impoverish communities, it's just a few steps more and a whole country can be taken over, with nary a shot fired.

What is done locally, has a major effect, nationally. For the love of a free nation, we all have a responsibility to prevent the loss of our country, at all costs.

Sincerely.

Carol Levanen, Ex. Secretary
Clark County Citizens United, Inc.
P.O. Box 2188
Battle Ground, Washington 98604
O'Donnell, Mary Beth

From: LaRocque, Linnea on behalf of Barnes, Ed
Sent: Monday, November 17, 2014 8:07 AM
To: Orjiako, Oliver
Cc: Titton, Rebecca; O'Donnell, Mary Beth
Subject: FW: Ridgefield Open House - For the public record

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Linnea LaRocque, Administrative Assistant
Clark County Board of Commissioners
360-397-9232 ext. 4167
PO Box 5000, Vancouver WA 98666

SAVE PAPER - Please do not print this e-mail unless absolutely necessary

From: Carol Levanen [mailto:cnldental@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 13, 2014 9:00 PM
To: Madore, David; Mielke, Tom; Barnes, Ed; Susan Rasmussen; Leah Higgins; Rick Dunning; Rita Dietrich; Jerry Olson; red Pickering; Jim Malinowski; Frank White; Benjamin Moss; Lonnie Moss; Melinda Zamora; Nick Redinger; Curt Massie; Marcus Becker; Zachary McIsaac; Carol Levanen; Clark County Citizens United Inc.; Silliman, Peter
Subject: Ridgefield House - For the public record

Dear Commissioners,

I have just reviewed the comments that are now on line for public view from the 2016 Comprehensive Plan Open House, conducted at the Ridgefield Fire Station, in Ridgefield, Washington. I noted that there were two comment sheets displayed for me and two for Susan Rasmussen. I submitted only one comment sheet in the box that night, and I confirmed with Susan that she only submitted one comment sheet as well. The other comment sheet was from the previous open house, held in Hazel Dell, Washington. Staff combined them somehow, as there is certainly a mistake with the information displayed. Please make corrections to both the open houses to demonstrate the correct public comment submitted by Susan and myself at each meeting. In addition, I didn’t see any notation of the comments made by two landowners, one regarding the many 5 acre lots and one asking why the proposal is only based on one small group of people, back in 2007. (I believe he was talking about the Rural Lands Task Force)

Thank you for a timely response to this request. We wouldn’t want the public to think we go around stuffing comment sheets in the public comment boxes.

Best Regards,

Carol Levanen, Ex. Secretary
Clark County Citizens United, Inc.
P.O. Box 2188
Battle Ground, Washington 98604
From: Carol Levanen [mailto:cnidental@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, November 14, 2014 10:54 AM
To: Madore, David; Mielke, Tom; Barnes, Ed; Silliman, Peter; Susan Rasmussen; Leah Higgins; Rick Dunning; Rita Dietrich; Jerry Olson; Fred Pickering; Jim Malinowski; Frank White; Benjamin Moss; Lonnie Moss; Melinda Zamora; Nick Redinger; Curt Massie; Marcus Becker; Zachary McIsaac; Carol Levanen; Clark County Citizens United Inc.
Subject: Food for thought (For the record)

Dear Commissioners,

As CCCU researches rural economics and planning, we have come upon interesting publications. Board member, Frank White, passed on a book written by Columnist, investigative journalist and novelist, Elizabeth Nickson. She has been a national columnist for Canada’s Globe and Mail and National Post. She was European bureau chief of Life Magazine and a reporter for Time magazine, and has written for many international publications, including the Sunday Times Magazine (London), the Guardian, Tatler, Vogue, and Harper's magazine. She lives on Salt Spring Island in Washington state, in the Pacific Northwest.

The documentary book regarding the environmental movement and rural economies is called, Eco-Fascists, and should be read by every local government head. She apologizes for the brash name, but she wanted the reader to understand the impact of what she is reporting. She particularly discusses her attempt at using Transfer of Development Rights, on her 28 acres in Washington state. The information is an eye opener and clearly demonstrates why this development concept doesn't work.

She discusses the U.S. and International organizations involved in the environmental lock up of rural lands and rural economies, as she travels across the nation and locally. She goes to the communities to see first hand, the economic devastation that has occurred in rural communities, in the name of environmental protection. I have highlighted important passages and would be happy (and Frank) to share this book, to educate you over the destruction of the rural lands via environmental and over regulation on the local level.

My thoughts go to the international trend. What better way to destroy a nation and get control of it, but to highly restrict the economic viability of that nation. In one chapter she discusses in her research, that when many rural communities go down, meth takes over in that community. What better way to destroy some of our best fighting and patriotic young men, than to impoverish them and then addict them to a drug that destroys them forever. When you destroy the economy, it's people, control the land, and impoverish communities, it's just a few steps more and a whole country can be taken over, with nary a shot fired.

What is done locally, has a major effect, nationally. For the love of a free nation, we all have a responsibility to prevent the loss of our country, at all costs

Sincerely,

Carol Levanen, Ex. Secretary
Clark County Citizens United, Inc.
P.O. Box 2188
Battle Ground, Washington 98604
Following comments were submitted online:

Parcel No: 181553000

Subject: Clark Co. GMP

Comments:
We have lived at 19115 NE 42nd Ct. for close to 25 years and have watched areas adjacent to our neighborhood, especially to the south and west, develop into smaller parcels, either higher density or 1/2-2.5 acres. As we age, we want the ability to sub-divide our property into a smaller parcels, 1 or 2.5 acres so that we can stay in our community while downsizing into a smaller, one level home. This property is part of our retirement and we never imagined that 25 years later as the North County developed we would still be considered rural 10 or even five, zoning which is inconsistent within our same 20 block radius. Many of our neighbors feel the same. Its seems reasonable to re-evaluate our zoning, which apparently was dubbed R-10 but since the late 80's has actually been R-5. With growth around Legacy Salmon Creek hospital and WSU-V and major road expansion to the north, it seems more prudent to zone our neighborhood at 1 to 2.5 acres, instead of just stamping at the same zoning it has been since 1987 when most of the houses were built on five acre parcels. We would very much appreciate you consideration of rezoning us to reflect growth needs and our desire to use our property in a way that will allow us to stay in our community.

Submitted by:
Lisa and Tim Irwin-Roddy

Email: irwin36@msn.com

Address:
19115 NE 42nd Ct
Ridgefield, WA
From: LaRocque, Linnea  
Sent: Thursday, November 13, 2014 8:26 AM 
To: cccuinc@yahoo.com  
Cc: McCall, Marilee; Penta, Andrew  
Subject: Closure of abandoned records request - Levanen

Good morning Carol,

On October 14th 2014, you presented a written request for records to the Board of County Commissioners. You had requested hearing and planning commission data. Both the BOCC and Community Planning requested clarification on October 15th. I had also spoken with you personally one day here in our office, to which you had said you would try to clarify.

We had not heard back so both Community Planning and BOCC sent an email to your address on November 3, 2014 advising you that we intended to close your request due to abandonment on or before November 12th, if you did not contact us to identify what records you wanted.

It is now the 13th and I have not heard from you so will consider your requested abandoned and closed.

Should you still want any identifiable hearing documents, please do not hesitate to either respond to this, or provide another request in writing, which ever you prefer, and I will open a new records request. If you have any questions, my number is below, please call me.

Thank you Carol!

Linnea

Linnea LaRocque, Administrative Assistant  
Clark County Board of Commissioners  
560-397-2232 ext 4167  
PO Box 5000, Vancouver WA 98666

SAVE PAPER - Please do not print this e-mail unless absolutely necessary
November 14, 2014

Clark County Community Planning
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, Washington 98666

Subject: Growth Plan Update

Dear Planning Representatives:

This letter is for purposes of commenting on Clark County’s Comprehensive Growth Management Plan.

I received a notice of a growth plan update that will include my property located at 25008 NE 29th Avenue Ridgefield [property I.D. 215118000]. This is a 36 acre parcel of land used for agriculture purposes that has been in my family since 1956.

I am aware that Clark County is urbanizing and growth pressures are dictating smaller minimum agricultural lot sizes. This is evidenced by the fact many properties in proximity to this farm property are being divided into smaller lots for residentially related purposes. I understand the County contemplates keeping this 36 acre tract in an agricultural designation [AG] but also designating it with a new AG -10 zone.

I am supportive of this action as evidenced by my signature below.

Joan E.
Johnson
Dear Board of Clark County Commissioners,

I want Clark County to be farmer friendly and have policies that help increase the amount of Clark County grown food.

Please consider Slow Food Southwest Washington's Grow Clark County recommendations that propose policy to be added to the Clark County Comprehensive Plan, which would conserve farmland and develop the farm economy.

I am a farmer and teacher at a local high school, Horticulture, and value the farmland. Please preserve what we have left for future generations and for our current residents to enjoy.

Sincerely,

Amy Sidran

8806 NE 159t St

`attle Ground, WA 98604
We are owners of tax lots 2054600009 (15 ac) & 2054590000 (9.73 ac) east of Hockinson, currently zoned FR-2, Parcels of the original 160 acre Ahola Homestead. Seven Ahola siblings & grand-children now own the Homestead comprising ELEVEN tax lots, only 1 of which is over 40 acres. We desire the opportunity to sell or gift some acreages to our children or grand-children. A reduction from 40 to 20 acre lots would not allow this. For the Hockinson area zoning for 5 acre lots make more sense. Maybe FR 20 zoning is practical in commercial forest areas of North Clark Co. but a 20 or 40 ac. parcel is rare in the Hockinson area. We feel the Growth Management Plan should consider each parcel by neighborhood density as well as board feet of timber when zoning for Forest Reserve. Mark & Linda Ahola
My parents own the property at 21108 NW 67th Ave, Ridgefield on a couple acres, and also 21201 NW 67th Ave, Ridgefield on 23 acres. My family of 5 currently resides at the 21108 NW 67th Ave address with my parents. I am very much in favor of the proposed change to allow one house on a 10 acre piece instead of the current 1 house per 20 acre piece. My siblings and I would very much like to be able to build homes on this property to be able to live nearby each other and be here to help out my parents as they get older. Ideally, I would like to be able to split this up into 5 acre parcels, but this would be a great change in the right direction.

Thank you for considering my opinions.
Adrienne Schafer
360-990-3972
O'Donnell, Mary Beth

From: Fulton, Mike <Mike.Fulton@iberdrolaren.com>
Sent: Monday, November 17, 2014 6:39 PM
To: Cnty 2016 Comp Plan
Cc: alison fulton (fulton06@comcast.net)
Subject: 2016 Comp Growth Management Update

I own two parcels in Clark County impacted by Alternative2: Parcels number 190247000 and 190248000. These parcels are adjacent to residences with larger lots that are part of Mettler Manor, a cluster of homes on the west side near the southern boundary of Ridgefield.

These parcels, originally one lot, were segregated as part of the Mettler Manor cluster on July 17, 1991 into 10 acre lots. However, they are located in the AG-20 designation and possibly only one lot is buildable.

The economics of working a 20 acre farm with minimal water supply have changed over the years. Local farmers were able to make a good living on their larger farm parcels in the years before large farming operations changed the market value of products being sold locally. Mass production and economies of scale from the larger operations, including those who import their goods for sale locally, has made it economically unviable for a small, local farmer holding twenty acres to truly utilize the land for commercial farming and be able to sustain themselves. The value of leasing these parcels to a large producer (since farming on our own would be too costly to make any profit, as discussed above) barely covers the cost of the current property taxes and insurance, making the land almost valueless to the owner as an agricultural property.

A designation of R-S would allow for a greater relief of the anticipated growth in Clark County and is commensurate with the residential properties in Mettler Manor. As a result, I recommend that the land be designated as 5 acre parcels, similar to the zoning designation directly south of Mettler Manor and just north of 179th Street and west of NW 61st Avenue.

Best regards,

Mike Fulton
6214 NW 179th Street
Ridgefield, WA 98642

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender and immediately delete this message and any attachment hereto and/or copy hereof, as such message contains confidential information intended solely for the individual or entity to whom it is addressed. The use or disclosure of such information to third parties is prohibited by law and may give rise to civil or criminal liability.

The views presented in this message are solely those of the author(s) and do not necessarily represent the opinion of Iberdrola, S.A. or any company of its group. Neither Iberdrola, S.A. nor any company of its group guarantees the integrity, security or proper receipt of this message. Likewise, neither Iberdrola, S.A. nor any company of its group accepts any liability whatsoever for any possible damages arising from, or in connection with, data interception, software viruses or manipulation by third parties.
Por favor, piense en el medio ambiente antes de imprimir este mensaje.

Si usted recibe por error este mensaje, por favor comuníquelo a su remitente y borre inmediatamente tanto el mensaje como cualquier anexo o copia del mismo, ya que contiene información confidencial, dirigida exclusivamente a su destinatario y cuya utilización o divulgación a terceros están prohibidas por la ley, pudiendo dar lugar a responsabilidades civiles y/o penales.

Las ideas contenidas en este mensaje son exclusivas de su(s) autor(es) y no representan necesariamente el criterio de Iberdrola, S.A. ni de otras sociedades de su grupo. Ní Iberdrola, S.A. ni ninguna sociedad de su grupo garantiza la integridad, seguridad y correcta recepción de este mensaje, ni se responsabiliza de los posibles perjuicios de cualquier naturaleza derivados de la captura de datos, virus informáticos o manipulaciones efectuadas por terceros.
These comments are related to material presented at open houses in October 2014.

I prefer alternative 1 – no action. The land added in the 2007 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan Update will not be used sufficiently by 2035 for residential, industrial, and commercial development to warrant adding any more land to the Urban Growth Areas in the current update. In fact, current projections for 2035 are lower than the projections for 2024 that were used in the 2007 Update, meaning less land is needed in this update, not more. Other changes being proposed in Alternative 2 and 3 seem unnecessary or counterproductive to the goal of preserving resource lands and preventing development outside of Urban Growth Areas.

I am concerned about the proposed reduction to minimum parcel size for agriculture, forest, and rural land in Alternative 2. At the 10/29/14 open house, I asked why this change is being made and was told it is because there is not much land that is over 10 acres for agriculture, over 20 acres for forest, and over 10 acres for rural. That seems like a weak reason for reducing the minimum size of parcels. If in fact there is so little land that will be impacted, then why make the change? Why not preserve what is left of the larger parcels?

Information needs to be included in the Draft Supplemental EIS on how much land would be impacted by the proposed changes (acres and percentages) and why the changes are needed. Both positive and negative impacts on land owners need to be identified, such as increased property tax if zoning is changed to allow more development. Resource and rural lands serve many purposes for fish and wildlife, water quality, aquifer recharge, open space, etc. and need to be preserved and I am concerned about the impact on these uses of the proposed changes. Allowing more subdivision of agriculture, forest, and rural land will result in fragmentation of existing parcels, reducing their value as resource lands. The remaining agriculture, forest, and rural land in Clark County needs to be preserved and large parcels should be kept intact. Instead of encouraging development, Clark County should be implementing policies that encourage agricultural and other resource uses on the remaining land outside the Urban Growth Areas. Without any other information, at this point I am assuming the reason for the change is to encourage more development outside of the Urban Growth Areas, which I believe is counter to the requirements of the Growth Management Act as it will result in development where it shouldn’t occur. I am also wondering why urban reserve needs to be removed from the land north of Salmon Creek at this time, allowing development to occur in that area before development occurs in other areas that aren’t urban reserve.

I am also concerned about the changes in Alternative 3, allowing development on land that is currently rural for Battle Ground and agricultural for La Center. I am sure there is land elsewhere that can be used for jobs that is already in the county’s Urban Growth Areas, resulting in no need for these expansions. The Draft Supplemental EIS needs to explain why this land needs to be added to the Urban Growth Area when there are large areas of land added in the 2007 Comprehensive Plan Update that are available for job growth. I believe the land by La Center was removed from the Urban Growth Area in the last update because it is prime agricultural land and should not be used for commercial development.
As a 50-year resident of Clark County, I care deeply about the quality of life and would like to see it maintained. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Karen Wood
14910 NE 46th St
Vancouver, WA 98682
Following comments were submitted online:

Parcel No: ???

Subject: 20 acres to 10

Comments:
I have lived in Ridgefield west of I-5 for 38 years and in that time I have seen alot of changes....some of the farm land that surrounds me is the best in Clark county...please keep it that way. More houses, creates traffic and with that comes crime.
Please, I beg you to save the farming in Clark County.

Submitted by:
Judy McIntyre

Email: snowchic@centurylink.net

Address:
16515 NW 41st Avenue
Ridgefield, Washington
The Law Office of
Jerome F. Eline II, P.S.

ATTORNEY AT LAW
Jerome F. Eline II
jeline@jelinelaw.com

LEGAL ASSISTANT
Lori L. Conover

1010 Esther Street
Vancouver, WA 98660
Telephone (360) 737-1978
Facsimile (360) 695-9491

November 17, 2014

Clark County Commissioners
PO Box 5000
Vancouver, WA 98666-5000

ATTN: Tom Mielke
David Madore
Edward L. Barnes

Re: David Lawrence Property
510 NE 17th Avenue
Battle Ground, WA 98604
Parcel #224202000
Legal: #146 SEC 14 T4N R2 EWM 24.70A M/L

Dear Commissioners:

I represent Mr. David Lawrence, who owns property on the East Fork of the Lewis River, parcel number 224202000. There are no buildings on the property and therefore, no site address. Mr. Lawrence would like to have his property zoned for 5-acre lots, or at a minimum, reduced from 20-acre zoning to 10-acre zoning. The reasoning for his 5-acre request is the following:

1. A review of the zoning surrounding the subject property indicates that those properties are zoned for 5-acre lots.
2. The actual lot sizes are 5-acres to the North and 2-acres to the South. Usually one would find the normal process of a graduated increase or decrease in lot sizes, but not such an abrupt change.
3. The property is designated for residential use, R-20, and has the same allowable uses as in the 5 and 10-acre zones.
4. The property is bordered on the East and the West by the Lewis River, which insures that the use of the land, no matter how it is zoned, will continue to protect the natural habitat.
5. The property is divided into two parts (one 5-acre parcel to the West, the other 20+ acres to the East) by an existing paved private road and easement, which provides access to neighboring properties north of this property.

It would be very desirably practical to be permitted to split the land on each side of this

013564
road/easement into separate, independent parcels.

I have enclosed several documents to support the reasoning presented for this request as follows:

a) Clark County Property Account Summary;
b) Warranty Deed;
c) Assessor’s Map, showing lots sizes

Thank you for your consideration to what appears to be an opportunity to update the comprehensive plan in a manner reflective of the inherent conditions and practical needs of involved property owners.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

JEROME F. ELINE II

JFE:at
encl.
cc: David Lawrence
**Clark County Property Information**

**Account Summary**

- **Property Identification Number:** 224202000
- **Property Type:** Real
- **Property Status:** Active
- **Tax Status:** Regular
- **Site Address:** (Situs Address)
- **Abbreviated Legal Description:** #146 SEC 14 T4N R2EWM 24.70A M/L

### Account Building Environmental Taxes Auditor Docs Documents Permits Sales Search

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Owner</th>
<th>Owner Mailing Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LAWRENCE DAVID G</td>
<td>510 NE 17TH AVE BATTLE GROUND WA, 98604 US</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Administrative Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning Designation</th>
<th>Codes... R-20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zoning Overlay(s)</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive Plan</td>
<td>R-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp. Plan Overlay(s)</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census Tract</td>
<td>404.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdiction</td>
<td>Clark County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire District</td>
<td>FD 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park District</td>
<td>District 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School District</td>
<td>Battle Ground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>Captain Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td>Chief Umtuch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>Battle Ground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer District</td>
<td>Rural/Resource</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water District</td>
<td>Clark Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Land Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clark County Road Atlas</th>
<th>1/4,514,T4N,R2E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approximate Area</td>
<td>1,075,932 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subdivision</td>
<td>no data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>0215148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Number</td>
<td>012150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sales History**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>03/27/2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document Type</td>
<td>DEED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>607788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale Amount</td>
<td>$750,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Assessment Data

- **2013 Values for 2014 Taxes**
  - **Market Value as of January 1, 2013**
    - **Land Value:** $225,756.00
    - **Building Value:** $0.00
    - **Total Property:** $225,756.00

- **2012 Values for 2013 Taxes**
  - **Market Value as of January 1, 2012**
    - **Land Value:** $214,109.00
    - **Building Value:** $0.00
    - **Total Property:** $214,109.00

### Taxable Value

- **Total:** $214,109.00

### General

- **Re-valuation Cycle:** 3
- **Assessor Neighborhood:** 11

---

If you have questions concerning the data on this page, please contact the Clark County Assessor’s Office. Main Phone: (360) 397-2391, Email: assess@clark.wa.gov

- [Print Version](#) | [Create a PDF Report](#)

---

**Legal Stuff**

**Disclaimer**

Clark County does not warrant the accuracy, reliability or timeliness of any information in this system, and shall not be held liable for losses caused by using this information. Portions of this information may not be current or accurate. Any person or entity who relies on any information obtained from this system, does so at their own risk.

RCW 42.56.070(9) prohibits releasing and/or using lists of individuals gathered from this site for commercial purposes.
**Wetlands and Soil Types**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wetland Class:</th>
<th>830WZ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wetland Inventory:</td>
<td>No Mapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Hazard Area:</td>
<td>Outside Flood Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoreline Designation:</td>
<td>Rural Conservancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil Types / Class:</td>
<td>Non-Hydric / ORC, Non-Hydric / WR, Non-Hydric / WA, Non-Hydric / WR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Aquifer:</td>
<td>Category 2 Recharge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMA Map / FIRMS Panel:</td>
<td>53011C02340</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Geological Hazards**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geological Hazard</th>
<th>Severe erosion hazard areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slope Stability:</td>
<td>Slopes &gt; 15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazard:</td>
<td>Landslide Debris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquefaction:</td>
<td>Bedrock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHAIP Class:</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Habitat and Cultural Resources**

| Habitat Area Buffer: | |
| Species Area Buffer: | |
| Archaeological Probability: | Moderate-High |
| Archaeological Site Buffer: | No |

If you have any questions concerning the data on this page, please contact Clark County Environmental Services. Main Phone: (360) 397-2121

Print Version | Create a PDF Report | [Legal Stuff]

Disclaimer

Clark County does not warrant the accuracy, reliability or timeliness of any information in this system, and shall not be held liable for losses caused by using this information. Portions of this information may not be current or accurate. Any person or entity who relies on any information obtained from this system, does so at their own risk.

RCW 43.56.070(9) prohibits releasing and/or using lists of individuals gathered from this site for commercial purposes.
WARRANTY DEED

THE GRANTORS, Roger K. Fitch, as his separate estate, as to an undivided 12.5% interest, Carolyn F. Johnson, as her separate estate, as to an undivided 12.5% interest, Paul J. Caplinger & Karen A. Caplinger, husband and wife, as to an undivided 12.5% interest, James Frederick Caplinger, as his separate estate, as to an undivided 6.25% interest, John Kenneth Caplinger, as his separate estate, as to an undivided 6.25% interest, Susan J. Berkey, a married woman as her sole & separate property, as to an undivided 12.5% interest, Jon Roberts Kettenring, Ann K. Young and Robin K. Pasquarella, in equal shares, as tenants in common, an undivided 25% interest, Karen A. Caplinger, a married woman, as her sole & separate property, an undivided 12.5% interest, for and in consideration of Ten Dollars and other Good and Valuable Consideration in hand paid, convey and warrant to David G. Lawrence, an unmarried man, the following described real estate, situated in the County of Clark, State of Washington, to wit:

A portion of the North half of the Southeast quarter of Section 14, Township 4 North, Range 2 East of the Willamette Meridian, Clark County, Washington, described as follows:

Beginning at the Southeast corner of the North half of the Southeast quarter of Section 14, Township 4 North, Range 2 East of the Willamette Meridian, Clark County, Washington; Thence north along the east line of said Section 14, 214 feet, more or less, to the centerline of the East Fork of the Lewis River as it flows on the east side of said Southeast quarter of Section 14; thence northwesterly along the centerline of said East Fork of the Lewis River to a point 801.5 feet north of the south line of said north half of the Southeast quarter of Section 14; thence, parallel with the south line of said north half of the Southeast quarter of Section 14, 426.3 feet, more or less, to the centerline of NE River Bend Drive, which is a private
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easement established by easement agreements recorded under Clark County Auditor's Numbers G313729 and G703852; and mapped by Survey recorded at Book 25 of Surveys, Page 145, records of Clark County, Washington; thence southwesterly along the centerline of NE River Bend Drive to a point 412 feet north of the south line of said north half of the Southeast quarter of Section 14; thence west parallel with the south line of said north half of the Southeast quarter of Section 14, 626.9 feet, more or less, to the centerline of the East Fork of the Lewis River as it flows on the west side of said Southeast quarter of Section 14; thence southwesterly along the centerline of said East Fork to its intersection with the south line of said north half of the Southeast quarter of Section 14; thence east along the south line of said north half of the Southeast quarter of Section 14, 2,280.8 feet, more or less, to the Point of Beginning.

TOGETHER WITH AND SUBJECT TO a non-exclusive easement 60 feet in width, for ingress, egress, and the transportation of utilities, over and across NE River Bend Drive, as established by easement agreements recorded under Clark County Auditor's Numbers G313729 and G703852; and mapped by Survey recorded at Book 25 of Surveys, Page 145, records of Clark County, Washington.

TOGETHER WITH that certain non-exclusive easement for ingress, egress and utilities, 30 feet in width, as described under Clark County Auditor's Number G703853, which is immediately west of and parallel to NE 147th Avenue, a county road.

Grantors, for themselves, their heirs, successors and assigns, retain the right, together with Grantee, to utilize the above-described non-exclusive easements for the benefit of Grantors' retained real property. Grantors' retained real property is westerly of and adjacent to the real property conveyed herein, being 25 acres, more or less, situated in the North half of the Southeast quarter of Section 14, Township 4 North, Range 2 East of the Willamette Meridian, Clark County, Washington, and being a portion of Assessor's Tax Parcel No. 224115-000.

Containing 27.53 acres, more or less.

SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING:

1. Any question that may arise due to the shifting and/or changing in the course of East Fork of the Lewis River.

2. Right of the general public to the unrestricted use of all the waters of a navigable body of water not only for the primary purpose of navigation, but also for corollary purposes, including (but not limited to) fishing, boating, bathing, swimming, water skiing and other related recreational purposes, as those waters may affect the tidelands, shorelands or adjoining uplands and whether

the level of the water has been raised naturally or artificially to a maintained or fluctuating level, all as further defined by the decisional law of this state. (Affects all of the premises subject to such submergence)
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3. Right of the State of Washington in and to that portion, if any, of the property herein described which lies below the line of ordinary high water of the East Fork of the Lewis River.

4. Agreement and the terms and conditions thereof:
   Between: Katherine A. Kettingring
   And: Albert H. Matson, et al
   Recording Information: G 313726
   Modification and/or amendment by instrument:
   Recording Information: G 703852

5. Easement, including terms and provisions contained therein:
   Recording Information: 0011180092
   In Favor of: Adjoining property
   For: Ingress, egress and utilities

6. Covenants, conditions, restrictions and assessments, if any, affecting title, which may appear in the public record, including those shown on any recorded plat or survey.

Each Grantor conveys all of his or her undivided-interest in the real property described above regardless of the percentage amount of such interest.

DATED this 27th day of March, 2007.

Paul J. Caplinger

Karen A. Caplinger (individually and
for the marital community)

Roger K. Fitch

Carolyn F. Johnson

James Rederick Caplinger, by Karen A
Caplinger, Attorney in Fact

John Kenneth Caplinger, by Karen A
Caplinger, Attorney in Fact

Susan J. Bankey

Jon Roberts Kettingring, by Karen A
Caplinger, Attorney in Fact
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Ann K. Young, by Karen A.
Caplinger, Attorney in Fact

Robin K. Pasquarella, by Karen A.
Caplinger, Attorney in Fact

K aerial A. Caplinger, Attorney in fact for:
Roger K. Fitch
Carolyn F. Johnson
James Frederick Caplinger
John Kenneth Caplinger
Susan J. Berkey
Jon Roberta Kettenring
Ann K. Young
Robin K. Pasquarella

STATE OF ARIZONA } ss.
COUNTY OF MARICOPA }

I certify that I know or have satisfactory evidence that Paul J. Caplinger and Karen A. Caplinger are the persons who appeared before me, and said persons acknowledged that they signed this instrument and acknowledged it to be their free and voluntary act for the uses and purposes mentioned in the instrument.

DATED this 27 day of March, 2007.
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STATE OF ARIZONA

COUNTY OF MARICOPA

I certify that I know or have satisfactory evidence that Karen A. Caplinger is the person who appeared before me, and said person acknowledged that she signed this instrument, on oath stated that she is authorized to execute the instrument and acknowledged it as the Attorney in Fact for Roger K. Fitch, Carolyn F. Johnson, James Frederick Caplinger, John Kenneth Caplinger, Susan J. Berkey, Jon Roberts Kettanring, Ann K. Young, and Robin K. Pasquarlla, to be the free and voluntary act of such parties for the uses and purposes mentioned in this instrument.

DATED this 27th day of March, 2007.

[Signature]


CLETE R SIGWART
NOTARY PUBLIC - ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY
My Commission Expires January 15, 2010
Exhibit "A"

A PORTION OF THE NORTH HALF OF THE SOUTHEAST QUARTER OF SECTION 14, TOWNSHIP 4 NORTH, RANGE 2 EAST OF THE WILLAMETTE MERIDIAN, CLARK COUNTY, WASHINGTON, DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

BEGINNING AT THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF THE NORTH HALF OF THE SOUTHEAST QUARTER OF SECTION 14, TOWNSHIP 4 NORTH, RANGE 2 EAST OF THE WILLAMETTE MERIDIAN, CLARK COUNTY, WASHINGTON;
THENCE NORTH ALONG THE EAST LINE OF SAID SECTION 14, 214 FEET, MORE OR LESS, TO THE CENTERLINE OF THE EAST FORK OF THE LEWIS RIVER AS IT FLOWS ON THE EAST SIDE OF SAID SOUTHEAST QUARTER OF SECTION 14;
THENCE NORTHWESTERLY ALONG THE CENTERLINE OF SAID EAST FORK OF THE LEWIS RIVER TO A POINT 801.5 FEET NORTH OF THE SOUTH LINE OF SAID NORTH HALF OF THE SOUTHEAST QUARTER OF SECTION 14;
THENCE WEST, PARALLEL WITH THE SOUTH LINE OF SAID NORTH HALF OF THE SOUTHEAST QUARTER OF SECTION 14, 426.3 FEET, MORE OR LESS, TO THE CENTERLINE OF NE RIVER BEND DRIVE, WHICH IS A PRIVATE EASEMENT ESTABLISHED BY EASEMENT AGREEMENTS RECORDED UNDER CLARK COUNTY AUDITOR'S NUMBERS G313729 AND G703852; AND MAPPED BY SURVEY RECORDED AT BOOK 25 OF SURVEYS, PAGE 145, RECORDS OF CLARK COUNTY, WASHINGTON;
THENCE SOUTHWESTERLY ALONG THE CENTERLINE OF NE RIVER BEND DRIVE TO A POINT 412 FEET NORTH OF THE SOUTH LINE OF SAID NORTH HALF OF THE SOUTHEAST QUARTER OF SECTION 14;
THENCE WEST PARALLEL WITH THE SOUTH LINE OF SAID NORTH HALF OF THE SOUTHEAST QUARTER OF SECTION 14, 625.9 FEET, MORE OR LESS, TO THE CENTERLINE OF THE EAST FORK OF THE LEWIS RIVER AS IT FLOWS ON THE WEST SIDE OF SAID SOUTHEAST QUARTER OF SECTION 14;
THENCE SOUTHWESTERLY ALONG THE CENTERLINE OF SAID EAST FORK TO ITS INTERSECTION WITH THE SOUTH LINE OF SAID NORTH HALF OF THE SOUTHEAST QUARTER OF SECTION 14;
THENCE EAST ALONG THE SOUTH LINE OF SAID NORTH HALF OF THE SOUTHEAST QUARTER OF SECTION 14, 2,290.8 FEET, MORE OR LESS, TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.

TOGETHER WITH AND SUBJECT TO A NON-EXCLUSIVE EASEMENT 60 FEET IN WIDTH, FOR INGRESS, EGRESS, AND THE TRANSPORTATION OF UTILITIES, OVER UNDER AND ACROSS NE RIVER BEND DRIVE, AS ESTABLISHED BY EASEMENT AGREEMENTS RECORDED UNDER CLARK COUNTY AUDITOR'S NUMBERS G313729 AND G703852; AND MAPPED BY SURVEY RECORDED AT BOOK 25 OF SURVEYS, PAGE 145, RECORDS OF CLARK COUNTY, WASHINGTON.

TOGETHER WITH THAT CERTAIN NON-EXCLUSIVE EASEMENT FOR INGRESS, EGRESS AND UTILITIES, 30 FEET IN WIDTH, AS DESCRIBED UNDER CLARK COUNTY AUDITOR'S NUMBER G703853, WHICH IS IMMEDIATELY WEST OF AND PARALLEL TO NE 147TH AVENUE, A COUNTY ROAD.

The real property described above is commonly known as:

Tax ID 224202-000

Buyer Initials [ ] Date [ _____ ]
Seller Initials [ ] Date [ _____ ]

COLUMBIA TITLE

Contact us at 360-881-5454 if you have any questions about the information contained herein.

013573
NOVEMBER 18, 2014

Community Planning Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
PO Box 9810 Vancouver, Washington 98666-9810

Subject: Comments on the 2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan Update Alternatives.
Sent via email to: comp.plan@clark.wa.gov

Dear Sirs and Madams:

Friends of Clark County (FOCC), supports and encourages a Public Utilities Zone that would include designated parks.

We, however, have two main objections, both with Alternative 2.

First objection is Alternative 2(1). Consolidation of Comprehensive Plan land use designations. Bottom line is that these are not simple map clean ups.

Rural Lands.

Alternative 2(1) includes a proposal that "makes it easier to change from one minimum parcel size to another" for every rural parcel in Clark County. The BOCC would combine rural parcels of all minimum sizes into one Rural Designation. Somehow, this means that only a Type III Process is necessary to divide parcels instead of a legislative Type IV process.

We agree with Staff, that this proposal has a good chance of being rejected by the Growth Management Board. This is not a simple change. It is not just “housekeeping”.

Combining rural parcels of all minimum sizes into one designation is a rewrite of the code in that it changes the process to divide rural parcels. Dividing parcels would take only a Type III rather than a Type IV Process. That means lower notification, lower analysis of environmental consequences, and going through the Hearings Examiner rather than the Planning Commission. The Hearings Examiner is a person appointed by the BOCC and uses criteria determined by the Growth Plan approved by the BOCC. This change in process is a change that would affect the whole county. At least, the proposal itself should have its own legislative level Type IV
process with a full EIS review of the effects on air, water, roads, population, ratio of urban to rural residences, etc. and analysis by the Planning Commission.

We support Staff concerns about this proposal. Because this change in process affects every rural parcel in the county, it is a change that would affect the whole county. Therefore it should, have the legislative level, Type IV evaluation that is meant for code changes that affect the whole county. Even then, there is a good chance that it would not be accepted.

We recommend that it be taken out of Alternative II.

**Forest and Commercial Lands.**

There are analogous problems for the consolidation of Forest Tier 1 and Forest Tier II into one Forest (F) designation and for combining Commercial Neighborhood, Community and General designations into one Commercial designation.

We recommend that the whole "Consolidation of Comprehensive Plan land use designations" section be removed from Alternative 2. At least until they have their own legislative level process.

The second objection is with the proposed decreases of minimum parcel size for Agricultural, Forestry and Rural minimum parcel sizes. This decreased the minimum size without changing the process for dividing the parcel. It is still problematic with the Growth Board because it is countywide and probably needs its own legislative process to analyze the wide-ranging effects on county water, roads, utilities, and urban/rural population distribution etc. Staff has some of these figures. To support staff we would ask for their data and consider it. Please listen to them when they offer possible ways to improve the chances for it to be accepted. If you must do it, then consider clustered houses WITH a title revision that secures the rest of the parcel as undivided rural or resource land in perpetuity.

Meanwhile, consider that Agriculture is not dead in Clark County.

Large lots are necessary for some things like raising meat (Inspiration Plantation and others). Newer crop such as vineyards need larger lots. The new non-GMO foods market may need crops from larger lots. Plant nurseries need larger lots.

Larger Ag lots have been selling as well as small ones. When dairies move to the Inland Empire, other kinds of agriculture come to replace them. Some of these will need larger parcels. Healthy local food will remain in demand. Even if we cannot grow all of our food, we can stay healthier if we grow some of it.

Sincerely,

Sydney Reisbick
President
Friends of Clark County
O'Donnell, Mary Beth

From: Bianca Benson <bianca@friendsofclarkcounty.org>
Sent: Tuesday, November 18, 2014 9:39 AM
To: Cnty 2016 Comp Plan
Cc: 'Sydney Reisbick'
Subject: Comments on the 2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan Update Alternatives.
Attachments: Alternative comments by Sydney.pdf

Please review and submit to record the following attachment.

Bianca Benson
Executive Director
Friends of Clark County
503.701.9203
visit our website
November 18, 2014

VIA EMAIL and U.S. MAIL

Commissioner Tom Mielke
Commissioner David Madore
Commissioner Edward L. Barnes
Board of Clark County Commissioners
P.O. Box 5000
Vancouver, WA 98666-5000

RE: Comment on the Clark County Growth Management Plan Update Process

Dear Commissioners:

Thank you for the opportunity to provide formal comment on the Growth Management Plan update process. I present these comments on behalf of myself, my brother and my father, who both individually and collectively own different rural properties in Clark County. I am also certain that these comments are echoed by a vast number of voters in the rural areas that make up your respective constituencies.

Our primary objective in providing this comment is to ask that each of you in your roles as the deciding authority on the issue to add two new alternatives to the single alternative currently being considered for rural property designations. Of the three alternatives currently scheduled for analysis in the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS), one is status quo, and one applies to the La Cantor city limits only. Given this reality, there is really only one alternative for the rural properties, an alternative strikingly similar to status quo. Given that the stated purpose of this extremely important process is to prepare for increased population and employment through 2035, entailing just one slightly different alternative to status quo falls well short of what would be expected from a good public policy standpoint, as well as the requirements of the Growth Management Act and the State Environmental Protection Act (SEPA).

Under the terms of SEPA, the staff is to present a "reasonable number and range" of alternatives to the Commissioners for consideration. WAC 197-11-440. Similarly, the EIS process (by the terms of the Washington Administrative Code and the Revised Code of Washington) is supposed to provide both the Commissioners and the public with "sufficient information for a reasoned choice among alternatives." Solid Waste Alternative Proponents v. Okanogan County, 66 Wn. App. 439, 442 (1992); see also WAC 197-11-440(5). One alternative, as currently proposed, hardly accomplishes this legislative and judicial intent and does not serve the rural voters of Clark County.
Moreover, it is imperative that your staff provide you with the full spectrum of growth possibilities, not just actual population statistics or State projection guidelines to predict future growth. We have just endured what has been widely described as “the great recession”—clearly not something that should be expected to be repeated again in the next twenty years. As such, any statistics that do not account for this rare occurrence are skewed and need to be adjusted. If we take an accurate, balanced and honest look at the past twenty years, we can expect extraordinary growth in Clark County in the twenty years to come.

You are in charge of this important analysis, and you have the authority and responsibility vis-à-vis your constituency to direct a neutral, realistic, and balanced analysis of possibilities!

It is my understanding that Clark County Citizens United has proposed two alternatives that account for the realities outlined above and that provide the "reasonable range" of alternatives necessary to allow for a "reasoned choice" as required by Washington law. Without attempting to recite the specifics of those alternatives in this letter, it is my understanding that Alternative 4 reasonably and appropriately expands changes to rural designations detailed in Alternative 3 (the only current alternative), and Alternative 5 presents a "pro-growth" approach that deserves equal consideration given the tremendous growth we have seen in Clark County over the last twenty years.

Commissioners should direct staff to include two new hearings at one of their public meetings by the end of the year where consideration of these two alternatives is a specific agenda item to be discussed.

I trust that these comments will not fall on deaf ears, and look forward to the Commissioners exercising their inherent authority to ensure that this process results in a reasoned and fair update to the Growth Management Plan in 2016.

Sincerely,

Zachary O. McIaac

ZOM:tm

c: County Administrator Mark McCauley
Ms. McDonald,

We started our process about 9 mos. ago and had several alternatives to consider and accept for our estimated growth to plan for. If I understand you correctly we did at that time have at least three choices.

Hope this helps,
Tom

From: Teresa MacDonald [mailto:TMacDonald@ashbaughbeal.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 18, 2014 3:31 PM
To: Mielke, Tom; Madore, David; Barnes, Ed
Cc: Cnty Board of Commissioners General Delivery; Cnty 2016 Comp Plan
Subject: Clark County Growth Management Plan Update Process

Please see the attached letter from Zachary O. McIsaac commenting on the Clark County Growth Management Plan update process. Copies will follow by U.S. Mail.

TERESA MacDONALD
Legal Assistant to John Riper, Jesse Miller, Zak McIsaac and Michael Richard

Ashbaugh Beal

ashbaughbeal.com
O’Donnell, Mary Beth

From: Ann Foster <annfoster5093@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 18, 2014 10:09 AM
To:Cnty 2016 Comp Plan
Subject: Comments on the 2016 update options to the Growth Management Act

Hello:

I am commenting on the options under consideration to update the Washington’s Growth Management Act in Clark County. I am requesting that these comments be placed in the record.

I am an ordinary citizen of this County, and like most citizens, have a limited understanding of the process that is taking place currently to update the urban growth plan that is required by Washington’s Growth Management Act. I can’t speak to the technical issues involved, but I can speak to the values in this County that I see at risk.

My interest, and those of my community, is to support productive agricultural lands and businesses. In keeping with this, my interest is also to nurture and encourage existing productive agricultural lands and businesses...to appreciate their importance and value.

I am the organizer of two farmers’ markets in Clark County. In this capacity, I am constantly focusing on local farmers who market their products directly to customers, either at a farmers market, through a CSA, a farm stand, a U-pick and usually a combination of some or all of these opportunities. It is these folks who depend on all of us to buy from them, accommodate their needs, and encourage their growth. These are farm businesses and food businesses that produce food for us to eat. These are businesses who hire year-round, and when they sell locally, those dollars stay within the local economy.

These are the folks whose kids are in FFA or 4-H and learn the passion of raising farm animals, growing heirloom tomatoes or planting and nurturing the obscure species of tree that will be beneficial to the earth’s oxygen for generations to come and learn to preserve the environment by using sustainable growing practices. These are not hobbyists.

I support Option 1. I do not want Clark County to reduce the AG-20 minimum lot size and density from 20 to 10 acres, nor do I support Clark County changing the Forest-40 zone minimum parcel size from 40 acres to 20 res. Changing minimum lot sizes within rural zones clearly appears to be a maneuver that gets around the protections now offered to agricultural lands (as required by the GMA) and is unilaterally in the interest of large
land-owners who see residential development or “light industrial” development in their future, all at the risk of their neighbors' land – and existing farms and farmlands.

Keep urban growth within the current urban growth boundary. We need to protect and grow our working farmlands – not destroy them.

Best regards,

Ann Foster

Organizer, Salmon Creek Farmers' Markets

Board member, Washington State Farmers Market Association

Member, Clark County Food System Council

President, North Salmon Creek Neighborhood Association

14011 NW 27th Avenue, Vancouver, WA

360-574-5093
NOVEMBER 18, 2014

Community Planning Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
PO Box 9810 Vancouver, Washington 98666-9810

Subject: Comments on the 2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan Update Alternatives.
Sent via email to: comp.plan@clark.wa.gov

Please submit these comments to the record.

Dear Sirs and Madams,

I am a rural resident of Clark County. I own 70 acres, much of which is timberland. I have been raising organic vegetables and fruits for many years, selling produce in the farmers’ markets and directly from the farm. I have 5 wells on the property. One puts out an adequate supply of water for my food production for now, one has dried up completely, 2 are very marginal, meaning they run out of water easily, and one is adequate for residential use.

Although I own many acres, only 4 are suitable for food production. Food production requires relatively flat land, electricity available for processing, roads for harvest and transport, and sunlight. Soil is also a major factor, but modern agriculture can amend many soils by means of organic compost and cover crops.

As most people realize, ample water is essential for food production here. Farmers cannot afford to buy water from a utility and expect to remain in business very long. Their well water is essential. Many studies reveal that the water table in Clark County is very limited. Here is a statement from Focus on Water Availability Lewis River Watershed, WRIA 27 p. 1 (Publication Number: 11-11-031 August 2012) accessed on Nov. 12, 2014

Factors affecting water availability

Here is limited water available for new uses in WRIA 27, especially given that river levels need to be maintained to ensure adequate water quality and fish migration. Additionally, Pacificorp has senior water rights to maintain reservoir levels in Lake Merwin and Yale Lake, and as a result, much of the water in the Lewis
River Watershed has already been spoken for. Increased demands from population growth, low summer and early fall streamflow levels, and impacts from climate change add to the challenge of finding new water supplies in WRIA 11, especially during the summer months."

I’m concerned that this is not being given adequate consideration when the county is planning to add more residential lots to rural areas.

I heard one argument submitted by Carol Levanen, of Clark County Citizens United, that water availability is not an issue in Clark County since “PUD supplies 93% of water to county residents already. I have looked into this matter since it didn’t seem to ring true to me.

Clark Public Utilities has 185,000 customers in Clark County. We can assume that that means the amount of homes and businesses that use electricity. They supply water to 31,000 customers. Adding up water supplied by the cities, Washougal, 5000, Camas, 7,652, Ridgefield, 2081, and Vancouver, 68,000, that comes to 113,733 on public water systems. The remaining 71,267 must be private wells.

It’s those private wells that will be in jeopardy if the county allows as many as 1000 more wells to rural areas. Who will be responsible when the wells start to go dry? How will farmers grow food for our community?

Water availability is certainly the most important problem that adding more home sites to rural Clark County will bring. Poor county road maintenance is another...already many roads are not wide enough to stripe so that residents can see the center line in winter months.

The schools, especially in Battle Ground, are already stretched to their limits with added students, with no plans to house the new influx of children. The Columbian just ran an article about that.

Tim Trohimovich of Futurewise has submitted a letter explaining many other reasons for limiting rural expansion. I hope you will take his advice seriously and choose to stay with Alternative 1 – no action.

Thank you,

Val Alexander,
Board member
Friends of Clark County
O'Donnell, Mary Beth

From: Bianca Benson <bianca@friendsofclarkcounty.org>
Sent: Tuesday, November 18, 2014 8:53 AM
To: Cnty 2016 Comp Plan
Cc: 'Coyote Ridge Ranch'
Subject: Comments on the 2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan Update Alternatives
Attachments: Alternative comments by Val.docx

Please review and submit attachment to the record.

Sincerely,

Bianca Benson
Executive Director
Friends of Clark County
503.701.9203
visit our website
November 17, 2014

Community Planning
Comp Plan Comments
P.O.9810
Vancouver, WA 98666

comp.plan@clark.wa.gov

RE: Proposed Zoning Changes for Parcel Nos. 230277000 and 230282000.

Dear Sirs:

We concur with and support the written comments submitted by Carol Levanen at the open house meeting on 10/29/14.

It would be an injustice if Clark County were to ignore the established small existing parcels and attempt to zone them as FR-20.

Our parcels Nos. 230277000 and 230282000 are situated south of the first standard parallel north near Yacolt Mt. Prior to the Growth Management Act these parcels were zoned R-5. There are 5 brothers and sisters in my generation in my family. Each of us should be allowed to build a home for each of us on the family tree farm and also grow timber. All of the parcels across Yacolt Mt. Road and immediately south of our tree farm are 5 acre parcels with homes. It is an alienation of my property
rights if Clark County attempts to prohibit us from building homes for ourselves on the property which has been owned by our family for almost 60 years. There are more than 12 homes near our property.

We know that Assessor's Parcel Account No. 230282-000, Tax Parcel No. 18 is a legal buildable lot or parcel as it was established as a separate parcel in 1948.

The following is an excerpt of the legal description for Assessor's Parcel Account No. 230282-000, recorded under Auditor's File No. 4866391 D on 6/25/12:

"This parcel is a legal lot. This parcel was created in 1949 when Clark County constructed Yacolt Mtn. Road, (re: Right of Way Deed, September 1, 1948, recorded under Auditor's File No. G08949, Book 448, Page 580) formerly known as Kelly Hill Road, said road construction in 1949 caused this parcel to be physically separated from the major portion of the SW 1/4 of the NE 1/4 of Section 5, T4 North, R3 East, WM. Subsequently, for this parcel, Assessor's Parcel Account No. 230282-000, Statutory Warranty Deed was recorded under Auditor's File No. G620280, image No. 849748, on December 4, 1972, and is that portion of the NW 1/4 of the SW 1/4 of the NE 1/4 of Section 5, T4 North, R3 East, Willamette Meridian, described as follows:

The distance measurements describing the legal dimensions of this parcel are according to the bearings taken, distance measurements made, and property line stakes set by the L. L. Knight survey of 1947. Along the parcel property lines established and marked by the L. L. Knight survey, the West property line fence was constructed in 1948 and the East and South property line fences were constructed in 1949. Thus the property lines of this parcel were established by survey and have been marked with property line fences since 1948 – 1949." (for further legal description refer to deed).

It is requested that the above described parcels be zoned for 5 or 6 acre family home sites which allow for growing timber.

Please add us to your mailing and update list at the above E-mail address and the below mailing address.

Sincerely,

Alan Greene

P.O. Box 2844

Battle Ground, WA 98604
Sharon Andreason & Kevin Engelstad  
Trustee, Vice President & President, Home Owners  
P.O. Box 1060  
Woodland, Washington 98674  
November 18, 2014

Community Planning  
Comp Plan Comments  
P.O. Box 9810  
Vancouver, Washington 98666  
Email: comp.plan@clark.wa.gov

Dear Community Planning:

We are writing on behalf of the Charlene Andreason Trust, Williams Park Development Corporation and the parcel that is our personal home. We control or own all of the property located south of Bratton Road that is in consideration for a zone change from FR-40 to FR-20 and outlined in the map and titled Proposed Area. We respectfully request that all the following delineated properties be rezoned to R-5 so they will be in compliance with the comprehensive plan in the future because none of the properties meet the FR-40 requirements now nor will they meet the FR-20 that is proposed. Additionally, all the properties are around 5 acres now with the exception of Lot 35 which is 14.06 acres and are legal buildable lots as determined by legal lot determination issued by Clark County.

All the properties located West and South of these properties have a zoning designation of R-5 and are improved lots with single family homes or vacant lots. So we are surrounded by 5 acre lots and all except the 14.06 acre lot are at the five acres in size or less. The parcel east of the proposed area is zoned 10 acres.

What we are asking is that our property be in compliance with the new comprehensive plan that will be adopted in 2016, and a change to R-5 zoning designation would accomplish that goal.

The properties that we own and request a zoning change to R-5 are:

Lot # 35, Tax # 2552220000, 14.06 acres, Charlene Andreason Trust  
Lot # 81, Tax # 2559110000, 5.00 acres, Charlene Andreason Trust  
Lot # 80, Tax # 2559100000, 5.13 acres, Charlene Andreason Trust  
Lot #22, 27 & 104, Tax # 2558520000, 5.38 Acres, Kevin Engelstad, Sharon Andreason, personal residence  
Lot #82, Tax # 2559120000, 5.00 acres, Williams Park Development Corporation  
Lot #83, Tax # 2559130000, 5.00 acres, Williams Park Development Corporation

These lots will never meet the FR-20 since they are under different ownership and with no chance to combine them to reach the new proposed designation. Thank you for your time in considering our request.

Sincerely,

Sharon Andreason & Kevin Engelstad
Enclosure
Please find attached our comments and request for zoning change for land that is in consideration for rezoning in the 2016 comp plan. If you need further assistance or clarification, please contact me at (350) 607-8504 or you can email at the above address.

Also would you send me an acknowledgement of this email and attachments. I have mailed the original request but will not arrive in time to meet your deadline of 5:00 pm today.

Thank you

Kevin Engelstad
Following comments were submitted online:

Parcel No: 209693000

Subject: Zoning

Comments:
As the area around I-5 Exit 16 is being slowly allowed to be developed, I would like to see my parcel zoned commercial/light industrial.

Submitted by:
Larry Anderson

Email: rocksluna@hotmail.com

Address:
1160 Bierney Creek Rd.
Lakeside, Mt.
We were not contacted prior to the existing zoning change.

The current zoning and the proposed zoning make little sense for the Thomas Lake area when one considers the soil type and the contradiction between policy is to have no more run off than 19th century pioneers found, but the practice of using heavy equipment to grade and compact the soil renders much of the soil nearly impervious to water. Placing infiltration lines in the ten feet between homes in heavily compacted soil often produces soggy yards and flooded crawl spaces during the wet season.

Ron Sturgeon
5303 NE 58th St
Vancouver 98661
693-3315
11/18/2014

BOCC
Comprehensive Plan Alternatives Input

RE: Property ID # 196176000, 196205000, 196346000, 196347000
5500 NE 139th Street, Vanc., WA 98686

For the public record:

Please change zoning to Residential.

My property is near Pleasant Valley Highlands and Gray Hawk Ridge which are very nice subdivisions. I would like to be the same size as they are. Farming my acres has no profit, and I’m too old and ready to sell.

Many subdivisions are more north and east of me. We are close to I-5 and 205 freeways this is a good place to put a neighborhood.

As you look on your maps you can see that our square from 50th Ave to 72nd Ave and 139th St to 159th Streets has been excluded in growth. Please extend growth to include this area.

Sincerely,

Grace Harris
360-573-2871

It’s time for me to be included.
Comments regarding the Clark County Comp. Plan:

Our property is very close to the Fargher Lake Rural Center. An access road (Fargher Lake Dr.) provides easy access into the property off of State Highway 503. Fargher Lake Drive also provides access to three owner-occupied residential parcels contiguous to the West property line of our property. Two of the parcels are on 2.5 acres. There are also residential properties contiguous to the North property line and in the surrounding area of the designated Fargher Lake Rural Center.

We realize that county planners are proposing an FR-20 zone for our parcel. This was the zoning when we purchased the property 40 years ago. Later it was changed to FR-40, which was a short sighted decision and without our consent. The FR-20 zone will bring the zoning back to where it was 40 years ago. This area has changed considerably over the past 40 years and there will be demand for smaller parcels especially in the vicinity of the newly designated Fargher Lake Rural Center. If you intend to cluster development in and around the Fargher Lake Rural Center, it would be logical to encourage the availability of smaller parcels in close proximity of the Fargher Lake Rural Center. This rather than have development spread further out rather than having it concentrated in the Rural Center vicinity.

For all these reasons, we request that parcels, including our own, in close proximity to the Fargher Lake Rural Center need to be designated an R-5 zone.

Thank you for considering our comments and we are hopeful that you will take them seriously into consideration.

Sincerely,
James W. Hanna (owner)
13410 N.E. Rose Parkway
Portland, OR 97230
T: (503) 246-0765
F: (503) 244-6541
jimhanna@qwest.net
O'Donnell, Mary Beth

From: Gretchen Starke <gstarke@pacifier.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 18, 2014 4:50 PM
To: Cnty 2016 Comp Plan
Subject: comments on alternative 2 of the comp plan
Attachments: draft eis, alternative 2 comments.doc

Please see the attached comments on the Draft EIS for the comprehensive growth management plan update. Thank you.

Gretchen Starke
Friends of Clark County
November 17, 2014

Community Planning Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
PO Box 9810 Vancouver, Washington 98666-9810

Dear Sirs and Madams:

Subject: Comments on the 2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan Update Alternatives.

Sent via email to: comp.plan@clark.wa.gov

First, before criticizing aspects of Alternative 2, we would like to express our approval of the idea of designating special zones for providing public facilities, including parks. This is far sighted and would be good for both the taxpayer and the eventual user of the facility.

However, the idea of having the same level of review for the division all parcels, whatever the size and location, in the rural zone is troubling. This proposal is more than a "clean up." It is a wholesale change in handling land division in the Rural Zone. As to the idea of "simplifying" land divisions, yes, it would do that. But, from the view point of the taxpayer and considering the future of the county, is that really desirable? Our contention is that it is not.

The purpose of the Growth Management Act is to prevent the sort of sprawl that this proposal would encourage. Under the shortened review of Level III, the cumulative effects of all those land divisions would be virtually ignored. Eventually, throughout the Rural Zone there would be five acre lots, each one considered in its own little bubble and created as if there would be no effect on its neighbors or the future of the county as a whole. Where would be the adequate consideration for increased traffic, for the adequacy of the water supply, the disposal of solid waste, the needs for police and fire protection services? Habitat protection, conserving agriculture, preventing pollution of our streams and rivers, all could be given short shrift under the Review III that is proposed.

The result would be a mess, neither rural nor urban. Wall to wall five acre lots do not make a truly rural area. Because public services cannot be provided efficiently to an area of five
acre lot after five acre lot, they would decline. Make no mistake, people want these public services, the amenities of civilization. Or taxes would go up. Or both would occur.

These are good and valid reasons to slow things down as the county becomes more and more developed. The needs of the people -- those here now and those yet to be born -- must take precedent over the desires of a particular land owner or developer.

But the thing that is most disturbing about this proposal to throw all Rural Zone land divisions, whatever the size, into the same Review Level III bucket, is that it is being incorporated into the update of the Growth Management Plan. To consider a change that would result in increased density in the Rural Zone as being merely just one of a few “cleanup, standardizing, and simplifying details” could confuse and mislead the public. Any series of land divisions that would increase density in the Rural Zone, as this proposal would do, should not be encouraged by making it easier. Dividing your land into smaller lots should be difficult.

No, the commissioners should tell the staff to take that proposal out of Alternative 2. If, for whatever reason, this proposal is wanted, it should be considered apart from the update of the comp plan. It should be presented to the public on its own and thoroughly explained. There should be a thorough discussion of all the issues involved -- traffic, quality and quantity of water, costs of providing electricity, loss of habitat and open space, among other issues. Further and most important, this proposal must undergo its own environmental review on its own complete with an analysis of cumulative effects.

Please refer to the other comments submitted by Friends of Clark County. Please enter this into the record. I wish to be a party of record and receive all information on the update of the comp plan.

Gretchen Starke
Friends of Clark County,
Board Member

892-8617
gstarke@pacifier.com
November 18, 2014

To: Clark County Community Planning
1300 Franklin St.
Vancouver, WA 98660
Email: comp.plan@clark.wa.gov

From: Terry Wellner
#23 Westridge Dr
Lake Oswego, OR 97034
(503) 522-9610
Email: twellner@aim.com

Re: 2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan Update

I respectfully request that my tax lot parcels No. 181207000 and 18125300 be changed to R-22 in the 2016 Comprehensive Plan Update (see attached partial zoning map).

Owning the adjacent lot to the south (tax lot #181208000), I would like to develop the three 10 acre parcels together mainly as condominiums with some office/commercial along 179th. The proposed OR-22 zoning on the southern lot is consistent with this development.

Proximity to I-5 and 179th exit has resulted in large tracts directly west and southwest of my lots to be zoned CG (General Commercial). A new traffic circle is planned at the junction of 179th St and 15th Avenue, just at the southwest corner of our planned development.

The higher density residential zoning will allow more people to access these major roads and office/retail developments with minimum travel on city and county roads.

Willow Creek and associated wetlands run north/south along the west side of our lots. This green space will provide a pleasant setting for condominium development, as well as a visual and noise buffer to I-5 and commercial activities on adjoining CG and MX zoned properties.

Thank you for your assistance.

Best regards,

Terry Wellner
Good Morning Jacqueline,

Attached is my request for a zone change in the 2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan. I have also sent this to the comp.plan email address. Could you please let me know that the appropriate people receive my request.

Thank you for your help,

Terry Wellner
RE: Growth Plan Update 2016 and remove urban holding on my property.

Property ID#181449000, physical: 19110 NE 50th Ave, Vancouver 98686
current zoning: R1-7.5
proposed zoning: R1-20

To all decision making parties in regards to the proposed alternatives for the comp plan for 2016.

I will make this brief: As I have said many times, NO, I do not want the zoning to change. I have requested in every available way of communication, workshops, hearings, letters, emails, one on one conversations for 22 years. Be it the board of commissioners', or planning I have asked for this zoning and to lift the urban holding, it was finally included in the comp plan in 2008 with this zoning. I am continuing to ask to have the urban holding lifted.

I would like all to consider and to recall this is the same property Future Wise protested in Olympia earlier this year and lost.

If anyone wants to read further as to why leaving the current zoning is the "fair" and "best" thing to do, please read my last communications below starting with David Madore July 11th, 2013.

Regards;

Pam Poelvoorde
12714 NE 43rd Ave
Vancouver, WA 98686
----- Original Message -----
From: Pamela Poelvoorde
To: Benton, Don
Sent: Saturday, April 05, 2014 3:29 PM
Subject: Re: original Vancouver school records-JLA CC fair-urban holding

Don,

In a less formal note. Enjoy your vacation with Mary the the family.
Thanks for your help and direction.

Pam

----- Original Message ----- 

From: Benton, Don
To: 'Pamela Poelvoorde'
Cc: Clifford, Christopher
Sent: Saturday, April 05, 2014 2:25 PM
Subject: RE: original Vancouver school records-JLA CC fair-urban holding

Pamela,
Thank you for your email. I believe The Vancouver School District would be very interested in your Grandfather’s papers and certainly the Clark County museum. I have one of my staff members, Chris Clifford, looking into your other question about the urban holding situation on your property. I will be out of the office on vacation with my family until April 14th. I will follow up with Chris when I return to see what the outcome was.
Thank you for your encouraging words. I have tried my whole life to bring conservative common sense to government and I am enjoying doing that at both the state and county level.

Thank you,

Don
Don Benton
Director, Environmental Services Department
360-397-2121 extension 5358

From: Pamela Poelvoorde (mailto:pamelahp@msn.com)
Sent: Tuesday, April 01, 2014 9:55 AM
To: Benton, Don; Don Benton
Cc: pamelahp@msn.com
Subject: Fw: original Vancouver school records-JLA CC fair-urban holding

Senator Don Benton
409 Legislative Building
P.O. Box 40417
Olympia, WA 98504-0417

Clark County Dept of Environmental Services
1300 Franklin Street
Vancouver, WA 98666-5000

Dear Senator Benton:
I am forwarding you an email I sent to David Madore in July of last year. I know with some direction from you, Oliver Orjiako and Marty Snell are more than capable to get the needed information to the decision making positions to resolve this issue.

I would first like to thank you again for supporting my granddaughter Beth-Ann at the JLA auction last summer. It was her 10th and final year in 4H and we are all so happy and proud of her. It was a great last year for her, her two hogs placed as Grand Champion market Hog, and Reserve grand champion in middle weight. I know you have supported the kids for 20+ years and I want you to know I am proud of your dedication. It does not go unnoticed that you are very involved in the county as well as the state.

The third item I want your advice on is I have the original hand written documents, accounting and letters for the Vancouver school district from the 1800s and early 1900s. My great grandfather John B Lindsay, the first county commissioner and petitioner/organizer of school district 59, doc dated February 4th, 1884. However the county would not know my great grandfather was very instrumental in asking the other settlers to work with him to have a place for the children to learn basic education, because I have the hand written letters. This was very important to my great grandfather because in Iowa he had no access to a school and he could not read or write, so Good Hope school was built. My grandfather (Andrew Lindsay) was on the school board for many years and was responsible for having the school cleaned out. The family did not know where they should go, and we were always told they were "grandpa's papers" and they were just kept in a box. Ok, now it comes to me, I think they are a important part of our history and do not belong to me.

This is were you come in. What should I do with the records? I was talking with Pat Jolatta a few years ago when I was the VP of the Battle Ground garden club and we were going to get together. My mother had gotten ill a short time after Pat and I had talked. I was very busy with my mom for several years until she passed a year and a half ago. I feel I need to take care of this, "it is on my bucket list" as the grandkids would say.

Getting back to the beginning of my letter. I am sure after reading the below letter to David Madore there is little explanation needed. I talked with you and Deb Wallace several years ago about not being able to build a one story house on the property because I could not climb the stairs. I wanted to sell part of the property and use the proceeds to make things easier for my mother. Both of you agreed it was unfair and to challenge it, but the county moves so slowly I finally sold the house.

After being in this process for over 22 years, I believe it was 2008 we were included with good zoning, and I don't think it would have happened then if it were not for Betty Sue and a great planning department. I believe with Steve Stuart at the wheel, so to speak, I would be kept in urban holding forever. I have had several people interested in the property but with the overlay they do not want to take a chance of investing the money. I have been told "with the long process and, "say one thing and do another", in Clark County we are looking for something NOT in urban holding". I understand how buyers feel.
I think it is ridiculous when the Clark County Humane Society has to have Steve Horenstein represent them to renew a new contract. **On the other hand Jeff Smith, owner of Smith Root, can easily come in and have the holding lifted on 50th & 159th to expand his business without the needed services. Jeff Smith can have urban holding lifted, Jeff Smith can put in a septic tank, but then I don't have a contract with the Government.** I quite frankly don't care what Smith Root is doing with their business, I have better things to worry about and I am glad Smith Root is doing well, it is good for all of us. My reason for bringing it up is **Steve Stuart said to justify lifting the Urban Holding for Jeff Smith and not me is "Jeff Smith will be paying so there will be money for services in front of your property".** That sounds like impact fees to me, and I doubt that is were the monies would be spent. David Madore said in the same workshop the county is not charging impact fees, and Steve Stuart did not disagree, and he always does if David Madore says anything correct or not, but the fees will be back. If Jeff Smith is not paying impact fees then what is he paying?

Bottom line is I know more information about what is going on in that building than I want too. I do not want to speak again and again at public meeting, bring up yet another bad decision made by the county in public and have the local media take up more time and money of all the people in the county. All I am asking is a fair shake, with as little waves as possible without getting Steve Horenstein involved and I know it can be done.

I apologize for the fragmented sentences and bits and pieces of information but it would be a novel to go into everything in my files.

Thank you for your time and I look forward to hearing from you.

Pam Poelvoorde
12714 NE 43rd Ave
Vancouver 98686

Hm# 360-576-1460
cell# 360-907-8431

----- Original Message ----- 
From: Pamela Poelvoorde
To: David.Madore@clark.wa.gov
Sent: Monday, July 29, 2013 11:36 AM
Subject: Fw: Lifting urban on 50th Ave

July 29, 2013
Dear Mr. Madore;
It has been several weeks since we talked at the county workshop and I have not received a response from you. Please take the time to give me an update on were you are in getting the problem, described in my email, solved.

Thank you,
Pam Poelvoorde

----- Original Message ----- 
From: Pamela Poelvoorde
To: Sent: Thursday, July 11, 2013 3:01 PM
Subject: RE: Lifting urban on 50th Ave

David Madore
Clark County Commissioner
1300 Franklin Street
Vancouver, WA 98666-5000

RE: Board workshop on 7/10/2013 regarding lifting urban holding on 50th Ave.
property know as 19100 NE 50th Ave, Vancouver, WA 98686 ID #181449000

Dear Mr. Madore:

First I would like to thank you for taking the time to talk with my daughter and I
yesterday.

At this point in time I am again requesting the lifting the urban holding on our
property. I know that lifting it at the same time as the industrial property on 50th that
is being considered with Mr. Smith is the only option for consideration I will have this
year. As was mentioned yesterday changes to the plan can/is only done once a year. I
started the process with the county in 1991 with a short plat application, it was denied.
I was told by county planning at the time due to the new GMA, they were putting
together a plan. I was told I did not have a preliminary in at that time so it was a no go.
The next meeting I went to I received a draft titled "The Hometown Community
Framework Plan for Clark County, Washington" dated 10/15/1992, and I still have it in
my files upon files and it is interesting reading.

I will not go into the years of letters of county record the family and I have written,
meetings, and hearing asking for reasonably zoning. I will say I am in my 22nd year, 15
of them spending countless hours at the county meeting and hearings, listening,
speaking and writing letters to county officials. I finally have the zoning only to be
stopped again by urban holding overlay. In a prior board meeting I was told, in so many
words, I was getting compensated in lower taxes by not being able to use the property
the way I would like, build a one story
home on my property because of a disability, sell to a family member,
builder/investor. I would like to make it clear it is not compensation, it is deferment of
the prior 7 year's tax, at 8% interest, 20% penalty for change of use, and 1% per
month from April 30th of the tax year through the month of removal when I sell the
property and the use is changed. The last estimate I received from the county several
years ago, if I removed the entire 18.85 acres was almost $30,000.00. Money would
also be made for the county in development with very low impact to the area. When the
one acre is put in my daughter Amy's name there will remain 17.85 acres of the original
20 acre parcel. Of a twenty acre parcel there are three homes on a acre or more,
approx 4 acres of timber (can't harvest the trees, in timber management) in the back
with Mill Creek running through it (wet lands). Now we are down to 13.85 acres and
192nd st runs the length of the entire north side of the property and I will guess that is
close to 2 acres, leaving 11.85 acres. In a short plat it does not matter what the zoning
is, with the needed land requirement to build there is not going to be a large impacting subdivision. I do not know how 5 to 12 upscale home are going to make a large impact on the area, and as far as water/sewer, they may hold it and build later or have larger lots with wells and septic. That again will be up to the county.

The situation we were talking about yesterday stems back to the same problem, urban holding. The property is in The Lindsay Family Trust and sadly my mother passed away and it states upon her death the acre my daughter (Amy Blankenship) is living on belongs to her. There is an exception in the law for such cases, 40.520.010 Legal Lot Determination, #5 states- The parcel was created through court order, will and testament, or other process listed as exempt from platting requirements by RCW 58.17.035, 58.17.040 or Section 40.540.010 A, or through an exemption from platting regulations provided by law at the time of creation of the parcel;

I spoke with Oliver in April of this year in regards to the acre transfer to my daughters name and he said he was not sure if there is a fee, however he did not think there would be a problem and planning would help with the process. I will say again, Oliver is a valued asset to the county, I may not always like the answers but he has always been kind and professional.

Last week I took all needed papers into permits (per Jeff on the phone) and spoke with a woman planner of 12 years and she was aware of the RCW and in checking the approval criteria of zoning (R1-7.5), that is ok, through court order, will and testament, or other process, that is ok. Then in pulling up the property I got yet again, no can do, URBAN HOLDING OVERLAY. She said there was nothing further she could do for me.

This is not the problem it has been made out to be. I understand you need a plan, reasons and answers that may come up from people that will oppose it at a hearing. There will be a property owner asking, why that property and not mine, is very easy. There is a law that gives people the right to be beneficiaries of real property through wills and testament, upon death, because of that persons passing the urban holding needed to be lifted. I doubt there will be several people wanted in on that exception.

As far as the GMA, as written, does not care what landowner is in urban holding. I have seen the zoning, land use, and colors of the maps change many times. I have seen people come into the county, make request, receive their requests, build and move on. It is up to the board to balance fair choices and to protect private property rights, not eminent domain without compensation or consideration.

When I was a young girl I was honored to be part of the "Daughters of the Pioneers" I was honored to be be recognized at the Clark County Fair for being a descendent of the oldest family in Clark County. Now in my 60s I just want to sell the property and get out. I have been in holding for 22+ years and that has lowered the value of the property considerably, and that is wrong. I played by the rules, I have been patient but I am no longer.

I am holding you to you word that you can get this done for our family this year. I have put it back on the market and it is our families time in the county with no excuses.
I would like to thank you in advance for taking care of this matter for us. If you have questions please do not hesitate to contact me. I look forward to hearing from you.

Pamela Poelvoorde  
12714 NE 50th Ave  
Vancouver, WA 98686  
360-576-1460

--

This e-mail and related attachments and any response may be subject to public disclosure under state law.
O'Donnell, Mary Beth

From: Orjiako, Oliver
Sent: Thursday, November 20, 2014 8:42 AM
To: Mielke, Tom; 'Pamela Poelvoorde'; Cnty 2016 Comp Plan
Cc: Madore, David; Barnes, Ed; Snell, Marty; marilee.maccall@clark.wa.gov; Benton, Don; chris.clifford@clark.wa.gov; Cnty Board of Commissioners General Delivery; commplanning@clark.gov; Lebowsky, Laurie
Subject: RE: GROWTH PLAN UPDATE original Vancouver school records-JLA CC fair-urban holding

Good morning Commissioner:

Mrs. Pamela Poelvoorde property is in the urban growth boundary. I am looking into the matter and have talked to Pamela in the past. Staff will take care of her issue. Please, let me know if you have questions. Thanks.

Best Regards,

Oliver

From: Mielke, Tom
Sent: Wednesday, November 19, 2014 5:19 PM
To: 'Pamela Poelvoorde'; Cnty 2016 Comp Plan
Cc: Madore, David; Barnes, Ed; Snell, Marty; Orjiako, Oliver; marilee.maccall@clark.wa.gov; Benton, Don; chris.clifford@clark.wa.gov; Cnty Board of Commissioners General Delivery; commplanning@clark.gov; Lebowsky, Laurie
Subject: RE: GROWTH PLAN UPDATE original Vancouver school records-JLA CC fair-urban holding

Hi Pamela,

I'm looking at your address of 19110 NE 50th Ave. and to the best of my recollection we are not proposing any changes in zoning if you are even in the UGB. With all of that said, I will follow-up with staff and Mr. Benton on what is going on.

Thanks,

Tom

From: Pamela Poelvoorde [mailto:pamelahp@msn.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 18, 2014 1:13 PM
To: Cnty 2016 Comp Plan
Cc: Mielke, Tom; Madore, David; Barnes, Ed; Snell, Marty; Orjiako, Oliver; marilee.maccall@clark.wa.gov; Benton, Don; chris.clifford@clark.wa.gov; Cnty Board of Commissioners General Delivery; commplanning@clark.gov; Lebowsky, Laurie
Subject: Fw: GROWTH PLAN UPDATE original Vancouver school records-JLA CC fair-urban holding

RE: Growth Plan Update 2016 and remove urban holding on my property.
    Property ID#181449000, physical: 19110 NE 50th Ave, Vancouver 98686
    current zoning: R1-7.5
    proposed zoning: R1-20

To all decision making parties in regards to the proposed alternatives for the comp plan for 2016.
I will make this brief: As I have said many times, **NO**, I do not want the zoning to change. I have requested in every available way of communication, workshops, hearings, letters, emails, one on one conversations for 22 years. Be it the board of commissioners', or planning I have asked for this zoning and to **lift the urban holding**, it was finally included in the comp plan in 2008 with this zoning. I am continuing to ask to have the urban holding lifted.

I would like all to consider and to recall this is the same property Future Wise protested in Olympia earlier this year and lost.

If anyone wants to read further as to why leaving the current zoning is the "fair" and "best" thing to do, please read my last communications below starting with David Madore July 11th, 2013.

Regards;

Pam Poelvoorde
12714 NE 43rd Ave
Vancouver, WA 98686

--- Original Message ---
From: Pamela Poelvoorde
To: Benton. Don
Sent: Saturday, April 05, 2014 3:29 PM
Subject: Re: original Vancouver school records-JLA CC fair-urban holding

Don,

On a less formal note. Enjoy your vacation with Mary the the family.

Thanks for your help and direction.

Pam

----- Original Message ----- 
From: Benton. Don
To: 'Pamela Poelvoorde'
Cc: Clifford. Christopher
Sent: Saturday, April 05, 2014 2:25 PM
Subject: RE: original Vancouver school records-JLA CC fair-urban holding

Pamela,
Thank you for your email. I believe The Vancouver School District would be very interested in your Grandfather's papers and certainly the Clark County museum. I have one of my staff members, Chris Clifford, looking into your other question about the urban holding situation on your property. I will be out of the office on vacation with my family until April 14th. I will follow up with Chris when I return to see what the outcome was.
Thank you for your encouraging words. I have tried my whole life to bring conservative common sense to government and I am enjoying doing that at both the state and county level.

Thank you,

Don
Don Benton
My husband Doug and I own the referenced property. While we appreciate the proposed growth plan (Alternative 2) for our area, we are requesting a complete de-designation in zoning of our property from an FR 40/FR 2 to a RURAL designation with ability to subdivide into 3-5 acre parcels and to be included within the urban growth boundary. In 1994, prior to the growth management act, our property was zoned for residential. In 1994, our property was randomly down zoned by the county to AG, Forest Tier 2 and yet our house resides in a neighborhood of 7 houses. Moreover, we are supported by residential water service and we are surrounded by residential zoned properties and/or properties that are non-conforming in size to their current zoning (as per the County's property information website).

Despite when the decision was made to allow surrounding properties to subdivide (i.e. before or after 1994), I feel we are being held to a standard that is not consistent and is unfair. We are again requesting the opportunity, as so many others have done around us, to subdivide our property into 3-5 acre parcels. I have a long list of examples below of neighboring properties that are still today zoned FR 40/FR 2 just as we are - but have non-conforming lot sizes. Additionally, all of these properties are classified the same way on the county's environmental constraints pages.

Information about our property and our immediate neighbors is below. As I stated above all of these properties are zoned on the county website as FR 40/FR 2 despite the current lot sizes.

23700 NE 176th St, Brush Prairie (Lightfoot) – 21.65a
23512 NE 176th St, Brush Prairie (Eric and Michelle Solari) – 2.93a
23511 NE 176th St, Brush Prairie (Paul and Vanessa Fitzgerald) – 2.52a
23611 NE 176th St, Brush Prairie (Frank and Meredith Page) – 3.01a
23703 NE 176th St, Brush Prairie (Ken and Sandy Mantha) - 2.78a
23303 NE 176th St, Brush Prairie (Jim and Maria Azinger) – 2.74a
23606 NE 178th St, Brush Prairie (Ray and Nancy Scheimer) – 2.79a

*Original owners of all of this property Gordon and Kathleen Homola*

Boundary line adjustments were made in 2003

There is another street (180th) to the North of us that appears to be the same type of situation. The property on 180th was all owned at one time by Melvin and Verda Homola. All addresses are classified as FR-40 and FR-2 but have lot sizes ranging from 1-6 acres. The addresses include:

23609 NE 180th St, Brush Prairie
23401 NE 180th St, Brush Prairie
23700 NE 180th St, Brush Prairie
23807 NE 180th St, Brush Prairie

Lastly, there is another property directly to the south of us that was once 54.91a that has recently been subdivided into multiple lots (6a – 14a plots). All of the properties below were and remain classified as FR-40 and FR-2. The addresses include the following:

17301 NE Home Rd., Brush Prairie
17305 NE Home Rd., Brush Prairie
17309 NE Home Rd., Brush Prairie
17403 NE Home Rd., Brush Prairie
17405 NE Home Rd., Brush Prairie

Thank you for your consideration. If you have additional questions or need to reach me, please feel free to contact me via email or my mobile phone number below.

Regards,

*Keri Lightfoot*

360/448-0146 Mobile
Comments are:

Please develop an Alternative that includes a full range of options for preserving rural and urban agriculture including permaculture, natural farming, food forest gardening, and areas for observing nature in all its messiness and glory; urban and rural forest, prairie, wetlands and water feature “shorelines,” fish and wildlife habitat (including pollinator and other beneficial insect habitat). Please protect surface and ground water quality and quantity, parks and recreation, and other such “natural resource” values.

We need healthy local food and healthy local food requires quality soil, air and water. Optimal nutrition is essential for a quality life.

Thank you so very much for accepting these comments into the public record and into the 2016 plan.

Sincerely

signed,

William C. Milmoe
6609 NE 76th Circle
Vancouver WA 98661
360 695 4482
In my first comments I forgot to emphasize the importance of affordability, health and community. I would rather work less, drive less, bike safely more, walk more and share knowledge, food and entertainment with neighbors then be a "good consumer". Life is way more important than some abstract number (like GDP).

Please help make our community more liveable, resilient and sustainable and less of a colony of large corporations and Washington D.C. Better to be a free person with real security then a cowering slave.

Organic or better farming/gardening, keeping out enslaving GMO's are very important to me and my friends.

Thank you so very much!!!

William Milmoe
6609 NE 76th Circle
Vancouver WA 98661

360 695 4482
Oliver:

Comments from Jude.

Gordy

From: Wait, Judith Ann [mailto:judith.wait@email.wsu.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, November 18, 2014 4:51 PM
To: Cnty 2016 Comp Plan
Cc: Euler, Gordon
Subject: comments for the record re Comp Plan Alts & EIS

Comments attached.
Thanks for accepting them into the public record,
and for addressing them soon.
signed,
Jude Wait

Please develop a true Alternative to the proposed “Alternatives” you have proposed. Otherwise, Alternative 1 is the only choice. If you plan on combining 2 and 3, why don’t you present that upfront? Are you trying to work around the intent and/or letter of Washington State’s Growth Management Act (GMA) or State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA)? One is not an alternative to the other. The only comparable Alternatives are 1 and 2, or 1 and 3.

Per the comments submitted by Futurewise, we agree. We also agree with the comments submitted by several members of the Friends of Clark County. Together, they would make a good start at a viable Alternative. The two documents developed by the Clark County Food System Council are also herein incorporated, as previous comments (to the SEIS Scoping) stated, as they include recommendations for conserving food production agriculture.

Furthermore, you should develop an Alternative that includes a full range of options for preserving rural and urban agricultural (and permaculture and native vegetation areas), urban and rural forest and prairie, wetlands and “shorelines,” fish and wildlife habitat (including pollinator and other beneficial insect habitat), surface and ground water quality and quantity, parks and recreation, and other such “natural resource” values.

This Alternative could be called the Sustainable Future Alternative, and it should include Principles of Smart Growth to address the other issues, some of which are touched upon in your Proposed “Alternative” 2 and 3, such as transportation and regional travel, parks and recreation (add: for the region including integrating/collaborating with the Cities in Clark County).

See also the two sets of comments submitted on Sept 1, 2014, on the (Supplemental) EIS from Jude Wait (reincorporated herein by reference, so not repeated). The proposed Sustainable Future Alternative could address the issues raised (there and herein). As well, additional Elements of the Comprehensive Plan, such as the heretofore recommended Agriculture Element should be included. …and would be both comprehensive and integrated into Water and Environment Elements. To evaluate the Sustainable Futures Alternative, and compare Alternatives, use a vision for a resilient future, a future we will be proud to promote for our grandchildren’s grandchildren—also commonly referred to as a sustainable future—as evaluation criteria.

Get some help with the recommendations herein, such as about Smart Growth and Sustainable Development, from MRSC http://www.mrsc.org/subjects/planning/smartgrowth.aspx and the American Planning Association (whose Washington chapter had a conference in Spokane in October, 2014—see the Legacy and Prophecy brochure for resource contacts). There are resources galore from which Clark County could choose to use. Join the ICLEI’s Local Governments for Sustainability USA and use their toolkit <http://www.icleiusa.org/news/press-room/press-releases/iclei-launches-sustainability-planning-toolkit-to-accelerate-movement-of-sustainable-cities-and-counties>.  

013617
In the meantime, until a true Alternative is co-developed (with true community participation), one that ensures sustainable growth management, the Environmental review of proposed aspects of Alternatives could allow phasing, pursuant to the provision of the SEPA Rules [WAC 197-11-060(5)]. For example, “Phasing allows environmental review to focus on issues that are ready for decision, while deferring decisions that require additional information to the future” (See also Snohomish County’s Environmental Policy Code (Chapter 30.61 SCC); referred to in the Comprehensive Plan 2015 Update Draft EIS Volume 1 Snohomish County).

As such, No proposed alterations to the parcel sizes, current zoning, or other designations pertaining to Rural parcels, Forest parcels, Reserve, Holding, or Agriculture, are acceptable at this time.

Arguments already made by Futurewise, Friends of Clark County, Agricultural Preservation Committee, Future of Farming, American Farmland Trust, and Clark County Food System Council documents (herein included by reference) indicate the need for more information and a solid plan for implementation of a full range of tools, strategies, and programs—Agricultural preservation tools etc—as well as the Washington State Food System Roundtable principles and goals. Until Clark County can develop an Alternative that ensures future sustainability principles and laws are presented and evaluated, including those necessary to mitigate adverse impacts, Clark County should stick to the real “map cleanup” efforts such as making the color scheme legible.

For example, in the proposed Alternative 2, a downsizing of parcel size, permitting subdivision (and all its consequences) would be imposed, whether on the people who said they wanted to keep the current parcel size designation, as well as the people who would like a smaller lot size category. Yet there are other solutions, which would be much better in the long run, for all the people—those who own parcels, those who returned the survey (aka Census but not even close to a scientifically valid survey nor census that should be conducted to inform policy), and all residents of Clark County, now and into the future.

Welcome to the future Alternative: Young people want to farm. People want to eat locally produced wholesome food. Citizens want good governance and good health. We know we need the birds and bees to cultivate healthy habitats. The honorable activity of farming, and growing food that feeds people, is not a mere “hobby.” Food farming is vital for our present lives, for the future for our great-great-grandchildren, and for resilient communities. Evaluate the Sustainable Future Alternative for Clark County.

Respectfully submitted,

Jude Wait,
Co-editor/researcher/author of the Sustainable World Sourcebook (2010);
Clark County resident
November 17, 2014

Mr. Oliver Orjiako
Planning Director
Clark County Community Development
Post Office Box 5000
Vancouver, Washington 98666-6000

Subject: CR-1 Text Amendment/Sewer

Dear Oliver:

As you know, I represent Dale Sanders who owns property located at 21605 N.E. 10th Avenue. The property is currently zoned CR-1 and Urban Reserve. We previously submitted requests to the County for it to consider inclusion of this property in an urban growth area. However, development of the three alternatives the County is considering for its 2016 comprehensive plan update does not include Mr. Sanders’ property in an urban growth area. The primary reason Mr. Sanders wishes to include his property in a UGA is so that the property can be served with sewer. Under current County code, sewer can serve CR-1 property if it currently exists under this provision:

UDC 40.370.010C. New Structures within UGA and Rural Centers Served by Public Sewer – Public Sewer Connection Required – Exceptions.

Inside UGAs and rural centers served by public sewer, connection to public sewer is required as a condition of building permit issuance for any new structure which has the potential to increase sewage effluent, or additions to existing structures which have the potential to increase sewage effluent, unless the responsible official determines, using a Type I review process, that the new structure or addition is for single-family detached residential use, or a nonresidential use for which an on-site sewage disposal system can be approved by the Clark County Health Department....
The County has already made a policy choice to allow rural center property to be served by sewer if the sewer line exists. We are seeking a minor amendment to allow rural center property to be served by sewer if the sewer line is within 1/2 mile of the rural center boundary. We believe this would be consistent with current policy as long as controls are in place that would not allow properties outside of UGAs and rural centers to hook-up to sewer unless some other exception is met. Accordingly, we are offering the proposed amendment set forth below as an alternative to including Mr. Sanders' property in the UGA.

UDC 40.370.010 Sewerage Regulations

E. Public Sewer Connection Prohibited Outside UGAs – Exceptions.

For proposed structures or other developments outside of a UGA, connection to public sewer is prohibited except as follows:

1. In response to documented health hazards; or

2. To provide public sewer to regional park facilities, K – 12 public schools or to uses within the urban reserve district otherwise required to be served by public sewer; or

3. Where the county has contractually committed to permit public sewer connection; or

4. To serve developments within rural centers if an existing sewer line is within 1/2 mile from the boundary of the rural center; provided, however, property outside of rural centers and UGAs cannot be served by the sewer lines serving rural centers unless an exception in (E)(1), (2) or (3) is met.

If sewer is extended, the maximum number of permitted hookups should be specified at the time of extension and no additional development exceeding this number should be permitted.
Please consider this request during the 2016 comprehensive plan update. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

LeAnne M. Bremer, P.C.

cc: Dale Sanders
November 19, 2014

LeAnne M. Bremer, P.C.
Miller Nash, LLP
Attorneys at Law
500 Broadway Street, Suite 400
Vancouver WA 98660

RE: Response to November 17, 2014 Letter regarding your request for CR-1 test amendment/sewer relating to Mr. Dale Sanders property located at 21605 NE 10th Avenue.

Dear LeAnne:

Thank you for your letter dated November 17, 2014 requesting a text amendment to UDC 40.370.010 Sewerage Regulations. The previous request was to include the property into the urban growth boundary. As you are aware, the property is designated a Rural Commercial and zoned existing commercial (CR-1) outside of Rural Centers. You are correct that the three proposed alternatives slated for review under SEPA did not show inclusion of the parcel in the urban growth area. That is because the City of Vancouver is not proposing to expand the current urban growth area.

The status of the Duluth area comes up often in term of whether it qualifies as a rural center. It is important to note that the Cities of Battle Ground and Ridgefield are expressing concern about the county enlarging the existing number of commercially designated parcels in the area.

Community Planning Department will log your request, along with those of other property owners making a similar request for consideration in the current plan update process. I will recommend that you follow news reports concerning the plan and watch for announcements about meetings that may be of interest to you. You may sign up for news and announcements by email or also learn more about the growth plan update by visiting our website at www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016 update/comments.html If you have questions, please contact Jose Alvarez at (360) 397-2280 ext. 4898.

Sincerely,

Oliver Orjiako, Director
Community Planning Department

cc: Community Planning: Jose Alvarez, Gordy Euler
Civil PA's Office: Chris Cook
Archive/Record: Mary Beth O'Donnell, Marilee McCall
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—he is the name 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

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 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 NE 199th st
Ridgefield, WA 98642
For the index.

-----Original Message-----
From: Euler, Gordon
Sent: Thursday, November 06, 2014 5:07 PM
To: ronlisahoffman@msn.com
Subject: FW: 13719 NE Laurin Rd

Lisa:

Oops--just re-read the e-mail and see your address is below.

Your parcel is zoned for agriculture, but has an industrial urban reserve overlay on it. Urban reserve is used as a long-range planning tool; the intent is to identify lands close to urban growth areas that will someday be included in urban growth areas. There isn't any change proposed except to the underlying zoning of AG-20. Since you only have an acre the change wouldn't benefit you, as you point out.

What you might be interested in is a proposal to create a rural industrial land bank on the Lagler (across 117th Avenue) and Ackerland (north of you) properties. Check out the webpage: http://www.clark.wa.gov/planning/landbank for more information.

Gordy Euler
Clark County Community Planning.

-----Original Message-----
From: Euler, Gordon
Sent: Thursday, November 06, 2014 4:56 PM
To: 'ronlisahoffman@msn.com'
Cc: O'Donnell, Mary Beth
Subject: FW: 13719 NE Laurin Rd

Lisa:

You asked a number of questions here. It would be helpful in responding to have your location. Thanks.

Gordy Euler
Clark County Community Planning

-----Original Message-----
From: Lebowsky, Laurie
Sent: Thursday, November 06, 2014 2:10 PM
To: 'ronlisahoffman@msn.com'
Cc: Euler, Gordon
Subject: FW: 13719 NE Laurin Rd

Hi Lisa,
Gordy Euler could help you with this question and I copied him on this email.

-----Original Message-----
From: Lisa Hoffman [mailto:ronlisahoffman@msn.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 06, 2014 2:09 PM
To: Lebowsky, Laurie
Subject: 13719 NE Laurin Rd

Ms. Lebowsky- My husband, Ron, met you last week at the town hall open house on land use change. My concern is the light industrial railroad overlay zoning. What is the purpose of that change - why was it changed? The Ag20 to Ag10 has no effect on us or our neighbors. We're all in the same zoning but all have grandfathered 1-5 acre lots. Can you please shed some light on this or direct to me to right person who can? Thank you
Lisa
Sent from Windows Mail

From: ike.nwankwo@commerce.wa.gov  
Sent: Tuesday, November 18, 2014 4:33 PM  
To: susan rasmussen  
Cc: Jeff.Wilson@commerce.wa.gov

Susan, I called you (360) 263-2154 last week to discuss the issues you raise regarding Clark County’s comprehensive plan update but you were not available.  
I left a message hoping you would call back – I hope you received my message.

I am going to call you again now and hope you are available to discuss your concerns, if not, please feel free to call me any time you have a moment.  
My phone number is 360-725-3056

Thanks very much  
Ike

From: susan rasmussen  
Sent: Friday, November 07, 2014 12:00 PM  
To: Nwankwo, Ike (COM)  
Subject: Hello Ike,

I realize that you are a very busy person with a lot of responsibilities. However, I am still waiting answers about concerns that we have regarding the updates to the Clark County comprehensive plan.

Another issue that is of prime importance to the rural Clark County property owners, is the fact that the rural communities and their citizens are only being offered one plan that addresses the rural lands. By offering three alternative plans, the planners are giving the impression that there are viable choices to be made from these “alternatives.” In truth, only one of these “alternatives” speaks in anyway to the rural lands. In effect, we are offered no options. The rural citizens are being dictated to. By strategically limiting the number of options that address rural lands, the planners are being neglectful of their required duties regarding the SEIS scoping report, and GMA policies.

On October 20, I asked you to review our Superior Court Case No. 96-2-00080-2. Written by Judge Poyfair, April 4, 1997, Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law and Order; court orders:  
“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 of the terms of the GMA.”

On November 1, I posed the question to you, “Why haven’t these Superior Court Orders been upheld?” Carol Levanen and I asked the same question to you at the county’s open house at the Ridgefield Fire and Rescue complex October 30.

Doesn’t Clark County have an opportunity here for the 2016 updates to acknowledge the Superior Court orders of 1997, make the necessary corrections to the comp. plan, and bring the county in compliance to the written orders?
O'Donnell, Mary Beth

From: Orjiako, Oliver
Sent: Thursday, November 20, 2014 11:40 AM
To: Alvarez, Jose; O'Donnell, Mary Beth
Cc: Cook, Christine; Wendt, Brian
Subject: FW: Hello Ike,

Just FYI

From: Nwankwo, Ike [mailto:ike.nwankwo@commerce.wa.gov]
Sent: Thursday, November 20, 2014 11:31 AM
To: susan rasmussen
Cc: Wilson, Jeff; Orjiako, Oliver; Euler, Gordon
Subject: RE: Hello Ike,

Hi Susan,
Moving is quite a hassle and I sympathize.

I have been discussing your concerns with the county and advising they address them. I didn’t know you were expecting a response from me. As you know, the county has not submitted anything to us for review and so I do not have anything to act upon. Besides, I hope you know we only have advisory role. Any action you feel is not consistent with the GMA could be appealed. I also want to let you know I could not find the Superior Court Order you alluded to in your email. If you can get a copy or link, please send it to me. If it is really a Court Order (not an opinion), the County is bound to comply, if not, the Court will enforce it, not Dept. of Commerce.

One thing I have to mention about one issue you raised (more lots/development in rural areas), that is not something we will support especially without needed infrastructure to support such higher level of development, but it is a local call and I will leave that to the County to decide.

Please call me at (360) 725-3056 after your move so we can discuss some of these issues in details.
Thanks
Ike

From: susan rasmussen [mailto:sprazz@outlook.com]
Sent: Wednesday, November 19, 2014 7:58 AM
To: Nwankwo, Ike
Subject: Re: Hello Ike,

Hello Ike,
Thanks for responding. We are in the process of moving, so I can best be reached via this email. Hope that is alright. I’m looking forward to working with you, and helping the county planners towards a successful plan.

Best regards,
Susan Rasmussen, for the Board of Directors
Clark County Citizens United, Inc.
I know your time is valuable, Ike. We are waiting for answers to our concerns.

Respectfully,

Susan Rasmussen, for the Board of Directors,
Clark County Citizens United, Inc.

Sent from Windows Mail
Public Comment

SEPA Scoping

7/29/14 – 9/1/14
From: Mike Odren [mailto:mikeo@olsonengr.com]
Sent: Tuesday, July 29, 2014 2:38 PM
To: Mielke, Tom; Madore, David; Barnes, Ed
Cc: James Howsley; Eric Golemo; Mike Odren; Clark, Jennifer (BOCC)
Subject: Comprehensive Plan Update - Infrastructure Percent Deduction

On behalf of the Development and Engineering Advisory Board (DEAB), please find attached documentation concerning the County's assumed infrastructure deduction percentage rate for residential, commercial and industrially zoned lands. The documentation attached shows that the percentages currently listed in the comprehensive plan appear to be too low based on case studies and reviews of actual development under the current stormwater code. It is the collective hope of DEAB that the commissioners seriously consider the information provided and adjust the infrastructure percentage for the upcoming Comprehensive Plan Update. I will also submit hard copies of this attachment directly to the Board's office this afternoon. Should you have any questions about the information contained herein, please contact Eric Golemo or James Howsley.

Respectfully,

Michael Odren, R.L.A.
Chair, Development and Engineering Advisory Board
Landscape Architect, Land Use Planner
Associate Principal
Olson Engineering, Inc.
1111 Broadway
Vancouver, WA 98660
July 29, 2014

Clark County Board of Commissioners  
Attn: Jennifer Clark  
P.O. Box 5000  
Vancouver, WA 98666-5000

Re: Comprehensive Plan Update - Infrastructure Percent Deduction

To the Board of County Commissioners,

The Development and Engineering Advisory Board (DEAB) has reviewed documents and proposals regarding the current Comprehensive Plan Update. Members of the board have expressed concern regarding the assumed infrastructure deduction percentage being used to develop the plan. The commissioners asked DEAB to provide some info and input regarding the infrastructure deduction percentage. This letter is in response to that request.

Currently the assumed infrastructure deduction percentage rate is 27.7% for residential and 25% for Commercial and Industrial. This rate has not changed with updated stormwater ordinances. While these assumptions may be appropriate in areas of well draining soils, we believe they underestimate the impact in areas of poorly draining soils which is where most of the undeveloped portion of the urban growth area is located. DEAB has conducted some research with the help of other local engineering consultants. We have attached some sample infrastructure percent calculations in soils with fairly low infiltration rates similar to the areas at the fringe of the urban growth boundary. First we looked at a few theoretical examples prepared by SGA Engineering or the county during the previous stormwater code update. On some, it was assumed LID was feasible, but in low rate soils this may not be the case, or utilizing LID may only compensate for the new LID flow standard.

With DOE forested standard with low infiltration the infrastructure % on these three example projects are: 39%, 51%, and 32%.

Next we obtained a few calculations on sample projects from several local consultants. These examples do not account for the new LID flow standard. It is assumed this will add cost but not likely take additional area.
Sterling Design provided a calculation for Whispering Pines subdivision. Under the old stormwater rules the infrastructure is 31% with the current adopted rules it goes to 34.5%.

Olson Engineering provided 4 examples in the Battleground area. No exhibits are attached but could be provided upon request.

The summary is below:
18 Lot subdivision - 42%
167 lot Subdivision - 25%
117 Lot Subdivision - 32%
26.3Ac Commercial - 34%

In conclusion DEAB feels the 27.7% is low and doesn’t accurately reflect the percentage of land lost to infrastructure. The average infrastructure percentage in the 8 examples we looked at was about 36.2%. It should be noted that not all land brought into the urban growth boundary is in poorly drained soil. But based on a weighted average 32-35% is likely a more accurate range for the assumed Infrastructure Percent Deduction.

Please let us know if you have any questions.

Respectfully,

Michael Odren, R.L.A.
Chair, Development and Engineering Advisory Board

Eric E. Golemo, PE
Sub-Committee Chair, Development and Engineering Advisory Board

Attachments and Supporting Information:
1) Site use per code Table Projects 1-3
2) Project 1 - Figure
3) Project 2 - Figure
4) Project 3 - Figure
5) Email from Peter Tuck of Olson Engineering (7-2-2014) - Project examples
6) Email from Joel Stirling of Sterling Design (7-10-2014) - Project example
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>APPLICABLE CODE</th>
<th>LOTS</th>
<th>STORM</th>
<th>INFRASTRUCTURE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CURRENT CODE</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ECOLOGY STANDARD WITH LID</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ECOLOGY STANDARD - FORESTED</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>CURRENT CODE</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PROPOSED ORDINANCE - PASTURE</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PROPOSED ORDINANCE - FORESTED</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>COMMERCIAL - CURRENT CODE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COMMERCIAL - PROPOSED ORDINANCE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CURRENT CODE
POND UNDER CURRENT STORM ORDINANCE

STORM POND
POND UNDER PROPOSED STORM ORDINANCE
(PREDEVELOPED PASTURE CONDITION)
POND UNDER PROPOSED STORM ORDINANCE
(PREDEVELOPED FORESTED CONDITION)
POND UNDER PROPOSED STORM ORDINANCE
(PRE DEVELOPED FORESTED CONDITION)
Mike Odren

From: Peter Tuck [peter@olsonengr.com]
Sent: Wednesday, July 02, 2014 1:54 PM
To: Jamie Howsley; Eric Golemo
Cc: Mike Odren
Subject: RE: Comp Plan update infrastructure deduction

Jamie/Eric,

Regarding the area of a project impacted by road ROW and stormwater facilities in the Battle Ground area, I have the following:

18 Lot subdivision - 42%
167 lot Subdivision - 25%
117 Lot Subdivision - 32%
26.3 Ac Commercial - 28% with no frontage since City did that project. If that area was included %age would increase to approximately 34%

These calculations take the developable area only and do not include wetland areas that are not impacted.

Let me know if you have any questions.

Peter.

-----Original Message-----
From: Jamie Howsley [mailto:jamie.howsley@jordanamis.com]
Sent: Tuesday, July 01, 2014 3:38 PM
To: Eric Golemo; Peter Tuck
Cc: Mike Odren
Subject: RE: Comp Plan update infrastructure deduction

Holsinger is giving me something tomorrow. He thinks 40%

Please excuse spelling mistakes as is sent with Good via my iPhone (www.good.com)

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: Please do not read, copy, or disseminate this communication unless you are the intended addressee. This e-mail may contain confidential and/or privileged information intended only for the addressee. If you have received this in error, please notify me via return e-mail.

TAX ADVICE NOTICE: IRS Circular 230 requires us to advise you that if this communication or any attachment contains any tax advice, the advice is not intended to be used, and cannot be used, for the purpose of (i) avoiding tax-related penalties or (ii) promoting, marketing, or recommending any transaction, plan, or arrangement. A taxpayer may rely on professional advice to avoid tax-related penalties only if the advice is reflected in a comprehensive tax opinion that conforms to stringent requirements. Please contact us if you
have any questions about this requirement, or would like to discuss preparation of an opinion that conforms to these IRS rules.

-----Original Message-----
From: Eric Golemo [mailto:Golemo@SGAengineering.com]
Sent: Tuesday, July 01, 2014 03:34 PM Pacific Standard Time
To: Peter Tuck
Cc: Mike Odren; Jamie Howsley
Subject: RE: Comp Plan update infrastructure deduction

Were you able to come up with anything? I would like to respond to the Commissioners this week. Our office is working on some info. But, we don't have a lot going on in Battleground right now under the new code. Do you have any examples you could contribute.

From: Eric Golemo [mailto:Golemo@SGAengineering.com]
Sent: Thursday, June 26, 2014 4:05 PM
To: Peter Tuck (peter@olsonengr.com)
Cc: Mike Odren (mikeo@olsonengr.com); James Howsley (Jame.howsley@jordanramls.com)
Subject: Comp Plan update infrastructure deduction

Peter,

Jamie and I attended the hearing on the comp plan. One of the items we are working on is the infrastructure deduction. It is currently set at 27%.
This hasn't changed with the Stormwater code. We have argued that the 27% is likely adequate where you have good to moderately draining soils but not in poorly drained soils. The commissioners asked for some supporting documentation. Our office is working on some info. But, we don't have a lot going on in Battleground right now under the new code. Do you have any examples you could contribute.

Thanks,

Eric

Eric E. Golemo, PE
Owner / Director of Engineering and Planning

SGA Engineering, PLLC
Civil Engineering / Land Use Planning

Development Services / Landscape Architecture
2005 Broadway, Vancouver WA 98663
Phone: (360)993-0911
Fax: (360)993-0912

Mbl: (360)903-1056
Email: EGolemo@sgaengineering.com
The stormwater management facilities would increase from 9% of the project up to 12.5% project under that scenario. Total infrastructure would go from 34% up to 37.5% if the park dedication is included or from 31% up to 34.5% without the park.

Sincerely,

Joel Gregory Stirling, P.E.
STERLING DESIGN, INC.
Ph. (360) 759-1794
Fax. (360) 759-4983
Mbl.(360) 600-5666

-----Original Message-----
From: Eric Golemo [mailto:Egolemo@SGAengineering.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 10, 2014 1:03 PM
To: 'Joel Stirling'
Cc: James Howsley
Subject: RE: Whispering Pines Infrastructure Deduction-Battle Ground

Do you have an updated infrastructure percentage I can plug in?
Thanks,
Eric

-----Original Message-----
From: Joel Stirling [mailto:joel@sterling-design.biz]
Sent: Thursday, July 10, 2014 12:56 PM
To: 'Eric Golemo'
Cc: 'Joel Rutherford'
Subject: RE: Whispering Pines Infrastructure Deduction-Battle Ground

Good Afternoon Eric,

Based on the model run that I put together in the WWWM2012 program, utilizing the Auto Pond feature, the pond size went from 1.07 acres up to 2.19 acres which is roughly double the size (2.05 times larger). It is my experience that the Auto Pond feature is very conservative and the pond likely can be optimized further but even with the optimization it appears that there is a significant increase in required detention storage between the old and the new stormwater requirements for the Whispering Pines Subdivision. Let me know if there is anything else I can assist you with.

Sincerely,

Joel Gregory Stirling, P.E.
STERLING DESIGN, INC.
Ph. (360) 759-1794
Fax. (360) 759-4983
Mbl.(360) 600-5666

-----Original Message-----
From: Eric Golemo [mailto:Egolemo@SGAengineering.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 10, 2014 10:37 AM
To: 'Joel Stirling'
Cc: Joel Rutherford
Subject: RE: Whispering Pines Infrastructure Deduction-Battle Ground

Joel,
Were you able to get an estimate under the new code?
Thanks,
Eric

-----Original Message-----
From: Eric Golemo [mailto:Egolemo@SGAengineering.com]
Sent: Wednesday, July 02, 2014 3:50 PM
To: 'Joel Stirling'
Subject: RE: Whispering Pines Infrastructure Deduction-Battle Ground

Thanks.

-----Original Message-----
From: Joel Stirling [mailto:joel@sterling-design.biz]
Sent: Wednesday, July 02, 2014 3:46 PM
To: 'Eric Golemo'; 'Jamie Howsley'; peter@olsonengr.com
Cc: mikeo@olsonengr.com
Subject: RE: Whispering Pines Infrastructure Deduction-Battle Ground

I am stuck in meetings for the rest of the afternoon today but will see if I or one of my staff can set up a model run in WHM12 in the morning for comparison. As you all are aware, the requirement to utilize "old growth forest" as the pre-developed site condition is likely what will have the biggest impact on the size of the pond. I will keep you posted.

Sincerely,

Joel Gregory Stirling, P.E.
STERLING DESIGN, INC.
Ph. (360) 759-1794
Fax. (360) 759-4983
Mbl.(360) 600-5666

-----Original Message-----
From: Eric Golemo [mailto:Egolemo@SGAengineering.com]
Sent: Wednesday, July 02, 2014 3:40 PM
To: 'Jamie Howsley'; peter@olsonengr.com
Cc: mikeo@olsonengr.com; Joel Stirling
Subject: RE: Whispering Pines Infrastructure Deduction-Battle Ground

Do we have a calculation for the new code?  
Joel, have you looked at this?

-----Original Message-----
From: Jamie Howsley [mailto:jamie.howsley@jordanramis.com]
Sent: Wednesday, July 02, 2014 2:54 PM
To: Eric Golemo; peter@olsonengr.com
Cc: mikeo@olsonengr.com; Jamie Howsley
Subject: Whispering Pines Infrastructure Deduction-Battle Ground

Eric and Peter,

Attached is the infrastructure deduction for Holsinger's Whispering Pines subdivision. It is approved however under the old stormwater rules. I am being told that the stormwater would likely double if under the new rules.
As you can see with the park it is 34% without 31%.

Best,

Jamie

JAMES D. HOWSLEY | Attorney
Jordan Ramis PC | Attorneys at Law | Celebrating 50 years WA Direct:
360-567-3913
OR Direct: 503-598-5592
OR Main: 503-598-7070

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: Please do not read, copy, or disseminate this communication unless you are the intended addressee. This e-mail may contain confidential and/or privileged information intended only for the addressee. If you have received this in error, please notify me via return e-mail.

TAX ADVICE NOTICE: IRS Circular 230 requires us to advise you that if this communication or any attachment contains any tax advice, the advice is not intended to be used, and cannot be used, for the purpose of (i) avoiding tax-related penalties or (ii) promoting, marketing, or recommending any transaction, plan, or arrangement. A taxpayer may rely on professional advice to avoid tax-related penalties only if the advice is reflected in a comprehensive tax opinion that conforms to stringent requirements. Please contact us if you have any questions about this requirement, or would like to discuss preparation of an opinion that conforms to these IRS rules.

-----Original Message-----
From: MPC6000-VAN@jordanramis.com [mailto:MPC6000-VAN@jordanramis.com]
Sent: Wednesday, July 02, 2014 2:51 PM
To: Jamie Howsley
Subject:

This E-mail was sent from "MPC6000-VAN" (Aficio MP C6000).

Scan Date: 07.02.2014 14:50:45 (-0700)
Queries to: MPC6000-VAN@jordanramis.com
Gordy,
I appreciate the time you, Mark McCauley, and Oliver Orjiako took yesterday to meet with Steve Stuart and me.

During the meeting we discussed the possibility of Clark County moving the Tri-Mountain Golf Course and an abutting property into the Ridgefield Urban Growth Area. The properties in question, depicted on the attached map, would remain under County Park/Open Space designation and future County Park/Open Space zoning. Clark County will continue to operate and maintain Tri-Mountain Golf Course. Consequently, the proposed expansion would not alter the City’s population and employment forecasts. The UGA expansion would not alter the current provision of capital facilities and services and inclusion of the Tri-Mountain properties into the City’s UGA would allow Ridgefield to provide urban services more efficiently in the future. In addition, we understand that the County’s proposal to include the Tri-Mountain Golf Course in the Ridgefield UGA could benefit Clark County’s management and financing of the golf course.

consequently, the City of Ridgefield supports Clark County’s proposal to add the Tri-Mountain complex into the Ridgefield UGA for Park/Open Space purposes.

Thank you,
Eric Eisemann
Ridgefield Senior Planning Consultant

Eric Eisemann
E2 Land Use Planning, LLC
215 W. 4th Street, Suite # 201
Vancouver, WA 98660
360.750 0038
e.eisemann@e2landuse.com
July 29, 2014

Clark County Board of Commissioners
Attn: Jennifer Clark
P.O. Box 5000
Vancouver, WA 98666-5000

Re: Comprehensive Plan Update - Infrastructure Percent Deduction

To the Board of County Commissioners,

The Development and Engineering Advisory Board (DEAB) has reviewed documents and proposals regarding the current Comprehensive Plan Update. Members of the board have expressed concern regarding the assumed infrastructure deduction percentage being used to develop the plan. The commissioners asked DEAB to provide some info and input regarding the infrastructure deduction percentage. This letter is in response to that request.

Currently the assumed infrastructure deduction percentage rate is 27.7% for residential and 25% for Commercial and Industrial. This rate has not changed with updated stormwater ordinances. While these assumptions may be appropriate in areas of well draining soils, we believe they underestimate the impact in areas of poorly draining soils which is where most of the undeveloped portion of the urban growth area is located. DEAB has conducted some research with the help of other local engineering consultants. We have attached some sample infrastructure percent calculations in soils with fairly low infiltration rates similar to the areas at the fringe of the urban growth boundary. First we looked at a few theoretical examples prepared by SGA Engineering or the county during the previous stormwater code update. On some, it was assumed LID was feasible, but in low rate soils this may not be the case, or utilizing LID may only compensate for the new LID flow standard.

With DOE forested standard with low infiltration the infrastructure % on these three example projects are: 39%, 51%, and 32%.

Next we obtained a few calculations on sample projects from several local consultants. These examples do not account for the new LID flow standard. It is assumed this will add cost but not likely take additional area.
Sterling Design provided a calculation for Whispering Pines subdivision. Under the old stormwater rules the infrastructure is 31% with the current adopted rules it goes to 34.5%.

Olson Engineering provided 4 examples in the Battleground area. No exhibits are attached but could be provided upon request.

The summary is below:
18 Lot subdivision - 42%
167 lot Subdivision - 25%
117 Lot Subdivision - 32%
26.3Ac Commercial - 34%

In conclusion DEAB feels the 27.7% is low and doesn't accurately reflect the percentage of land lost to infrastructure. The average infrastructure percentage in the 8 examples we looked at was about 36.2%. It should be noted that not all land brought into the urban growth boundary is in poorly drained soil. But based on a weighted average 32-35% is likely a more accurate range for the assumed infrastructure Percent Deduction.

Please let us know if you have any questions.

Respectfully,

Michael Odren, R.L.A.
Chair, Development and Engineering Advisory Board

Eric E. Goleno, PE
Sub-Committee Chair, Development and Engineering Advisory Board

Attachments and Supporting Information:
1) Site use per code Table Projects 1-3
2) Project 1 - Figure
3) Project 2 - Figure
4) Project 3 - Figure
5) Email from Peter Tuck of Olson Engineering (7-2-2014) - Project examples
6) Email from Joel Stirling of Sterling Design (7-10-2014) - Project example
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>APPLICABLE CODE</th>
<th>LOTS</th>
<th>STORM</th>
<th>INFRASTRUCTURE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CURRENT CODE</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ECOLOGY STANDARD WITH LID</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ECOLOGY STANDARD - FORESTED</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>CURRENT CODE</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PROPOSED ORDINANCE - PASTURE</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PROPOSED ORDINANCE - FORESTED</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>COMMERCIAL - CURRENT CODE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COMMERCIAL - PROPOSED ORDINANCE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mike Odren

From: Peter Tuck [peter@olsonengr.com]
Sent: Wednesday, July 02, 2014 1:54 PM
To: Jamie Howsley; Eric Golemo
Cc: Mike Odren
Subject: RE: Comp Plan update infrastructure deduction

Jamie/Eric,

Regarding the area of a project impacted by road ROW and stormwater facilities in the Battle Ground area, I have the following:

18 Lot subdivision - 42%
167 lot Subdivision - 25%
117 Lot Subdivision - 32%
26.3Ac Commercial - 28% with no frontage since City did that project. If that area was included %age would increase to approximately 34%

These calculations take the developable area only and do not include wetland areas that are not impacted.

Let me know if you have any questions.

Peter.

-----Original Message-----
From: Jamie Howsley [mailto:jamie.howsley@jordanamis.com]
Sent: Tuesday, July 01, 2014 3:38 PM
To: Eric Golemo; Peter Tuck
Cc: Mike Odren
Subject: RE: Comp Plan update infrastructure deduction

Holsinger is giving me something tomorrow. He thinks 40%

Please excuse spelling mistakes as is sent with Good via my IPhone (www.good.com)

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: Please do not read, copy, or disseminate this communication unless you are the intended addressee. This e-mail may contain confidential and/or privileged information intended only for the addressee. If you have received this in error, please notify me via return e-mail.

TAX ADVICE NOTICE: IRS Circular 230 requires us to advise you that if this communication or any attachment contains any tax advice, the advice is not intended to be used, and cannot be used, for the purpose of (i) avoiding tax-related penalties or (ii) promoting, marketing, or recommending any transaction, plan, or arrangement. A taxpayer may rely on professional advice to avoid tax-related penalties only if the advice is reflected in a comprehensive tax opinion that conforms to stringent requirements. Please contact us if you
have any questions about this requirement, or would like to discuss preparation of an opinion that conforms to these IRS rules.

-----Original Message-----
From: Eric Golemo [mailto:Egolemo@SGAengineering.com]
Sent: Tuesday, July 01, 2014 03:34 PM Pacific Standard Time
To: Peter Tuck
Cc: Mike Odren; Jamie Howsley
Subject: RE: Comp Plan update infrastructure deduction

Were you able to come up with anything? I would like to respond to the Commissioners this week. Our office is working on some info. But, we don't have a lot going on in Battleground right now under the new code. Do you have any examples you could contribute.

From: Eric Golemo [mailto:Egolemo@SGAengineering.com]
Sent: Thursday, June 26, 2014 4:05 PM
To: Peter Tuck (peterson@olsonengr.com)
Cc: Mike Odren (mikeo@olsonengr.com); James Howsley (Jamie.howsley@jordanramis.com)
Subject: Comp Plan update infrastructure deduction

Peter,

Jamie and I attended the hearing on the comp plan. One of the items we are working on is the infrastructure deduction. It is currently set at 27%.
This hasn't changed with the Stormwater code. We have argued that the 27% is likely adequate where you have good to moderately draining soils but not in poorly drained soils. The commissioners asked for some supporting documentation. Our office is working on some info. But, we don't have a lot going on in Battleground right now under the new code. Do you have any examples you could contribute.

Thanks,

Eric

Eric E. Golemo, PE
Owner / Director of Engineering and Planning

SGA Engineering, PLLC

Civil Engineering / Land Use Planning

Development Services / Landscape Architecture
2005 Broadway, Vancouver WA 98663
Phone: (360)993-0911
Fax: (360)993-0912

MBI: (360)903-1056
Email: EGolemo@sgaengineering.com
The stormwater management facilities would increase from 9% of the project up to 12.5% project under that scenario. Total infrastructure would go from 34% up to 37.5% if the park dedication is included or from 31% up to 34.5% without the park.

Sincerely,

Joel Gregory Stirling, P.E.
STERLING DESIGN, INC.
Ph. (360) 759-1794
Fax. (360) 759-4983
Mbl.(360) 600-5666

-----Original Message-----
From: Eric Golemo [mailto:Egolemo@SGAengineering.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 10, 2014 1:03 PM
To: 'Joel Stirling'
Cc: James Howsley
Subject: RE: Whispering Pines Infrastructure Deduction-Battle Ground

Do you have an updated infrastructure percentage I can plug in?
Thanks,
Eric

-----Original Message-----
From: Joel Stirling [mailto:joel@sterling-design.biz]
Sent: Thursday, July 10, 2014 12:56 PM
To: 'Eric Golemo'
Cc: 'Joel Rutherford'
Subject: RE: Whispering Pines Infrastructure Deduction-Battle Ground

Good Afternoon Eric,

Based on the model run that I put together in the WHH2012 program, utilizing the Auto Pond feature, the pond size went from 1.67 acres up to 2.19 acres which is roughly double the size (2.05 times larger). It is my experience that the Auto Pond feature is very conservative and the pond likely can be optimized further but even with the optimization it appears that there is a significant increase in required detention storage between the old and the new stormwater requirements for the Whispering Pines Subdivision. Let me know if there is anything else I can assist you with.

Sincerely,

Joel Gregory Stirling, P.E.
STERLING DESIGN, INC.
Ph. (360) 759-1794
Fax. (360) 759-4983
-----Original Message-----
From: Eric Golemo [mailto:Golemo@SGAengineering.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 10, 2014 10:37 AM
To: 'Joel Stirling'
Cc: Joel Rutherford
Subject: RE: Whispering Pines Infrastructure Deduction-Battle Ground

Joel,
Were you able to get an estimate under the new code?
Thanks,
Eric

-----Original Message-----
From: Eric Golemo [mailto:Golemo@SGAengineering.com]
Sent: Wednesday, July 02, 2014 3:50 PM
To: 'Joel Stirling'
Subject: RE: Whispering Pines Infrastructure Deduction-Battle Ground

Thanks.

-----Original Message-----
From: Joel Stirling [mailto:joel@sterling-design.biz]
Sent: Wednesday, July 02, 2014 3:46 PM
To: 'Eric Golemo'; 'Jamie Howsley'; peter@olsonengr.com
Cc: mikeo@olsonengr.com
Subject: RE: Whispering Pines Infrastructure Deduction-Battle Ground

I am stuck in meetings for the rest of the afternoon today but will see if I or one of my staff can set up a model run in WAMM12 in the morning for comparison. As you all are aware, the requirement to utilize "old growth forest" as the pre-developed site condition is likely what will have the biggest impact on the size of the pond. I will keep you posted.

Sincerely,

Joel Gregory Stirling, P.E.
STERLING DESIGN, INC.
Ph. (360) 759-1794
Fax. (360) 759-4083
Mbl.(360) 600-5666

-----Original Message-----
From: Eric Golemo [mailto:Golemo@SGAengineering.com]
Sent: Wednesday, July 02, 2014 3:40 PM
To: 'Jamie Howsley'; peter@olsonengr.com
Cc: mikeo@olsonengr.com; Joel Stirling
Subject: RE: Whispering Pines Infrastructure Deduction-Battle Ground

Do we have a calculation for the new code?
Joel, have you looked at this?

-----Original Message-----
From: Jamie Howsley [mailto:jamie.howsley@jordanramis.com]
Sent: Wednesday, July 02, 2014 2:54 PM
To: Eric Golemo; peter@olsonengr.com
Cc: mikeo@olsonengr.com; Jamie Howsley
Subject: Whispering Pines Infrastructure Deduction-Battle Ground

Eric and Peter,

Attached is the infrastructure deduction for Holsinger's Whispering Pines subdivision. It is approved however under the old stormwater rules. I am being told that the stormwater would likely double if under the new rules.
As you can see with the park it is 34% without 31%.

Best,

Jamie

JAMES D. HOWSLEY | Attorney
Jordan Rams PC | Attorneys at Law | Celebrating 50 years WA Direct:
360-567-3913
OR Direct: 503-598-5592
OR Main: 503-598-7070

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: Please do not read, copy, or disseminate this communication unless you are the intended addressee. This e-mail may contain confidential and/or privileged information intended only for the addressee. If you have received this in error, please notify me via return e-mail.

TAX ADVICE NOTICE: IRS Circular 230 requires us to advise you that if this communication or any attachment contains any tax advice, the advice is not intended to be used, and cannot be used, for the purpose of (i) avoiding tax-related penalties or (ii) promoting, marketing, or recommending any transaction, plan, or arrangement. A taxpayer may rely on professional advice to avoid tax-related penalties only if the advice is reflected in a comprehensive tax opinion that conforms to stringent requirements. Please contact us if you have any questions about this requirement, or would like to discuss preparation of an opinion that conforms to these IRS rules.

-----Original Message-----
From: MPC6000-VAN@jordanramis.com [mailto:MPC6000-VAN@jordanramis.com]
Sent: Wednesday, July 02, 2014 2:51 PM
To: Jamie Howsley
Subject:

This E-mail was sent from "MPC6000-VAN" (Aficio MP C6000).

Scan Date: 07.02.2014 14:50:45 (-0700)
Queries to: MPC6000-VAN@jordanramis.com
POND UNDER PROPOSED STORM ORDINANCE
(PREDEVELOPED PASTURE CONDITION)
POUND UNDER CURRENT STORM ORDINANCE

BUILDING

STORM POND
POND UNDER PROPOSED STORM ORDINANCE
(PREDEVELOPED FORESTED CONDITION)
O'Donnell, Mary Beth

From: Euler, Gordon
Sent: Friday, August 01, 2014 10:32 AM
To: O'Donnell, Mary Beth
Subject: FW: Following up with requested information from 07/11 City-County Coordination Meeting
Attachments: Site Use Per Code Exhibit.pdf; Project 1.pdf; Project 2.pdf; Project 3.pdf; Project 4.pdf; 20140702145045432.pdf; Issue_Paper_5_SEPA_Scoping_7-11.pdf

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Mary Beth:

For the index. You might have this already. Thanks.

Gordy

From: McCall, Marilee
Sent: Friday, July 11, 2014 4:55 PM
To: Amanda Smeller-Woodland; Snodgrass, Bryan; Eiken, Chad; Elizabeth Decker-Consultant; Eric Elsemann-Consultant; Erin Erdmand-Battle Ground; Jeff Sarvis-La Center; Lee Krottnerus-Ridgefield; Mitch Kneipp-Washougal; James Weldon; Phil Bourquin-Camas; Robert Maul-Camas; Sam Crummett-Battle Ground; Towne, Sandra; Sara Fox-Camas; 'Steve Stuart-Ridgefield'
Cc: Orjiako, Oliver; Euler, Gordon; Anderson, Colete
Subject: FW: Following up with requested information from 07/11 City-County Coordination Meeting

As I feared, the memo is too large and the first transmission failed. Sending again with all other information.

I'm going to have to send the memo with attachments regarding rural lands in a separate cover, or figure out another way to get it to you on Monday.

Have a great weekend and thanks for your patience.

Marilee McCall
Administrative Assistant | Community Planning
360.397.2280 ext. 4558

From: McCall, Marilee
Sent: Friday, July 11, 2014 4:52 PM
To: Amanda Smeller-Woodland; Snodgrass, Bryan; Eiken, Chad; Elizabeth Decker-Consultant; Eric Elsemann-Consultant; Erin Erdmand-Battle Ground; Jeff Sarvis-La Center; Lee Krottnerus-Ridgefield; Mitch Kneipp-Washougal; James Weldon; Phil Bourquin-Camas; Robert Maul-Camas; Sam Crummett-Battle Ground; Towne, Sandra; Sara Fox-Camas; 'Steve Stuart-Ridgefield'
Cc: Orjiako, Oliver; Euler, Gordon; Anderson, Colete
Subject: Following up with requested information from 07/11 City-County Coordination Meeting

Not sure if this will come through for all of you, as one of the documents is 14MB.
Olson Engineering provided 4 examples in the Battleground area. No exhibits are attached but I am sure they could provide some.
The summary is below:
18 Lot subdivision - 42%
.67 lot Subdivision - 25%
117 Lot Subdivision - 32%
26.3Ac Commercial - 34%

The take away so far is that 27% is likely low. 33-35% is likely a more accurate range.

Sincerely,

Eric E. Golemo, PE
Owner / Director of Engineering and Planning
SGA Engineering, PLLC
Civil Engineering / Land Use Planning
Development Services / Landscape Architecture
2005 Broadway, Vancouver WA 98663
Phone: (360)993-0911
Fax: (360)993-0912
Mbl: (360)903-1056
Email: EGolemo@sgaengineering.com
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT APPLICABLE CODE</th>
<th>LOTS (%)</th>
<th>STORM INFRASTRUCTURE (%)</th>
<th>TOTAL (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECOLOGY STANDARD WITH LID</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
POND UNDER PROPOSED STORM ORDINANCE
(PREDEVELOPED FORESTED CONDITION)
POND UNDER CURRENT STORM ORDINANCE

BUILDING

STORM POND

BUILDING
POND UNDER PROPOSED STORM ORDINANCE
(PREDEVELOPED FORESTED CONDITION)
Date: July 02, 2014

Project: Whispering Pines Subdivision – SUB: 02-10

% of Whispering Pines Subdivision Dedication for 1,265,717 sq.ft. parcel (29.05 acres)

- Right of Way Dedication: 285,048 sq.ft. (6.54 acres) 22%
- Storm Facilities Dedication: 112,038 sq.ft. (2.57 acres) 9%
- Park Dedication: 43,560 sq.ft. (1.00 acres) 3%
Clark County Comprehensive Plan 2016 Update
Planning for growth 2015 – 2035
SEPA Scoping – Issue Paper 5

Purpose
This memorandum provides a basic framework and starting point from which the county and its cities
will launch the environmental impact review process under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA).
This process will be used to inform the public about three proposed growth alternatives, advertise the
county’s intent to prepare a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS), and provide an
opportunity to comment on the scope of impacts to be examined in the SEIS.

Background
In July 2013, Clark County began updating its Comprehensive Growth Management Plan to meet the
2016 periodic update requirement of RCW 36.70A.140. Community Planning prepared the following
issue papers to help the Board of County Commissioners make decisions about the update:

• Issue Paper 1 - Comprehensive Plan Overview: A summary of the county’s Planning
Assumptions, 2013 vacant and buildable lands model (VBLM) inventory and population and
employment projections.
• Issue Paper 2 – Population and Job Projections: Background information for a discussion with
the cities and the town of Yacolt on population and job planning assumptions for 2015-2035. On
Jan. 21, 2014, the Board adopted the state Office of Financial Management’s (OFM) medium
population projection of 562,207 for the 20-year period ending 2035 (Res. 2014-01-09).
• Issue Paper 3 – Employment forecast based on input from Washington Employment Security
Department (ESD). It was revised as Issue Paper 3.1 to include the 2014 VBLM information. On
April 29, 2014, the Board adopted the high employment forecast of 91,200 net new jobs for the
20-year period ending 2035 (Res. 2014-04-01).
• Issue Paper 4 – Population and Job Allocation: On June 24, 2014, the Board identified the
methodology for allocating growth by UGA and adopted preliminary allocations for initial review
(Res. 2014-06-17).

This issue paper, Issue Paper 5, will discuss the environmental impact review process under the State
Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) and seek Board direction on development of alternatives.

SEPA Process
Enacted in 1984, the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) requires local governments to evaluate
environmental impacts that could result from actions they approve or undertake. The most common
evaluation is to discuss potential impacts of a proposed development on various resources and qualities
of the environment listed on the SEPA checklist. There also are non-project actions that are reviewed,
such as adoption of code language or a new plan or policy. The completed checklist is shared with
federal, state and local agencies, Indian tribes, neighborhood organizations and interested parties.

BOCC WS 07/16/2014
Large development projects, such as an asphalt plant, and certain non-development projects, such as expansion of an urban growth area, require a more in-depth SEPA review, including, 1) identification and analysis of potential project-related impacts, and 2) consideration of possible alternatives to the proposed action. An environmental impact statement (EIS) is prepared, discussing any potential impacts. The county prepared an EIS in 2007, issuing both a draft EIS (DEIS) and a final EIS (FEIS). Comments on alternatives presented in the draft were used to determine a preferred alternative that was the focus of analysis in the FEIS.

For the 2016 update, the county is proposing to add to the 2007 environmental analysis, as needed, by preparing a supplemental EIS (SEIS). Under SEPA, analysis of a plan’s impacts is not required to be site-specific, but rather give an overview of impacts that could be expected under the alternatives.

The EIS process under SEPA begins with a scoping process. That is when the county seeks public input and Board direction to define issues related to the comprehensive plan update that will be addressed in the draft SEIS. The preferred alternative studied in the final SEIS and eventually adopted by the Board will reflect local jurisdictions’ input, Board directives, guiding principles and values and countywide planning policies. The SEIS and comprehensive planning process will end with adoption of an updated comprehensive growth management plan for Clark County.

Methodology
Since Clark County’s 2007 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update, conditions in the county, as well as state and federal laws, have changed, requiring corresponding changes to the plan. The Board has adopted planning assumptions and principles and values that provide policy direction for reviewing and updating the county’s growth management plan by June 2016.

As stated above, preparation of an EIS must include alternatives, including a ‘no action’ alternative that maintains the status quo. Possible alternatives for review in the EIS are listed below.

Alternative 1: No Action Alternative. This alternative is the adopted Comprehensive Plan as amended in July 2014, with the current urban growth boundaries, planning assumptions, policies and implementation ordinances.

Alternative 2: County-Initiated Actions.

   a) Urban growth areas adopted in July 2014.
   b) Rural Land amendments to the Zoning Map, such as AG-20 to AG-10, FR-40 to FR-20 and R-20 to R-10, where needed.
   c) Washougal UGA amendments to the Zoning Map to reflect county zoning and application of Urban Holding.
   d) Vancouver UGA amendments to the Zoning Map to remove the Three Creeks Overlay.
   e) Removal of Urban Holding in the Vancouver UGA area known as Fisher’s Swale.
   f) New Public Facility zone.
   g) Eliminate Comprehensive Plan Chapter 1 Table 1.6, Mixed Use footnote and subsequent Comprehensive Plan and Zoning changes.
   h) Streamline commercial zones from three to two.
i) Zoning Map changes to include property owner site-specific requests, particularly within the Salmon Creek and Discovery planning areas.

j) Zoning Map cleanup of Urban Reserve application consistency, UR-10, UR-20 and UR-40; Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Map cleanup of Urban Holding application consistency.


l) At the request of property owners, sites that meet Board directives and other criteria. The new planning assumptions, policy direction, principles and values defined by the commissioners will be used in this alternative.

Alternative 3: City-Requested Actions.

a) Urban growth areas adopted in July 2014.

b) Expansion areas proposed by cities in July 2014.

After the scoping process, land use alternatives will be developed based on technical analysis, input from cities, the Board’s principles and values and results of the environmental scoping and analysis. From the DSEIS, a preferred alternative will emerge, providing a 20-year land supply and meeting the 2014 planning assumptions and policy directions.

NEXT STEPS
During four open houses in August, the public is invited to comment on the scope of impacts to be examined in the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement. All open houses will be 7 - 8:30 p.m. Here are the open house dates and locations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, Aug. 19</td>
<td>Fort Vancouver Community Library, 901 C St., Vancouver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, Aug. 20</td>
<td>Lacamas Lake Lodge, 227 N.E. Lake Rd., Camas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, Aug. 27</td>
<td>Ridgefield Community Center, 210 N. Main Ave., Ridgefield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, Aug. 28</td>
<td>Battle Ground Community Center, 9123 E. Main St., Battle Ground</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
O’Donnell, Mary Beth

From: Euler, Gordon
Sent: Friday, August 01, 2014 10:25 AM
To: O’Donnell, Mary Beth
Subject: FW: TRI mountain
Attachments: Tri Mountain Parcel # v2.pdf; Tri Mountain UGA #2.pdf; Tri Mountain addresses.xlsx

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Mary Beth:

For the index. Thanks.

Gordy

From: Eric Eisemann [mailto:e.eisemann@e2landuse.com]
Sent: Friday, July 25, 2014 2:03 PM
To: Orjiako, Oliver; Euler, Gordon
Subject: TRI mountain

Eric Eisemann
E2 Land Use Planning, LLC
215 W. 4th Street, Suite # 201
Vancouver, WA 98660
360.750.0038
e.eisemann@e2landuse.com
### Tri Mountain Golf Course UGA Expansion

**7/23/2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel #</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Comp Plan</th>
<th>Situs Address</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Legal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>212785000</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>P/OS</td>
<td>1701 NW 299th St.</td>
<td>Clark County General Services</td>
<td>PO Box 5000</td>
<td>#16 SEC 16 T4NR1EWM 30A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ridgefield, WA 98642</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vancouver, WA 98666</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212800000</td>
<td>38.00</td>
<td>P/OS</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>#31 SEC 16 T4N R1EWM 38.00A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212782000</td>
<td>29.99</td>
<td>P/OS</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>#13 SEC 16 T4NR1EWM 29.99A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212815000</td>
<td>34.00</td>
<td>P/OS</td>
<td>1504 NW 289th</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>#46 SEC 16 T4N R1EWM 34.0A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ridgefield, WA 98642</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212819000</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>P/OS</td>
<td>29420 NW 11th Ave.</td>
<td>Gerald &amp; Grace Koethe</td>
<td>29420 NW 11th Ave.</td>
<td>#41 SEC 16 T4N R1EWM 2A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ridgefield, WA 98642</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ridgefield, WA 98642</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212783000</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>UL UH-20</td>
<td>6110 N 20th St.</td>
<td>Martha Steiger &amp; Helen</td>
<td>12808 NE 4th Ave.</td>
<td>#14 SEC 16 T4N R1EWM 3.64A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ridgefield, WA 98642</td>
<td>Erickson</td>
<td>Vancouver, WA 98685</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**137.63 Total Acres**

**Tri Mountain**
O’Donnell, Mary Beth

From: Euler, Gordon
Sent: Friday, August 01, 2014 10:23 AM
To: O’Donnell, Mary Beth
Subject: FW: Tri-Mountain Golf Course

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Mary Beth:

For the index. Thanks.

Gordy

From: Eric Eisemann [mailto:e.eisemann@e2landuse.com]
Sent: Wednesday, July 30, 2014 10:49 AM
To: Euler, Gordon
Cc: ‘Elizabeth Decker’; McCauley, Mark; steve.stuart@cl.ridgefield.wa.us; Orjiako, Oliver
Subject: RE: Tri-Mountain Golf Course

Gordy,
The City Manager and I discussed the State-owned parcels. There are four intervening parcels (two on the north end and two on the south end) that are not owned by the State. It is our opinion that ringing in the State-owned land may be desirable but adding the four intervening parcels (zoned P/OS but potentially developable as residential) potentially complicates the scope of the original idea of assisting the County with the Tri-Mountain lands. We propose limiting the scope of the UGA expansion to the original proposal.
Please let me know if you would like to discuss this further.
Eric

From: Euler, Gordon [mailto:Gordon.Euler@clark.wa.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, July 30, 2014 10:30 AM
To: ‘Eric Eisemann’
Cc: ‘Elizabeth Decker’; McCauley, Mark; steve.stuart@cl.ridgefield.wa.us; Orjiako, Oliver
Subject: RE: Tri-Mountain Golf Course

Eric:

Thanks to you and Steve for meeting with us on Monday. We acknowledge receiving the information below. The next step for us is to determine if the state has any issue with including the Weigh Station in the Ridgefield boundary expansion. We’ll keep you posted on what we find out.

Gordy Euler
Clark County Community Planning

From: Eric Eisemann [mailto:e.eisemann@e2landuse.com]
Sent: Tuesday, July 29, 2014 10:57 AM
That is correct and I informed Don that the burden is on the property owner to make the case for de-designation and not on Clark County.

From: Cook, Christine  
Sent: Monday, August 04, 2014 3:46 PM  
To: Orjiako, Oliver; Euler, Gordon; Alvarez, Jose  
Cc: O'Donnell, Mary Beth  
Subject: RE: Rocque Merritt

FYI – this land is all F-2, and the county land to the north, according to GIS is in forest use.

From: Orjiako, Oliver  
Sent: Monday, August 04, 2014 3:10 PM  
To: Euler, Gordon; Alvarez, Jose  
Cc: Cook, Christine; O'Donnell, Mary Beth  
Subject: FW: Rocque Merritt

Mary Beth for index. Thanks.

From: Benton, Don  
Sent: Wednesday, July 30, 2014 6:56 PM  
To: Orjiako, Oliver  
Cc: Vandling, Jim; Mielke, Tom  
Subject: FW: Rocque Merritt

Oliver,
I have attached an official request to re-zone from Rocque Merritt. I am attaching the request to this email and am asking that you make it part of the package of requests that go before the board.

Thanks,

Don

Don Benton  
Director, Environmental Services Department  
360-397-2121 extension 5358
Mr. Oliver Orjiako
Clark County Community Planning Department
1300 Franklin Ave.
Vancouver, WA 98666

Dear Mr. Orjiako,

I am writing to you regarding our family property located by Green Mountain. I have attached a map identifying for you the tax lots and the location of our properties. Our property tax numbers are 173159000, 173185000, and 173191000.

As you can see we are bordered to the north by County owned property and the black lines to the east, west, and South represent the Camas City border that surrounds the rest of our property. Our property is located in unincorporated Clark County.

I am requesting the County re-zone our properties from forest and agriculture to Rural Residential 5 (R5) in the annual comprehensive plan update.

Looking at the photos of our property you can see we are an island surrounded by Camas to our South, East and West, and by the County land to our North. Camas has plans to put in over 1,600 homes to our South, East, and West.

Your assistance in changing our zoning from F-40 to R5 in the next annual comprehensive plan update would be greatly appreciated.

Thank you for your prompt attention to this matter.

Respectfully,

Rocque Merritt
O’Donnell, Mary Beth

From: Orjiako, Oliver
Sent: Tuesday, August 05, 2014 4:36 PM
To: O’Donnell, Mary Beth
Subject: FW: WWGMHB, US Supreme Court and Washington State Court decisions - For the public record

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

For index! Thanks.

From: Cook, Christine
Sent: Tuesday, August 05, 2014 10:49 AM
To: Orjiako, Oliver; Euler, Gordon; Alvarez, Jose
Subject: FW: WWGMHB, US Supreme Court and Washington State Court decisions - For the public record

From: LaRocque, Linnea On Behalf Of Barnes, Ed
Sent: Tuesday, August 05, 2014 10:47 AM
To: Cook, Christine
Subject: FW: WWGMHB, US Supreme Court and Washington State Court decisions - For the public record

..ris, (on behalf of Comm. Barnes)
this is the latest email Carol had send this morning and was noted by Comm. Barnes in the hearing.
Comm. Barnes had asked Carol to send to you, she may send along, but you have it now too.
Linnea

From: Carol Levanen [mailto:cnidental@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 05, 2014 12:17 AM
To: Madore, David; Mielke, Tom; Barnes, Ed; Carol Levanen; Susan Rasmussen; Leah Higgins; Rick Dunning; Rita Dietrich; Jerry Olson; Fred Pickering; Jim Mallinowski; Frank White; Benjamin Moss; Lonnie Moss; Melinda Zamora; Nick Redinger; Curt Massle; Marcus Becker; Clark County Citizens United Inc.
Subject: WWGMHB, US Supreme Court and Washington State Court decisions - For the public record

This information is being submitted into the record by Clark County Citizens United, Inc.

Western Washington Growth Management Hearings Board
Washington State Courts - United States Supreme Court
1994-2010
Note* The following information is discussions and rulings of the WWGMHB and the courts. Consider each of these items as in quotations, which are taken from the reports.

United State Supreme Court
The United States Supreme Court has explained that the primary purpose of the "takings clause" in the Constitution is to "bar government from forcing some people alone to bear public burdens, which all fairness and justice, should be borne by the public as a whole". In the case of King County, when they imposed limits, and claimed the new ordinance was necessary to better protect critical areas, including promoting healthy watersheds and protecting salmon, it was clearly a public use.
1. that population projections and allocations are not solely for use in urban areas, and 2. that the population projections for urban areas plus the population projections for non-urban areas must total the population projection for the entire county. Based on this view of the law and facts, the board held that the GMA precluded 5 acre lots in rural areas, and it ordered the county to "increase the minimum lot sizes" in such areas.

The GMA requires the county to consider OFM population projections when sizing urban growth areas. Nothing in the GMA provides that a county must use OFM's population projections for any other purpose. More particularly, nothing in the GMA provides that a county must use OFM's population as a cap or ceiling when planning non-urban growth.

The implications are 1. that the legislature considered how OFM's projections should be used; 2. that the legislature decided to require that counties use OFM's projections when planning for urban growth; and 3. that the legislature decided not to require that counties use OFM's projections when planning for non-urban growth.

Based on the foregoing we conclude that the GMA does not require counties to use OFM's projections as a cap on non-urban growth. The board exceeded it's authority and the trial court did not err by reversing the Board's ruling.

Redmond v. GMHB 136Wn.2d at 38 (1998) (Redmond)
Redmond was accepted by the court specifically to clarify the definition of "Agriculture land" The court noted that the statutory definition of agricultural lands found at RCW 36.70A 030 (2) involves the concepts of both "primarily devoted to" and "long term commercial significance". Long term commercial significance is further defined at RCW 36.70A. 030 (10) p. 54. The court held under the statutory definition of that term a local government "must evaluate growing capacity, productivity, and soil composition, proximity to population areas, and the possibility of more intensive uses of the land in question."

Washington State Supreme Court (PFL report 1-10-2010) Gold Star Resorts, Inc. v. Futurewise
Futurewise petitioned the growth management hearings boards...to force Whatcom County to adopt a uniform low density limit - no more than one dwelling per five acres - in the county's rural areas. Agreeing with the property owners, the Supreme Court unanimously held that, under its own precedents, state growth boards may not force counties to impose one size fits all, "bright" line density limits.

Washington State Court of Appeals
- unanimous decision that the states' GMA does not require the county's uncompensated restrictions on landowners use of their property.

The court held that the county's "set aside" rule violates a state law prohibiting a "tax, fee or charge" on land use. This prohibition "applies to ordinances that may require developers to set aside land as a condition of development". None of the limited exceptions in the law apply, the court noted.

No one was compensated and no one was relieved from paying taxes on the portion of their property rendered useless...there was no evidence that the set-aside restrictions were necessary to protect the environment, health or safety of the community.

Other Court Actions
- counties must do more than simply catalog land that are physically suited to farming. They must consider development prospects. ("the possibility of more intense uses") and determine if land has the enduring commercial quality needed to fit the agricultural land definition.

12-23-2004
- the superior court affirmed "the definition of long term significance refers to the growing capacity and productivity of the soil.

age 4 of 10
If the county sought "to serve the farmers non-farm economic needs" (opening Br at 30) Serving the farmers "non-farm" economic needs is not a logistical or permissible consideration in designating
GOALS
3. There is no requirement in the Act that the county show how it will balance the GMA goals in every comprehensive plan amendment; instead, the burden is on petitioners to show that the county's action is not in compliance. Hood Canal et al. v Jefferson County 03-2-0006 (FDO 8-15-03)

GMA PLANNING
4. Under the GMA, a county has an affirmative duty to dispense as much accurate information to as many people as it possibly can. Simply providing access does not satisfy that duty.
Mudge v Lewis County 01-2-0010 c (FDO 7-10-01)
5. The Board recognizes, too, that the county is not obligated to add to the stock of low income housing but instead to set the framework in which the market can provide housing for all segments of the population. Campbell v San Juan County Case # 09-2-0104 (FDO at 14 (Jan. 27, 2010)

HOUSING
6. In order to implement this goal (RCW 36.70A.020 (4)), cities and counties are directed to do the necessary planning to perform an inventory and analysis of existing and projected needs, make adequate provisions for the needs of all economic segments of the community, and identify sufficient land for low income housing.
Campbell v San Juan County Case # 09-2-0104 FDO at 15 (Jan. 27, 2010)

LAND CAPACITY ANALYSIS
(as to historic or ancient lots) ICAN fails to acknowledge that even legally created lots are not developable if substandard. (ICAN's) argument reveals a distinction between a legal lot and a developable lot. In general a "legal lot" is any lot that was created by legal means. (I.E. subdivision, testamentary devise, boundary adjustment) A "buildable" or "developable" lot is one that meets the zoning and health code requirements. In Dykstra (Dykstra v. Skagit County) the court noted that a legal lot may still be a non-conforming substandard lot because its land is insufficient to be a buildable site and that the legal lot status does not confer development rights. Here the county properly based its holding capacity analysis upon developable lots ICAN v Jefferson County Case consideration at 6-7 (Sept. 11, 2009)

......RCW 36.70A 110 (2) also allows that "an urban growth area determination may include a reasonable land market supply factor" The Board read this to mean that while the county can provide for additional land over and above what the county's land capacity analysis says it actually needs to provide for sufficient land to accommodate its projected population, the use of a market factor is not required......while a market factor is a useful tool in ensuring adequate land supply over the 20 year life of the plan, it is not required......Coordinative case: Lubwig, et al v San Juan County Case # 05-2-0019c (and others) Order on Compliance at 26-27 (Jan. 30, 2009)
A Land Capacity Analysis' (LCA) is a requirement arising from RCW 36.70A 110 for all counties planning under GMA......The LCA is a critical mechanism for the sizing of a UGA because it is utilized to determine how much urban land is needed......
Friends of Skagit County, et al v Skagit County Case # 07-2-0025c (Order on Reconsideration June 18, 2008) at 15
......This is primarily because RCW 36.70A 110 goes to the establishment of an urban growth boundary and the ability of the area within the boundary to accommodate the allocated growth and to provide for urban facilities and services. areas......In other words, the emphasis and focus as to capacity applies to the urban growth. The Board does not find that RCW 36.70A 115 mandates the same type of analysis for rural areas.

Dry Creek Coalition v Clallam County Case # 02-2-0033 Final Decision Order at 11 (June 12, 2009)

LIMITED AREAS OF MORE INTENSIVE DEVELOPMENT (LAMIRDS)
......the county has not violated the GMA by failing to adopt parameters that define the Page 7 of 10
The use of an urban reserve area without defined standards of conversion to a UGA, in conjunction with a large market factor, did not comply with the GMA Achen.

Clark County Citizens United, Inc v Clark County 95-2-0067 (FDO 9-20-95)

**MINIMUM GUIDELINES**

The GMA does not dictate the use of a five tier classification system for waters of the state. 1000 Friends of Washington...v Skagit County 03-2-0017 (FDO 2-10-04)

**NATURAL RESOURCE LANDS - IN GENERAL**

Allowance of a 10 acre minimum lot size within agriculture RLs, with the associated possibility of 1du/5 acres in some areas as part of a clustering program.

Page 9 of 10 complies with and does not substantially interfere with the goals of the Act.

Butler v. Lewis County 99-2-0027c (FDO 6-30-00)

**Current use**

in RL areas is not a determinative factor of the appropriateness of an RL designation. Friday Harbor v San Juan County 99-2-0010c (R01-31-01)

The use of an urban reserve areas instead of designation of the land as RL for planning for the post 2012 period did not comply with the GMA.

If the land is RL, it must be designated and conserved until a proper analysis demonstrates a needed different designation Achen v Clark County 95-2-0067 (Compliance Order, 10-1-96)

The GMHB does have the authority to require aggregation of non-conforming lots. Achen v. Clark County 95-2-0067 (R011-20-96)

**PUBLIC FACILITIES AND SERVICES**

Compliance of the Act is achieved where a county develops LOS standards for rural and urban water services and precludes urban services into rural areas. Evergreen v Skagit County 00-2-0046c (FDO, 26-01)

Western Washington Growth Management Hearings Board - Compliance Order

Clark County Citizens United, Inc, Achen et al. v. Clark County #95-2-0067 (Poyfair Remand)

CCNRC's contention that 80% of the county was suitable for forest designation is simply too broad a sweep.

Final Order and Decision - page 17

Long Term Commercial Significance - CCCU and many of the individual petitioners contended that much of the agricultural resource land classified and designated by Clark County did not meet the definition of "long term commercial significance". Much of the support cited by petitioners for that contention came from a report (Ex 181) issued by the Farm Focus Group. This group was a subcommittee of the Resource Lands Citizens Advisory Committee. It issued a report that agree with the criteria used for initial agricultural land designations. However, a minority of the committee concluded that the commercially significant criterion could not be met in Clark County.

The 1980 Clark County comprehensive plan provided for "clustering" of residential development on resource land as long as approximately three fourths of the land remained for resource use. The record reveals that many different suggestions and recommendations were made as to appropriate minimum lot sizes for rural areas. The FSEIS alternative A involved 2 1/2 min lot size. Much public comment recommended 1 acre minimums.

Vacant Lands Analysis - In the assumption phase of the VLA the county used a market factor of 25% for residential areas and 50% for commercial and industrial areas.

Page 10 of 10

The gorge Commission has the authority to establish densities at that location. One residence for every 2 acres is the maximum allowed. Obviously, 1 du/2 acres is not an urban density. Until that density is changed, the GMA does not allow Clark County to impose an urban growth area there since it is not, nor could it be, urban.
Clark County Board of Commissioners
P. O. Box 5000
Vancouver, Washington 98666

Re: 2007 Comprehensive Land Use Maps and the Rural Economy - For the

Clark County Citizens United, Inc. is concerned for the economic future of rural County and strongly suggest a small increase of developable lots on agriculture and forest land to maintain the rural economy. Non-conforming lots and county ordinances have reduced options for many long term citizens at a detriment to maintaining their important family farms, as they pay increased tax revenue. Statistics show that new construction in Fire District 3 has high value for the local tax system per capita, with very little new services required. Rural land values increase while there is less individual cost and more value to the community. Rural housing invests in the community and asks very little in return. Existing infrastructure as additional public costs cannot be counted, when the property tax value far outweighs multi-housing options on a per person, per year basis.

The USDA Economic Research Service has a series of data maps that give important information for land use planning. These maps indicate that the percent of sales less than $10,000 for farms in Clark County in 2007 was 85.4% and 40% of the farmers worked off the farm. The population change rate and net migration rate for 2000 to 2010 was 10 to 25% and the density per square mile was 10,000 to 69,468, similar to King county. The natural population change rate from 2000 to 2010 was 8 to 26% Where is Clark County going to put the people? The largest increase of migration, according to the BERK study was in the rural lands and historically the ratio has been a 80/20 split.

According to USDA, The County Classification in 2013 for Clark County was Metro, with an Urban Influence Code of large Metro. This indicates that Clark County is an urban county, not a rural county. There was 0 to 4% employed in agriculture, 8-13% in manufacturing, 51-55% in services and 5-6% in government. Unemployment was 8.8 to 11.2%. The per capita income in 2008 to 2012 was $25,000 to $30,000. Good paying jobs need to be increased in all areas of the county, both urban and rural.

If you compare these numbers with designated resource lands in Clark County, it demonstrates that a major change needs to be made to the rural areas to compensate for these figures. But first the erroneous resource land maps need to be corrected and a true reflection of rural Clark County needs to be made. The current 2007 maps indicate that agricultural land is in the same location as forest land. Hillsboro Loam and Cinebar Loam cannot be in the same location at the same time. Clark County's maps indicate prime forest Class I-II and prime Agriculture Class I-II in areas where there are none. The maps look alike with just the colors changed. This is not a true reflection of resource lands according to the Soils of Clark County Manual. Changes and corrections need to be made because the economic future of rural Clark County depends on it.

Carol Levensen, ES, Secretary
Clark County Citizens United, Inc.
P.O. Box 2188, Battle Ground, Washington 98666

August 11, 2014
Clark County, Washington
Hillsboro Soil Series and Slope 15% or More

KEY

Sections
Hillsboro Soil Series*
Slope 15% or More

*Note: Hillsboro Loam identified by Soil Classes HA, HB, HC, HD, HE and HF
RURAL LANDS STUDY: ASSESSMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY IN CLARK COUNTY

Source: Clark County Assessor, 2011; BERK, 2012.

May 15, 2012
Net farm-related income is the sum of farm sales, sales of farm byproducts, and services related to the principal functions of the farm before taxes and expenses. In many cases, farmers also have income from non-farm related activities.
CLARK COUNTY NATURAL RESOURCES COUNCIL CERES RCCPA v. CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED INC

CLARK COUNTY NATURAL RESOURCES COUNCIL CERES RCCPA v. CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED INC

Font size:

Court of Appeals of Washington, Division 2.

CLARK COUNTY NATURAL RESOURCES COUNCIL, Vancouver Audubon Society, Coalition for Environmental Responsibility and Economic Sustainability (CERES), Rural Clark County Preservation Association (RCCPA) and Loo-wit Group Sierra Club, Appellants, v. CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED, INC., Respondents.

No. 22164-1-II.

Decided: March 12, 1999


The Clark County Natural Resources appeals a superior court determination that the Growth Management Act does not empower the Western Washington Growth Management Board to order a county to use as a cap on non-urban growth, population projections made by the Office of Financial Management. We affirm.

The Growth Management Act (GMA) is codified as RCW 36.70A. It was enacted in 1990. It applies in many but not all counties.

A county subject to the GMA is required to adopt county-wide planning policies, development regulations and, in most cases, a comprehensive plan. Such a county must designate urban growth areas, as well as agricultural lands, forest lands, mineral resource lands, and critical areas. By operation of law, such a county designates as "rural" any land "not designated for urban growth, agriculture, forest, or mineral resources."

Then designating urban growth areas, a county must include land and densities "sufficient to permit the urban growth that is projected to occur in the county for the succeeding twenty-year period." In doing this, a


6/17/201
county must consider “the growth management population projection made for the county by the office of financial management (OFM).” OFM makes its projection pursuant to RCW 43.62.035.

Having designated urban growth areas, a county may not allow urban growth outside those areas. “Urban” growth is “growth that makes intensive use of land for the location of buildings, structures, and impermeable surfaces to such a degree as to be incompatible with the primary use of land for the production of food, other agricultural products, or fiber, or the extraction of mineral resources, rural uses, rural development, and natural resource lands.”

Notwithstanding the designation of urban growth areas, a county may allow non-urban or “rural” growth outside those areas. “Non-urban” or “rural” growth encompasses “a variety of uses and residential densities, including clustered residential development,” provided that such uses and densities are “not characterized by urban growth,” and are “consistent with rural character.”

Clark County is subject to the GMA. It has about 700,000 acres, many of which are urban or suburban in character. In December 1994, it adopted a comprehensive plan that designated about 50,000 acres as rural. The plan stated that all rural lands would have a minimum lot size of 5 acres.

Numerous parties appealed the plan to the Western Washington Growth Management Board (“the Board”), including the Clark County Natural Resources Council (CCNRC) and Clark County Citizens United, Inc. (CCCU). CCNRC sought stricter controls on land use, while CCCU sought less strict controls on land use.

In September 1995, after weeks of hearings, the Board ruled, among other things, that Clark County’s plan did not adequately restrict rural growth. Legally, the Board rested its ruling on two premises allegedly drawn from the GMA: (1) that population projections and allocations are not solely for use in urban areas, and (2) that the population projections for urban areas plus the population projections for non-urban areas must total the population projection for the entire county. Factually, the Board observed (1) that the County allocated 15,000 of the population projection number for non-urban growth; (2) that the County had “an excess of 13,500 preexisting undeveloped tax lots;” and (3) that the County had based its planning on an average of 2.33 persons per household. As a result, according to the Board, “there would be more than twice the number of lots available to house the allocated 15,000 population projection, even without additional divisions of land that would likely occur over the next 20 years.” Based on this view of the law and facts, the Board ruled that the GMA precluded 5-acre lots in rural areas, and it ordered the County to “increase the minimum lot sizes” in such areas.

CCNRC appealed to the Clark County Superior Court, which reversed the Board’s order. The court ruled that the GMA did not require the County to use OFM’s population projections as a fixed cap on non-rural growth and that the Board had exceeded its authority by creating and imposing such a cap on the County.

CCNRC now appeals to this court. Its primary contention is that the trial court “erroneously concluded OFM population projections are not a restraint/cap on rural growth.” This contention involves a question of law – that we review without deference to the trial court, but arguably with deference to the Board. According to CCCU, the question is whether the GMA requires that the OFM’s population projections be used as the defining element in establishing land use densities in rural areas.” In simpler terms, the question is whether the GMA requires a county to use OFM’s population projections as a cap on non-urban growth.

The GMA requires a county to consider OFM population projections when sizing urban growth areas. Thus, RCW 36.70A.110 provides in pertinent part:

(1) Each county that is required or chooses to plan under RCW 36.70A.040 shall designate an urban growth area or areas within which urban growth shall be encouraged and outside of which growth can occur only if it is not urban in nature.

(2) Based upon the growth management population projection made for the county by the office of financial management, the county and each city within the county shall include areas and densities sufficient to permit the urban growth that is projected to occur in the county or city for the succeeding twenty-year period.

Nothing in the GMA provides that a county must use OFM’s population projections for any other purpose. More particularly, nothing in the GMA provides that a county must use OFM’s population projections as a cap or ceiling when planning for non-urban growth. Construed according to its plain meaning, then, the GMA does not require counties to use OFM’s population projections as a cap or ceiling on non-urban growth.

Attempting to forestall a holding based on the GMA’s plain meaning, CCNRC argues that “the conclusion that the OFM population projection is a hard cap not to be exceeded is supported by a review of the Growth Management Act (‘GMA’) as a whole.” It is our view, however, that such a review tends to detract from, not support, CCNRC’s position. As already observed, the GMA requires counties to use OFM’s projections when planning for urban growth. It omits any reference to counties using OFM’s projections when planning for non-urban growth. The implications are (1) that the legislature considered how OFM’s projections should be used; (2) that the legislature decided to require that counties use OFM’s projections when planning for urban growth; and (3) that the legislature decided not to require that counties use OFM’s projections when planning for non-urban growth.

CCNRC argues that the trial court was required to defer to the Board’s interpretation of the GMA, and that this court must also. Although a court will defer to an agency’s interpretation when that will help the court achieve a proper understanding of the statute, “it is ultimately for the court to determine the purpose and meaning of statutes, even when the court’s interpretation is contrary to that of the agency charged with carrying out the law.” Here, in our view, the Board misread the statute and exceeded its authority. If we were to defer to its ruling, we would perpetuate, not correct, its error. Under these circumstances, we hold that deference is not due.

Based on the foregoing, we conclude that the GMA does not require counties to use OFM’s projections as a cap on non-urban growth. The Board exceeded its authority, and the trial court did not err by reversing the Board’s ruling.

Affirmed.

FOOTNOTES

· See RCW 36.70A.040(1),(a).

· RCW 36.70A.040(3).

· RCW 36.70A.040(3)(c); RCW 36.70A.110(1).

· RCW 36.70A.040(3)(b); RCW 36.70A.170(1); RCW 36.70A.030(3), (5), (8), (11), (17), (18), (19), (20).

In 1994, subsections 17–20 were numbered 14–17, respectively.

· RCW 36.70A.070(3).

· RCW 36.70A.110(2); see RCW 43.62.035.

· RCW 36.70A.110(2).

· RCW 36.70A.110(1); RCW 36.70A.010(1), (2).

· RCW 36.70A.030(17). In 1994, this subsection was numbered 14 rather than 17.

· RCW 36.70A.110(1) (“Each county that is required or chooses to plan under RCW 36.70A.040 shall designate an urban growth area or areas within which urban growth shall be encouraged and outside of which growth can occur only if it is not urban in nature.”).

· RCW 36.70A.030(15). We use this subsection as a present indicator of legislative intent, even though it was not enacted until 1997. See Wash. Laws 1997, ch. 429, § 3.
RCW 36.70A.070(5)(b), as amended in 1997. In 1994, the GMA allowed "uses that are compatible with the rural character of such lands," and "a variety of rural densities." Former RCW 36.70A.070(5); Wash. Laws 1990, ch. 17, § 7.

Clerk’s Papers at 38.

The Board also made many other holdings that we are not asked to review.

Clerk’s Papers at 39-40.

Clerk’s Papers at 79.

The superior court said in part: It is evident the rural land use density regulations were driven in part by earlier Growth Management Hearing Board decisions requiring urban population plus rural population to equal Office of Financial Management population forecasts. [Citation omitted.] This formulaic view of the GMA requirement is fatally flawed. There is no requirement in the GMA that the OPM projections be used in any manner other than as a measure to ensure urban growth areas are adequately sized and infrastructure in those growth areas is provided for. The Board’s requirement to, in essence, require a vacant buildable lands analysis for the rural area was erroneous. This Board decision, however, compelled the County to downzone substantial portions of the rural areas in order to meet the Board’s apparent requirements. Clerk’s Papers at 739-740.

Appellant’s Brief at 11.


City of Redmond v. Central Puget Sound Growth Management Hearings Board, 136 Wash.2d 38, 46, 959 P.2d 1091 (1998). In other words, we review the trial court’s ruling “de novo.”

We discuss due deference to the Board later in this opinion.

Respondent’s Brief at 22.

Without so holding, we assume that the GMA permits a county to use OPM’s population projections when planning for lands outside its urban growth areas. That question is not presented by this appeal.

Appellant’s Brief at 19.

Snohomish County v. Anderson, 123 Wash.2d 151, 157, 868 P.2d 116 (1994), quoting Washington Natural Gas Co. v. PUD 1, 77 Wash.2d 94, 98, 469 P.2d 653 (1969) (“Where a statute specifically designates the things or classes of things upon which it operates, an inference arises in law that all things or classes of things omitted from it were intentionally omitted by the legislature”); Sour v. Johnson, 122 Wash.2d 899, 836, 864 P.2d 380 (1993); State v. Roadka, 71 Wash.2d 705, 707, 430 P.2d 586 (1967).


Overton, 96 Wash.2d at 555, 637 P.2d 652 (citation omitted); see also Cowiche, 118 Wash.2d at 813, 828 P.2d 549.

MORGAN, J.

BRIDGEWATER, C.J., and REYNOLDS, J.P.T., concur.
Following comments were submitted online:

Parcel No:

Subject: Transportation

Comments:
Transportation planning shouldn't be a 20 year plan. Growth is faster than planning and becomes outmotivated and traffic congestion increase at more rapid rate. Bus service needs be increased on SR 502 from Battle Ground Day, Swing shifts, Ridgefield industrial District Day, Swing, Grave shifts on the I-5 Freeway North and South Bound

Submitted by:
Dale Chambers

Email: chambersdale@yahoo.com

Address:
22715 N.E. St. Helens View Road
Yacolt, Washington
Following comments were submitted online:

Parcel No: 18583600

Subject: Growth in Clark Co.

Comments:
Clark county WAS a great place to live. Now not so much. The problems as I see them are:
Too many apartments. We need to stop building them or price them so that lower income people can't afford them. If the less desirable are priced out, they will leave or at least stop moving into the county. Less undesirables, less problems.
Encourage and allow larger lot sizes. Livability starts in ones home and neighborhood not by squeezing people together.

Submitted by:
Bill Ungrodt

Email: bsungrodt@hotmail.com

Address:
Salmon Creek,
Mallory,

Thank you. I've received the letter and will pass it on to the Board of County Commissioners and will also include it in the record for the Comprehensive Plan Update.

Jose Alvarez
Planner III
Clark County
Department of Community Planning
360.397.2280 x4898

-----Original Message-----
From: Engineer Assistant [mailto:ea@deltamanagementco.com]
Sent: Monday, August 18, 2014 10:41 AM
To: Alvarez, Jose
Subject: Ridgefield property RV Park use allowance

Good Morning Jose,

Wanted to ensure you received a copy of the letter we submitted on Friday. Please let me know if the Board needs anything from us. I look forward to hearing from you.

Thanks again,

Mallory Lewis
Delta Management Co
203 E. Reserve Street
Vancouver WA, 98661
t. 360-696-4448 EXT 1020
f. 360-695-1970
August 8, 2014

Board of Commissioners
1300 Franklin St
Vancouver WA 98661

Re: RV Park use allowance as part of the Comprehensive Plan Review
Parcel ID 182153000

This letter is to formally request the Board of Community Planning to amend the use table to include an RV Park in the “IL” designated zone located at 16606 NE 10th Ave., Ridgefield, WA 98642 (Parcel ID 182153000) adjacent to the Clark County Fairgrounds. This piece of property is owned by Castle Tree Trust, one of the Sadri family entities, and contains 5 acres of level and buildable land which currently sits undeveloped and is an eyesore to the passersby along I5.

The proposed development would consist of approximately 100 RV spaces and amenities that include:

- An onsite management office
- An onsite recreational facility
- Free WiFi and Cable access
- Onsite laundry facilities
- Onsite shower facilities
- All facilities in compliance with ADA standards
- Security cameras
- Well maintained landscaping
- Dog park
- Swimming pool (per planning feasibility)

All these amenities aid in our goal to provide excellent customer service while maintaining an average of 95% occupancy in our existing RV parks during the traveling seasons and over 80% occupancy during the off seasons. With over forty years of experience in property development and twenty years of experience owning and managing local RV Parks, we are confident that this development will thrive and be as successful as our other locations. We are proposing an attractive developed property that not only markets itself but also would enhance the surrounding economic community by increasing the customer base to local farmers, grocery stores, and local and small businesses. The development would also allow for street frontage improvements along 10th Street.

This use will be a great benefit to the local community by targeting tourists. The property could be easily marketed with the park located such a short distance from the Portland and Vancouver metropolitan areas and direct access to and from Interstate 5. With the Property bordering the Fairgrounds, the use would generate an increase in patrons to the Clark County Fair and Amphitheater attractions by offering a place for traveling consumers, outside of Clark County, to park, stay and enjoy several days of
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should the Board allow for the amendment, Clark County as a whole would see an economically 
positive impact. Not only would the park generate revenue for the Clark County Fairgrounds and 
Amphitheater, but also the difference in property tax, once developed, would be a substantially 
significant increase payable directly to Clark County. The County would also benefit from the rise in 
taxed sales of local goods and merchandise in this area. It is also likely that this development, once 
established, would encourage other developers to invest in the area and possibly develop or improve the 
surrounding neighborhoods.

We take a great deal of pride in our properties, with a management office onsite and the use of 
security cameras, we would be promoting a safe environment for the park and surrounding areas. While 
providing a safe atmosphere, the park would also encourage an overall well-being in our on-site 
recreational facilities. Again, this development would serve to benefit Clark County in increased tax 
revenues as well as an increase in consumers for the surrounding businesses, agriculture, and the 
Amphitheater and Fairgrounds. Thank you for your time and attention to this matter. We look forward to 
hearing from you.

Respectfully,

[Signature]

Asgiar R. Sadri
Trustee of Castle Tree Trust

References:
The following developed RV parks, owned by Sadri Family entities, are as examples of our proposed 
development for this property (also see aerial photos on Exhibit A)

Columbia River RV Park: Consists of 11.5 acres and 198 RV spaces
10649 NE 13th Ave.
Portland, OR 97211

VanMall RV Park: Consists of 3.85 acres and 101 RV spaces
10400 NE 53rd Ave.
Vancouver, WA 98662

Attachments:
Exhibit A – Aerial Photos
EIS SCOPING INPUT FORM
August 2014

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Gretchen Stanké (Friends of Clark County)

Address: 368 NE 124th Ave, Vancouver, WA 98686

Open house location: Vancouver Community Library, Aug 19

Comment:

1) There should be more alternatives - I suggest you look at a reduction of urban growth areas; in some cases, what would be the implications? (I know such an alternative could not be easy, but it should be looked at.)

2) An alternative that promotes working spaces.

Elements that should be looked at:

1) water, clear a building 2) stormwater - stormwater pollution

3) wetlands - essential ones help deal with stormwater;

4) Willison & Sisley

5) nature areas: in general / 6) wildlife & the urban-wild interface

7) hazardous areas, including SWMR, SWMR 8) roadways, 9) agricultural areas (should soils be protected) including walkways, streets

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: GStanké@Prefacies.com

Other ways to comment:

• Submit a comment on the web:
  www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

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

Comments are due September 1, 2014.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the EIS scoping.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that the SEIS contains issues of importance to our community.
Next 20 Years – STARTING NOW
East Clark County – Vancouver, Camas, Washougal

1. New 192nd Ave. Bridge – Will do what I-205 Bridge has done for growth in East Clark County.
   Jobs, Jobs, Jobs – East of 192nd Ave. and North Clark County. – Business, Housing, & Retail.
   Put Light Rail on I-205 as it was built for Light Rail, north to Vancouver Mall. Also East & West
   along NE 18th St Power Lines from Downtown Washougal to Downtown Vancouver.
   Bring Portland workers & jobs to Clark County.

2. Thousands of homes both sides of Lacamas Lake. Thousands of Jobs – Technology,
   Manufacturing, & retail along Lake Rd. & North of Lacamas Lake & out into Brush Prairie and
   Hockinson.

3. Without 192nd Ave Bridge – Growth East will slow & access to Portland will become a
   Gridlock & limit growth & Jobs due to excess car traffic on Both existing 2 Bridges. We need
   to support & HELP get this bridge built in the 5 years as in 5 years traffic will already be growing
   rapidly.

4. With all Companies locating in East Clark County, they will need Housing, Shopping,
   entertainment, & Roads and Infrastructure. If this is provided more companies will come.
   In addition to Companies already here & coming soon. So our Kids will have Jobs here. Not
   in Portland or Seattle.

5. With 125,560 residents and 91,200 Jobs coming. How will they all fit across 2 existing bridges
   already near capacity, without an East County Bridge at 192nd Ave? THIS IS COMING by or
   before year 2035. Stop fighting & do your jobs of Planning & Growing Forward.

ADAM KLUKA  AKLUKA@BHH.SILK.COM
EIS SCOPING INPUT FORM
August 2014

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Names: [Handwritten text]

Address: [Handwritten text]

Open house location: [Handwritten text]

Comment:
- The county needs to be brought into compliance with the findings of fact and conclusions of law; Case # 94-2-06620-2.
- The legal criteria was used to re-designate agri-horticulture's classification, the agri-horticulture has been discussed in the EIS process.
- The EIS was about the analysis of changes to the pattern of rural development; this was clearly erroneous, per Judge Payfair.
- The county's rural development regulations were inconsistent with the CMA.
- The county's resource development regulations were inconsistent with the CMA; the county's resource development regulations are inconsistent with the CMA, per Judge Payfair.

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: [Handwritten text]

Other ways to comment:
- Submit a comment on the web: www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments
- Submit a comment in writing:
  Comprehensive Plan EIS Scoping
  Community Planning
  P.O. Box 9810
  Vancouver, WA 98666

Comments are due September 1, 2014.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the EIS scoping.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that the SEIS contains issues of importance to our community.
Hello,

For your information, and for the record, here's a copy of Carol Levanan's testimony from the Board hearing of August 19.

Rebecca
Clark County Board of Commissioners  
P.O. Box 5000  
Vancouver, Washington 09666

Re: Rural Lands and the 2016 Comprehensive Plan Update

In the Superior Court of Washington, Case No. 96-2-0080-2, Clark County Citizens United, Inc. v Western Washington Growth Management Hearings Board, and Clark County, Honorable Edwin J. Poyfair ruled in favor of Clark County Citizens United, Inc. He states, the WWGMB was not above the law, the Agri/forest resource designations violate the GMA, the failure to solicit meaningful public input...violated the public participation provisions of the GMA, and the Comprehensive Plan EIS issued by the county violates the State Environmental Policy Act. But most importantly, he ruled that 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 are adequately sized and infrastructure in those growth areas is provided for. Even more important he ruled that The Board’s interpretation was erroneous, and the County’s decision to follow the Board lead was unfortunate. The result is a plan that gives little regard for the realities of existing rural development in direct contradiction of the term of the GMA.

Clark County Citizens United, Inc. is very concerned that rural lands are not included in the first open house meetings of the Comprehensive Plan update for 2016. After 20 years this plan has become obsolete. The massive downzoning and theft of the rural lands, by way of zoning and regulations, continues. In 2007 CCCU, Inc. would not be heard by the county because they were told that only urban changes were being made and rural was not being considered. But, the GMA did not intend that when a county designates a 20 year plan, that it should stay static throughout the rural areas for tens of years. There are thousands of legal substandard lots in rural Clark County that may have lost their vesting rights because of the inaction of Clark County. The cost to the landowners is in the millions. It has been 20 years now, and the county must address this problem and this court ruling by the Superior Court.

CCCU, Inc. urges Clark County to include a full review of the rural lands in this current 2016 review, correct the erroneous resource maps and incorrect zoning of the rural lands and honor the Superior Court ruling.

Sincerely,

Carol Levanen, Ex. Secretary  
Clark County Citizens United, Inc.  
P.O. Box 2188  
Battle Ground, Washington 98604
Following comments were submitted online:

Parcel No:

Subject: Agriculture

Comments:
The plan should address preservation of agricultural resource lands to provide local sources of wholesome food and provide ground water recharge and wildlife habitat. Land available for a range of farm sizes is needed. Agricultural resource land in the western half of the county should be prioritized because of it soil quality and water availability. Small to medium owner operated farms could provide a significant source of quality employment. Opportunity for comment is inadequate.

Submitted by:
James Hunter

Email: huntersgreens@spiritone.com

Address:
15716 N.E. 112th Avenue
Following comments were submitted online:

Parcel No:

Subject: Farm Land Preservation

Comments:
The plan should address preservation of agricultural resource lands to provide local sources of healthy food and provide ground water recharge and wildlife habitat. Each week I depend on the nourishing produce grown by these small to medium farmers in Vancouver. Land available for a range of farm sizes is needed. Farm land in the western half of the county should be prioritized due to its soil quality and water availability. Small to medium owner operated farms also provide jobs.

Submitted by:
Kim Zentner

Email: kimzen13@live.com

Address:

Vancouver, Wa
Following comments were submitted online:

Parcel No:

Subject: Agricultural resource lands

Comments:
I feel strongly, that land that can be used to grow food for people in this area must be preserved! Transportation is expensive-this makes food grown nearby an important part of keeping the population healthy. KEEP Local community gardens; community supported agriculture land; and private garden spaces! Family gardens provide food for individual

Submitted by:
Sylvia Fish

Email: sylviamermaid@msn.com

Address:
21210 NW 31st Ave
Ridgefield, Washington
Following comments were submitted online:

Parcel No: CSA Farms

Subject: Agricultural Land

Comments:
We receive produce weekly from a Certified Sustainable Farmer in Battle Ground, and think it is important to allow this activity. It provides healthy, local food and jobs.

Submitted by:
Carolee and Gil Ornelas

Email: carolee.ornelas@gmail.com

Address:
18115 se 18th St.
Vancouver, WA.
Following comments were submitted online:

Parcel No:

Subject: Save Farm Land

Comments:
The plan should address preservation of agricultural resource lands to provide local sources of wholesome food and provide ground water recharge and wildlife habitat. Land available for a range of farm sizes is needed. Agricultural resource land in the western half of the county should be prioritized because of it soil quality and water availability. Small to medium owner operated farms could provide a significant source of quality employment. Opportunity for comment is inadequate.

Submitted by:
Sarah Collmer

Email: sicollmer@gmail.com

Address:
704 W 20th St.
Vancouver, Washington
Following comments were submitted online:

Parcel No:

Subject: Preserve farmland

Comments:
I'm not well versed in the decisions that go into planning for an entire community's growth. However, I do very much value the agricultural heritage of the region. I'm a member for a local CSA and find access to fresh, local food important. I want to make my wishes know to preserve farmland under both the "agricultural resource lands" designation and the "current use taxation program". Thank you.

Submitted by:
Misty Murphy

Email: misty@castlemurphy.com

Address:
Following comments were submitted online:

Parcel No:

Subject: agriculture

Comments:
I am a farmer. As you update the growth plan, please reserve large areas for agriculture. Development has destroyed some of the best farmland in the world, paving over rich deep alluvial topsoil. When soil is strong, less (if any) chemicals are needed. The flatlands have the best soil for row crops, not the hills where the soil is more suited to orchards. Once built over, it is lost to farming. Many people realize our area needs to produce its own food. Please preserve Clark County's great soil.

Submitted by:
Jacqueline Freeman

Email: j88@sisna.com

Address:
20309 NE 242nd Ave
Battle Ground, Washington
Following comments were submitted online:

Parcel No:

Subject: Agriculture

Comments:
Please consider the importance of agriculture or small ag parcels, habitat conservation and open space within developed/developing areas.

Submitted by:
Kristine White

Email: gaiafaith@yahoo.com

Address:
21906 NE 227th Ave
BATTLE GROUND, WASHINGTON
To whom it may concern,

My apologies, but I'm unable to make your public meeting.

For the record:

I strongly support and would respectfully ask that my property be taken into the urban growth boundary. The property is currently zoned R-10 in urban reserve and is very close to the current boundary. I know it will be sometime (years) before it is reviewed again. Bottom-line: I'm getting on in the years and would like to leave each of my children (4) a piece of land, which, per your planning department, I'm unable to do unless it falls into the boundary. Thank you very much for your consideration. If you have questions I can be reached at the number below.

Sincerely,

Scott W. Cramer
60-574-5899

Property location:

6217 NE Salmon Creek Street
Vancouver, Washington 98685
The growth rates being used to plan for transportation in Clark County appear to be unrealistic, leading to costly planning errors and promoting "high capacity" transit in spite of low capacity usage of the transit system over the last 2 decades. Please adjust the growth rates to better reflect the actual conditions in Clark County. Regional Transportation Plans will better serve businesses and residents if they are more accurate.

Margaret Tweet

From: "Tweet, margaret" <tweetfamily@comcast.net>
To: "Lookingbill, Dean" <dean.lookingbill@rtc.wa.gov>

Sent: Thursday, October 4, 2012 11:04:21 AM

Dear Mr. Lookingbill,
At the March 2011 RTC meeting, there was discussion about adjusting the population and and employment rates used to predict future transportation demand, as per the attached document.

Questions: what is the population growth rate used for the following, the DEIS? FEIS? the 2030 plan? the 2035 Plan?
What is the jobs ratio used for the DEIS? FEIS? the 2030 Plan or the 2035 Plan.

The light rail/BRT proposal appears based on the 2035 predictions. Is it?

Please clarify, was the DEIS/FEIS based on the 2030 plan?

The increased jobs to household ratio of 1.03 for the 2035 plan is considerably higher than the current rate of .82.

Why did you recommend using this higher jobs to household ratio?

Thank you for any clarification you can provide.

Margaret Tweet

From: "Dean Lookingbill" <dean.lookingbill@rtc.wa.gov>
To: "Tweet" <tweetfamily@comcast.net>
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Ms. Tweet,

In response to your e-mail requests of 6/8/12 and 6/11/12 please note the following. Attached is the March 29, 2011 RTC Board memo on the 2035 population and employment forecast used for the 2035 Clark County Metropolitan Transportation Plan. There have been no updates to the to the plan or 2035 population and employment forecast since that time. The jobs to household ratio is stated in the memo.

Here is the web link to the OFM population projections, their methodology is explained on the web site.  http://www.ofm.wa.gov/pop/kma/projections12/projections12.asp

Here are two web links to the Employment Security Department, their assumptions and methodology are explained on their web site.  https://fortress.wa.gov/esd/employmentdata/reports-publications/Industry-reports/employment-projections

  https://fortress.wa.gov/esd/employmentdata/reports-publications/regional-reports/county-profiles/clark-county-profile

Dean Lookingbill

RTC Transportation Director
MEMORANDUM

TO: Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council Board of Directors
FROM: Dean Lookingbill, Transportation Director
DATE: March 29, 2011
SUBJECT: 2011 Metropolitan Transportation Plan Update: 2035 Population and Employment Forecast

AT A GLANCE – Action Requested
The RTC Board is being asked to take action on the adoption of the 2011 MTP 2035 population and employment forecast. The proposed 2035 forecast includes the feedback from the Board at their March 1, 2011 meeting, as well as a follow up review by the technical staff of RTC member jurisdictions. The forecast is consistent with the adopted 2007 GMA Plan, while extending the forecast year from 2024 to 2035. The 2035 population forecast of 641,800 is in between the OFM medium and high projection. The forecast also takes into account the current economic recession that has slowed growth in Clark County over the last several years. The 2035 employment projection of 256,200 is consistent with the adopted 2007 GMA Plan by maintaining a 1.03 jobs to household ratio. The 2035 employment forecast is less than the previous 2030 MTP employment forecast, however, the jobs to household ratio of 1.03 is considerably higher than the current ratio of .82 jobs to household.

INTRODUCTION
As the Board will recall, the long-range Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) is a part of the required federal and state transportation planning process and represents the collective strategy for developing a regional transportation system to provide both mobility and accessibility for person trips and freight movement. The 2011 MTP update is needed in order to meet the federal requirements that Regional Transportation Plans must be updated at least every four years. The MTP must also address a 20-year planning horizon for the life of the Plan which requires RTC to adopt the year 2035 as the Plan’s forecast year.

The 2035 population and employment forecast and its geographic allocation reflects and quantifies the adopted future land-use conditions for 2011 MTP Update. The forecast and allocation serve as major inputs to RTC’s regional travel forecasting model that in turn produces a forecast of future travel demand. In developing the 2011 MTP update, travel demand model outputs will be used in conjunction with adopted MTP goals and policies, existing local and state transportation plans and updated financial information to assess future transportation needs and compare the performance of long-range planning strategies and options. Additionally, the model will support the project development processes for WSDOT, local jurisdictions and C-TRAN by providing a county-wide comprehensive, regional forecast of travel demand. The 2035 forecast year is consistent with the required 20-year planning horizon for the environmental impact
2011 Metropolitan Transportation Plan Update: 2035 Population and Employment Forecast
March 29, 2011
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statements for roadway projects as well as transit projects like C-TRANs upcoming Alternatives Analysis for the proposed Fourth Plain Bus Rapid Transit project.

The purpose of this agenda item is to present the feedback that the RTC Board requested from the Regional Transportation Advisory Committee (RTAC) on the proposed 2035 forecast and to seek the adoption of the proposed county-wide 2035 population of 641,800 and employment forecast of 256,200 for use in the 2011 MTP Update.

DEVELOPMENT PROCESS FOR THE 2011 MTP DEMOGRAPHIC FORECAST

During the development of a new 2035 population and employment forecast, RTC has collaborated extensively with the long-range planning staff of partner agencies in reviewing current population and employment forecasts produced by the State of Washington and considering region-wide econometric assumptions developed by Metro. RTC staff, local jurisdiction staff and RTAC have continued to use the following principles to guide the development of the proposed 2035 forecast.

- Maintain consistency with adopted Comprehensive Growth Management plans and current land use designations
- Incorporate official state population forecasts from the Office of Financial Management (OFM)
- Consider long-term industry employment projections from the Employment Security Department (ESD)
- Account for the impacts of the recent economic recession
- Consider region-wide econometric assumptions developed by Metro
- Use the adopted MTP 2030 forecast and allocation as the starting point

Following the feedback from the RTC Board at their March meeting, RTC staff met with the long-range planning staff from Clark County, the City of Vancouver and all of RTAC members to discuss the comments from the RTC Board and to review the previously RTAC recommended forecast. The following two sections provide a summary of RTAC member’s responses to the Board comments and their recommended 2035 population and employment forecast.

PROPOSED 2035 POPULATION AND EMPLOYMENT FORECAST

RTC staff met with the local jurisdiction long-range planning staff on March 4th to discuss and review the previously RTAC recommended forecast and Board’s comments. Their review of available population forecasts concluded that the current state OFM medium projection trend (see attached graph) provides the best predictive forecast for county-wide population and that using a population forecast that falls between the OFM medium and high projection trends will provide sufficient mitigation against the risk of under-planning, while maintaining consistency with the Comprehensive Growth Management Plan. It was also noted that the new population
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forecast should account for the lower than expected growth that has occurred since the adoption of the comprehensive plan. They also concluded that a future job per household ratio of 1.03 sets an aggressive employment growth target that is consistent with the policy goals of the comprehensive plan and represents significant growth over the current job per household ratio of 0.82.

At the March 18th RTAC meeting, RTAC members agreed that a 2035 population of 641,800 and employment forecast of 256,200 is consistent with the adopted Comprehensive Growth Management Plan and presents little risk for under-planning for transportation needs. RTAC members stated that over-forecasting can dilute focus of planning efforts and cause the region to allocate scarce funds to transportation needs that may not materialize during the plan’s timeframe. RTAC also expressed that the county will begin the process to update the Comprehensive Growth Management Plan in few years, providing the opportunity to comprehensively address growth in the county and not solely through the lens of transportation.

RTAC recommends the RTC Board adopt at 2035 population forecast of 641,800 because of the following:

- It falls between the OFM high and medium projections to minimize risk of under-planning, like the GMA forecast for 2024.
- It represents the growth trend of the GMA that has been adjusted to reflect lower than expected population growth as shown by the 2010 census.
- It maintains consistency with the adopted Comprehensive Growth Management Plan.

RTAC recommends the RTC Board adopt a 2035 employment forecast of 265,200 because of the following:

- It is consistent with Comprehensive Growth Management Plan policy to capture a greater share of regional employment growth in order to allow for increased opportunity to work and live within Clark County.
- Raising the county’s current job to household ratio from 0.82 to 1.03 is an aggressive growth target that adds over 5,000 new jobs per year and doubles the county’s 2010 employment.

Planning staff from Clark County and the City of Vancouver will be in attendance at the April RTC Board meeting to address questions and comments from the Board regarding RTAC’s forecast recommendation.

NEXT STEPS

Maintaining consistency with adopted comprehensive plans is one the main principles guiding RTC and RTAC members in the process of developing a 2035 forecast of population and employment for the MTP update. The RTAC forecast recommendation begins with the planning
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policies of the Comprehensive Growth Management Plan; adds the most recent population projections from OFM; and accounts for the recent impacts to the county’s growth using observed data from the 2010 Census.

Upon the adoption of a 2035 population and employment forecast by the RTC Board, RTC staff will continue to work closely with its member jurisdictions to generate an allocation of the forecast to the 665 transportation analysis zones (TAZs) that represent Clark County. The main focus of the growth allocation effort will be maintaining consistency with adopted comprehensive plans and current zoning. Towards that end, RTAC has recommended the following approach to allocate the 2035 population and employment forecast:

- Begin with the 2030 TAZ allocation for the 2007 MTP
- Remove households and employment from land that has been remanded from urban growth areas (UGAs) since the 2007 adoption of the Comprehensive Growth Management Plan
- Remove households and employment that were added to urban reserve areas when allocating 2024 to 2030 population and employment growth for the 2007 MTP
- Review and modify planning-level overrides to redevelopment areas within UGAs
- Allocate remaining households and employment within designated urban reserves

This approach will maintain consistency with adopted land-use plans while providing a demographic forecast and allocation that extends 11 years beyond the 2024 horizon year of Comprehensive Growth Management Plan.

**ACTION REQUESTED**

The RTC Board is being requested to adopt a county-wide 2035 forecast of population and employment for the 2011 MTP. The proposed 2035 population forecast is 641,800 and the employment forecast is 256,200. The 2035 forecast will provide one of the major inputs to RTC’s regional travel forecasting model which in turn provides the 2035 travel demand forecast. The output of the travel forecasting model will be used along with adopted MTP goals and policies, existing local and state transportation plans and new financial information to assess the future transportation needs to be recommended in the MTP.

Attachment

20110405RTC_MTPpopEmpMemo.doc
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McCall, Marilee

From: Susan Setterberg <smsetterberg@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, August 30, 2014 8:22 PM
To: Cnty 2016 Comp Plan
Subject: Comments on 2016 comp plan update

After attending the open house in Ridgefield on August 17th, I have the following comments on the update plan.

**Light Rail:** As a new resident of Clark County, I am surprised at the seeming lack of support for light rail; however, when I’ve talked to county residents about it, I get a different response in favor of some kind of light rail. Having lived on the outskirts of four major metropolitan areas during my work career of 31+ years, I have found public transportation in the form of a light rail in three of those four areas to be an excellent way for both speed and cost to get into a city for work and for entertainment. It is inconceivable to me that Clark County would not participate in a light rail project that would connect to the Portland metro area system and provide ease of movement within the county. Traffic coming in and out of Portland at commute times is almost unbearable now. What would it be like in five or ten more years? I’ve heard opponents blame Portland but I wonder if any of those folks have been in the traffic and counted the license plates creeping by. I have. Easily, 60% of the cars creeping through the I-5 corridor are from WA. So, take some responsibility, look to the future, and make a plan that includes light rail as a transportation alternative. It will never get cheaper; traffic will only get worse.

**Code Changes for Park lands:** I understand that a number of park lands created in residential areas after the fact are still designated as residential rather than being reclassified as parks. This change should happen to protect the parks so the neighborhoods will not lose their parks for which they have worked so hard when developers seek to turn them into residential or commercial use.

**Wildlife Habitat:** There needs to be greater consideration of habitat quality and variety for wildlife in Clark County. Having a plan for recreational parks and relying on the few refuges is not sufficient. Quality habitat needs to be diverse and large enough to sustain diverse wildlife populations. There have been numerous studies and reports on forest fragmentation and wildlife corridors which should be considered when designating open space intended for wildlife and connecting those areas. Putting a treeed path or grass ditch behind a development and designating it a green belt does not mean it will adequately support birds and other animals. The needs of a variety of species native to the area need to be studied and considered. Rivers, creeks, meadows, farm land, forests, grasslands, wetlands, etc. can all be a part of making Clark County a wonderful place to live when they are full of wildlife.

Susan M. Setterberg  
Ridgefield, WA  
smsetterberg@yahoo.com
At the August 19 open house, I was very interested in the local food production material. I would like to see conservation of food production land included in the scope of the 2016 Comprehensive Plan Update. With even national grocery store chains touting their “local” food, it is clear that more people appreciate locally grown food. I purchase most of my produce at Joe’s Place Farm and New Seasons Market, and I would like to see more food produced locally in Clark County. Of the many benefits, it would be good for our local economy to have more of our food produced nearby. Since the urban growth boundaries are not likely to change, this update seems like a good opportunity to study ways to encourage local food production and include them in the update. I was happy to learn that the urban growth boundaries are not likely to change due to the recession and being made so large in the 2007 update. I’m also happy to see the county has chosen to use the medium population growth forecast and the high employment forecast to hopefully move Clark County away from being a bedroom community and relief valve for Portland metro area residential growth. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Karen Wood
14910 NE 46th St
Vancouver, WA 98682
kwood@pacifier.com
As Vice-president of the Vancouver Audubon Society, I attended the Ridgefield Open House on the update of the 2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan.

Vancouver Audubon suggests that attention be paid to the needs of birds and other wildlife in our county to promote the quality of living in our communities. The plan should thoughtfully and thoroughly consider the needs for adequate habitat types, quality and size to sustain and attract native birds and other wildlife. Although wetlands often get attention due to state and federal mandates for protection; various uplands and other habitat types, including farmland, should be considered in depth relative to sustaining wildlife.

Many studies have been done on the effect of fragmenting habitats and they have exposed some serious concerns. In addition, there have been successes with creating wildlife corridors to allow safe movement of species between favored habitats. The plan would benefit from identification of native wildlife, including migrant species, and assuring habitat remains in adequate amounts to sustain these populations.

Susan Setterberg
Vice-President
Vancouver Audubon Society
Following comments were submitted online:

Parcel No: 

Subject: EIS Scoping - Camas

Comments:
Concern = density + # of housing developments. Highly dense subdivisions= drain on schools, parks, open space, recreation, & roads. Athletic fields are far insufficient. CHS can’t be added to again & a vote by staff & students = no 2nd high school. We are becoming a community of subdivision after subdivision & if not for Lacamas & Round Lakes, we would also be very generic & have no unique identity. Populations rise too quickly & as a result, quality of life in Camas suffers.

Submitted by: Madeline Lyne

Email: lyne272@gmail.com

Address: 755 NW View Ridge St 
Camas, Washington
Following comments were submitted online:

Parcel No:

Subject: EIS August Meeting in BG

Comments:
Please consider shrinking the urban growth boundary for the city of Battle Ground. Put the land back in small farm agricultural use. Big box development projects only produce short term construction employment and low wage permanent jobs. Let's raise the standard for construction and increase job site inspections to insure higher quality construction. Waiving fees, permits, and inspections only encourages shoddy work. Thank you. Mark Gawecki

Submitted by:
Mark Gawecki

Email: msgawecki@comcast.net

Address:
Following comments were submitted online:

Parcel No:

Subject: local agriculture

Comments:
We live on 20 acres zoned ag. and would urge protection of agricultural land. The last questionnaire we received which offered the "choice" to develop "clusters" rather than restrict to 20 acre ag. zoning was a farce. Instead send the real question, offering the higher tax bill that comes with the open development season on our agricultural land. When our farm land is paved over and built upon, it's gone. We must have local ag. for food safety, air and water quality and for our grandkids.

Submitted by:
Dawn Doutrich

Email: maju@aracnet.com

Address:
6505 NE 209th st.
battle Ground, Washington
On August 27, our neighbor Leo Moon (11814 NE 177th Circle Battle Ground 98604) showed us a zoning map for the 2016 Battle Ground Comprehensive Growth Management (CGM) Plan. This map showed the 20 acre wetland parcel located directly to the North of my property at 11612 NE 177th Circle Battle Ground, WA (account #119205157 owned by Carolines Enterprises LLC; it lists no property value) re-zoned as "industrial".

Please see the screen shot below which has the property referenced highlighted. As you can see in the map below, the referenced property is virtually surrounded by private residences in multiple subdivisions. There is no road that runs to it from any direction. I need to question the reasoning behind any such re-zoning, if true, this appears to be a classic example of "spot" zoning. There needs to be gradual zoning transition areas between residential and industrial, which if this zoning change is accurate, doesn’t meet this requirement.

There’s also a road proposed between NE 179th Street to the East located in Clark County, and SW 40th Street to the West. We need to question the reasoning behind this proposed road as well. There are approximately 35 affected properties that would be directly impacted by this proposed road. Many of these properties have come into existence since the 2006 CGM Plan. Part of the plan related to this road belongs to Clark County which includes the Meadow Glade area, as well as the Battle Ground Urban Growth area to the South and Battle Ground City property to the North.

I continue to question the logic behind this proposed road in the CGM. There are no properties or populated areas currently located directly to the East of Hwy 503. It appears that a better, more appropriate plan would be to widen the existing roads of NE Cramer Road and Ne 189th Street. There needs to be a buffer, with gradual transitions between any proposed new roads and existing properties. With the proposed design, no buffer or gradual transition exists. The area related to this road proposal has developed in what appears to be a much different manner than was envisioned in the 2006 CGM. It’s all low density residential properties with several high end subdivisions. This road proposal needs to be eliminated from the 2016 Battle Ground, and Clark County CGM Plans.

I look forward to receiving a response to the concerns I raised.
Best Regards;

Brad Fresch
From: Wait, Judith Ann  
To: Cnty 2016 Comp Plan  
Subject: Scoping comments Comp Plan EIS  
Attachments: Clark Co Comp Plan EIS scoping Jude Wait comments 1 sept 2014.pdf

From: Wait, Judith Ann  
Sent: Monday, September 1, 2014 4:44 PM  
To: Euler, Gordon  
Subject: Scoping comments Comp Plan EIS

Gordy,

Happy Labor Day.

Attached are my comments. Thanks for accepting them via email.

Respectfully,

Jde Wait
I am submitting comments per the Scoping process for the SEIS on the Comprehensive Growth Management Plan for Clark County. First, the comment period is way too short given the one working day between the last Open House and the deadline which falls on Labor Day.

While my comments should not be seen as representing the views of anyone but me, they may indeed be agreeable to other residents, food system stakeholders, farmers, and other planning process participants such as a newly formed food system task force. I am a food system researcher focused on the resilience of food farming for regional food security. I have reviewed documents pertinent to Clark County, nearby Counties in Oregon and Washington, and literature (both gray and peer-reviewed) addressing food and farming systems issues across North America and internationally.

While Clark County is understudied, its current policy-makers are notoriously perceived as pro-development in a County with rampant sprawl and a lack of support for farmers. This perception and other forces probably further the degradation of commercially viable agricultural production. I suggest the County strive to use the Comp Plan update and EIS processes to remedy the situation in reality. First, the current condition needs to be reanalyzed using current information, starting with the reports released since 2007, and by conducting additional research and analyses. I have joined a task force that will further these goals, as such a process should not be led by one consultant hired by the County. (Please see also the comments from Food System CARE.) Nor can the County be solely in charge of public engagement. The County should instead focus on doing its job per the intent of the GMA and environmental mandates, including more adequate outreach and timeframes for public input. The County can partner with independent citizen task forces might not be trusted to take the lead.

As a COMPREHENSIVE Growth Management plan, the plan should incorporate and reference other documents and information. Given new information, evaluation of the last seven years, and a more concerted effort to assess agricultural protection, the EIS as well should cover water quality and quantity, fish and wildlife, Legacy Lands (Environmental_Services_Dept, 2014), parks and recreation, ecosystem and resource conservation, watershed management plans, public health, Smart Growth.

The EIS should address cumulative impacts of rapid urbanization given past actions (implemented, leading to direct and consequential impacts) and proposed actions.

The impacts of the last Plan update can now be reanalyzed with hindsight to what has transpired with respect to jobs, land use, economic development, business viability, and other issues. Current data should be obtained, ground-truthed and analyzed. Results could drive the updated plan and environmental analyses.

For Clark County’s comprehensive plan and EIS, the following topics should be added or expanded to help address the food system within the comprehensive plan: “Land Use Element • Agriculture and urban agriculture • Community gardening • Healthy food access Transportation
Element • Healthy food access and distribution Housing Element • Healthy housing Economic Development Element • Local food distribution and sales • Procurement Human Development Element • Community food security • Food assistance programs • Emergency planning • Coordination of joint planning and services Environment Element • Environmental impacts of the food system" (Puget_Sound_ Regional_Council, 2012).

Also, recommendations for policy and action priorities, as well as the kinds of data informing policy and agri-food system strategies (modeled after Fisher & Roberts, 2011) should be considered for implementation in the Comp Plan, a food system element perhaps, and the applicable environmental analyses (jobs, health, economics, food waste and the environment, environmental protection, Parks & Recreation, transportation, public safety, emergency response, etc.). Once a baseline of data is established, policies in place (and those of the past), future actions include monitoring progress over time. Evaluation criteria should address farm preservation and agri-food system resilience. The County should consider indicators found in State and municipal publications (Fisher & Roberts, 2011; Office_of_Farmland_Preservation, 2009).

Furthermore, please fully consider the economic and environmental values of agriculture [http://bo.futurewise.org/p/salsa/web/blog/public/?blog_entry_KEY=2013 as well social infrastructure. Clark County should PLAN to rank high on the County Scorecards applied to Puget Sound Counties (Canty, Martinsons, & Kumar, 2012) and conduct a foodshed study (such as in Hoopenboom, Sloane, & Canty, 2012).

The County should do something to mitigate the admitted impacts such as “The incremental loss of farmland impacts the continued viability of farming, making it more difficult to sustain the role this sector plays within the life of Clark County. It also impacts the other values that are associated with farm land, including open space and scenic values” (Final EIS for the Comprehensive Growth Management Plans of Clark County... 2007). Furthermore, consider more fully the impacts on habitat, ground water recharge, impervious surfaces, watershed changes such as increased flood potential, etc.

What does it mean that “Land proposed for conversion to urban uses consists of agricultural districts (about 4,600 acres), urban reserve (about 3,000 acres), and rural residential (about 4,000 acres). About 3,200 acres would be industrial, commercial, or employment center lands” (FEIS 2007)? Are there agricultural districts? Agriculture should be considered an ‘employment’ center, along with associated businesses and infrastructure.

What has the County done towards “rural land mitigation could include: County designations of a larger portion of the undeveloped rural lands with soils identified by SCS as prime agricultural and forest lands as resource lands, regardless of lot size; Incentives (e.g., transfer or purchase of development rights) and strict development regulations to discourage construction of residences on subdivided resource lands; [and] Adopt “No net loss” policies for rural designations” (FIES 2007, page 72/123)?
Please consider agricultural land preservation and economic development as being on the same side, in contrast to the FEIS language "Balance goals e.g. economic development versus agricultural land preservation" (page 15/123). How can the assessment of agricultural lands have been completed "prior to plan adoption" but not be assessed in the FEIS? Were individual farms asked about their viability?

How was the incremental loss of farmland impacts the continued viability of farming, making it more difficult to sustain the role this sector plays within the life of Clark County. It also impacts the other values that are associated with farm land, including open space and scenic values analyzed, and were the impacts mitigated (FEIS page 40/123)?

Please include urban agriculture in the Parks & Recreation and Open Space network plans. UA provides multiple benefits generally falling within ‘quality of life’ categories.

What kinds of input to Comp Plan do neighborhood associations have? Were they contacted?

How much land is in agricultural production and active farming? How much is left? How much is needed to ensure food security and long term commercial viability?

An agricultural and food production element is warranted, especially given the likelihood of a natural disaster such as earthquake or flood that disrupts the food distribution system. As well, climate change is impacting food production around the world, so the more self-sufficient a region, the more resilient. Diversification and multiple sources can also help build resilience.

Agriculture needs its own element or at least consider and highlight Ag issues in each element. Such as housing development, transportation, etc.

Water supply, quality, and access are key issues in the context of commercially viable agricultural production. As well, adequate supplies of clean water for domestic use, fish and wildlife, should be analyzed in the context of the EIS and Comp Plan. A monitoring plan should be added to the County’s Coordinated Water System Plan (Clark_County_Water_Utility_Coordinating_Committee, 2011) which furthers the goal of compliance with the Non-point Source permit to Clark County from the Dept. of Ecology (Clark_County, 2012).

References (included as integral to Scoping comments).


Mr. Euler,

Comments attached.

Respectfully submitted,

Jude Wait
Food System CARE <info@foodsystemcare.org>
Food System CARE co-convened a task force to pursue immediate and long term food system strategies. Our goal is to facilitate greater support for sustainable food production agriculture and community resilience in Clark County's food system.

Clark County food system stakeholders are endeavoring to retain and increase local food production and sourcing in a region with significant food insecurity and development pressure (Clark_County_Food_System_Council, 2012; Public_Health, 2012). Initiatives to influence the Clark County Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update process motivated us to coalesce and activate now. Indeed the Food System Council has already submitted documents to the County (Clark_County_Food_System_Council, 2013), and we agree with their content and intent, including the handout from the Open House Scoping sessions (hereby additionally included as Scoping comments).

1. Public scoping comments are due on Labor Day 2014—after Scoping “Open House” meetings on August 20, 21, 28, 29 provided the public an opportunity to learn from County Planning staff about the issues and alternatives. The purpose is “to define issues related to the comprehensive plan update that will be addressed in the draft SEIS (Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement). The comment period was way too short between information sessions and due date.

2. We will interact with the Comp Plan Update process as it proceeds. For instance, we will provide input to the official record on the revised Comprehensive Plan and the revised (and/or Supplemental) EIS to be released by the County.

3. Given the changes in the system since 2007, we recommend the old documents be scrutinized for accuracy and applicability. How well were the impacts of the huge GMA expansion predicted? What has transpired since 2007? There is new information in reports produced since then, but they too are outdated now (Berk_Consulting, 2012; Gilroy, 2008; Globalwise_Inc, 2007; Meter, 2008; Moser, 2010). Furthermore, the actual impacts on the agri-food system, such as farm and home foreclosures, land sales, conversions to other uses, etc., should be investigated. What is really going on with Current Use taxation designations?

4. Within the County planning context, we support maintaining and enhancing the “long term commercial significance” of the agricultural sector as directed under the Growth Management Act. However, we suspect the County has fallen tragically short on their intent to meet the mandate. Farmland has been lost across the County, in part through conversion to other land uses, and incorporating viable farmland into the UGA without acknowledging the importance of ongoing urban and urban-interface agriculture. As the nature of agri-food system commerce has changed over recent decades—with an upsurge in local and direct marketing strategies, a greater variety of operational scales and diversified cropping, for examples—we would offer a broad inclusive definition of “commercial” and “significance.”
5. Parcel sizes should be maximized for farming in rural and urban interface areas, along with more support for infrastructure revitalization. Preventing further fragmentation through agricultural districting is but one of many tools we recommend. Whole-system support for farmers would address the numerous barriers farmers have already identified, repeatedly. Solutions recommended by farmers and other stakeholders should be considered for implementation (Ag.Preservation_Committee, 2009; Rural_Lands_Task_Force, 2010), and evaluated as part of the Comp Plan and SEIS. This could mean an additional Alternative or an added set of issues to be presented and evaluated.

6. There is also a vibrant urban agriculture sector provisioning many families through the Food Bank, community gardens, Growing Groceries, Master Gardener mentors, school and church gardens, etc. The growth in this sector should be prominent in the Plan and impact analyses. Support and recognition are due. These are job and skill building sectors as well, along with improving food security and health, and reducing hunger and poverty.

We realize the need for independent food system initiatives as well, and many are underway. We intend to recognize them and fill some of the gaps to achieving greater collective impact and our vision for a more resilient region.

1. Acting as a network facilitation hub, our aim is to interconnect the wide array of food system stakeholders, including the voices underrepresented in public discourse—which is primary to the mission of Food System CARE.

2. We think the County and others should pool resources in order to support
   a. improved, upgraded and updated information on the agri-food sectors—which is needed to inform smarter long term planning
   b. increased public engagement through an independently facilitated process such as Wisdom Councils.

Thanks for your consideration of these comments. We are available to answer questions, provide clarification, and if given more time, streamline the comments.

For the task force,

Jude Wait


Clark_County_Food_System_Council. (2013). Promoting Agricultural Food Production in Clark County.


McCall, Marilee

From: Euler, Gordon
Sent: Tuesday, September 02, 2014 7:59 AM
To: O'Donnell, Mary Beth
Cc: Orjiako, Oliver; McCall, Marilee
Subject: FW: 2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan

Mary Beth:

For the index.

Gordy

From: Lynn Carman [mailto:lynn.carman@comcast.net]
Sent: Monday, September 01, 2014 4:09 PM
To: Euler, Gordon
Cc: Cnty Board of Commissioners General Delivery
Subject: 2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan

Lynn Carman
11104 NW 33 Avenue
Felida, WA 98625
September 1, 2014

card of Clark County Commissioners
1300 Franklin Street
Vancouver, WA 98665-5000

Honorable Clark County Commissioners:


I will request that my comments be included in any current or developed ‘Administrative Record’ assigned or established for this project.

It is time that Clark County move away from the ‘Status Quo’ option and take a serious look at the density that has been deemed upon Clark County with the first go around of GMA in the 90s. I can speak on the Felida area issues and the total destruction of the density deemed upon this area. All one needs to do is go back to the West Felida Plan area and see what a mess that area is in. The county deemed this area in the 1970s to no development when the first development came up off McCann Roadway. Then again DOE told the County that the density was an issue of concern but yet the County did nothing. The roadways are failing faster than anything with the density we see out there and with the development on the South end with Erickson’s projects we are going to see this end fallow suit like McCann Roadway. The folks in Felida are doomed! The county needs to stop relying on main arterials and put in a grid system so that folks can safely get out of an area if there is a disaster. But again what can one say.

Clark County hasn’t abided by what is in the best interest of its citizens for over 70 years not with the neglect and use of band-aids instead of serious planning. So if we see this in the Felida area, what is it doing all over Clark County??? Development has ruled for all these years for what, to make us a bedroom community to Portland? You talk about adding jobs, but close that barn door. With jobs and more citizens, you have neglected the emergency services end of keeping the area residents safe. What does your oath read?? Again there are folks that have been screaming since the first go around of GMA.....you add more citizens, you need to make sure you add more emergency service folks to keep up with the demands. I was shocked to find out you only have 3 sheriff deputies for the night shift......what message are you sending to the citizens?? Crime pays well here!

Then there is the issue of water quality, which is a joke. When you allow a development to move forward, it is engineered a certain way. The hearing examiner rules roof drains must go into dry wells and it’s a joke when the homeowner then put in French drains without a permit process to make the bio pond over flow. Whom down there is taking stormwater seriously??? Then the County comes along with their own project and dumps
stormwater into a privately own experimental stormwater system......this is totally against the law. Why isn't the County putting in a bio pond for this project, you make developers jump through hoops but the County violates the clean water act?

'totally believe in karma and I hate to say this, I told you so in the first go around of GMA. It's failing the citizens of Clark County and it's become a ... Clark County isn't planning for future generations. Sim City is failing us all. Start taking a proactive stance on growth and stop the density that we all see now before it's gets worse.

Sincerely,
Lynn Carman
Following comments were submitted online:

Parcel No:

Subject: Amboy Rural Center Zoning

Comments:
Has been a number of years...hat ever happened to the rezoning of rural center Amboy to one acre parcels? Has been kicked around for 20 years to make the land more useful.

Submitted by:
Ken Maylone

Email: kdmaylone@aol.com

Address:
Hello,

Attached please find written comments submitted by Carol Levanen during the Board's Hearing of Aug. 26 (public comment time).

Thank you,
Rebecca
Clark County Board of Commissioners  
August 26, 2014  
P.O. Box 5000  
Vancouver, Washington

Clark County Citizens United, Inc. often receives calls from landowners who are processing a land division and tries to help allow the process to go smoother. Previously, lands five acres or larger were legally created by a segregation process. A surveyor created a legal description, which was filed with the auditor's office. When and if the land was sold, the new owner's responsibility was to apply for a building permit, provide a water source, and construct a driveway. Now, the short plat process has a whole new very expensive meaning. But, proportionality must legally apply to such a process.

A pre-application conference, short plat application, post decision review and the final plat permit must now occur, with each one requiring a fee. The landowner must hire someone to go through those processes, which is expensive. Under these applications, one must provide potable water, build roads, and go through many expensive procedures, that can amount to eighty items. Here is an example of the overreaching requirements.

A man died from cancer and the widow decided to sell her home to her children and build another home on the land. The land was approximately 20 acres and was in a five acre zone. The woman saw she could divide the land into three parcels, one for the existing home and children, one for her new home and one to help pay the expenses and decided to begin a short plat process. After many years, the process is still not finished and the county keeps putting up road blocks. One condition was that she deed a very large thirty foot easement, down one side of her property to Clark County. This requirement is illegal, under state law, unless the county pays for it. A partial list of requirements is included in this report, but there may be some that have not been mentioned. These are the expenses she has incurred so far, all in the name of regulation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County permit fees</th>
<th>$16,215.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geotech study</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three wells drilled</td>
<td>$26,241.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electric</td>
<td>$2,053.00 after pro-bono help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPU</td>
<td>$215.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driveway construct</td>
<td>$14,830 after pro-bono help</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consulting firm - $28,318.00  
Engineering - $6,262.00  
Signs - $44.44  
Septic - $89.00  
Attorney - $3,988.75  
Survey $14,351.00

The total to date is $113,607.00 and the short plat is not complete yet. The children are waiting to purchase the home and the woman pays to live in an apartment. Development requirements and associated costs are close to equaling what she would receive from the sale of the third parcel. She has lost all of the value of that lot, which will not generate any financial aid to her. There is something wrong with this picture. The short plat ordinance needs to be fixed. Only safety, survey and legal documents should be included in the process of simply dividing acreage, for whatever purpose, be it agriculture use, forest use or housing, with the building permit addressing the development process.

Sincerely,

Carol Levanen, Ex. Secretary, Clark County Citizens United, Inc.
From: Mike Bomar [mailto:MBomar@credc.org]  
Sent: Thursday, August 21, 2014 3:14 PM  
To: Niten, Jeff  
Cc: Swanson, Jeff  
Subject: CREDC Comments on Clark County Economic Development Policies

Jeff,

Thank you for the opportunity to submit comments. I have also attached our Board approved Lands for Jobs Committee recommendations for your reference. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Best,

Mike Bomar  
President  
360.397.1060 (O), 360.894.5100  
mbomar@credc.org  
505 Broadway, Ste 417 Vancouver, WA 98660 credc.org

CREDC
Wednesday, August 20, 2014

Clark County
Attn: Jeff Niten
PO Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98668-1995

Mr. Niten:

Thank you for allowing us the opportunity to provide comments on the proposed Economic Development Policies for the 2016 Comprehensive Plan Update. The Columbia River Economic Development Council (CREDC) is a public private partnership focused on accelerating business growth and innovation in Clark County. The CREDC is the lead organization responsible for implementing the 2011 Clark County Economic Development Plan that was adopted by Clark County and local municipalities.

In response to your request for feedback, the draft policy document was sent to our Lands for Job Committee with an opportunity for the group to provide individual feedback on the policy to be considered for this letter. The committee is made up of both public and private CREDC partners including representatives from land use consulting firms, contractors, local ports, Clark County, and the City of Vancouver.

Our feedback and recommendations are as follows in no particular order:

1. **Background and Context**
   a. We recommend updating Clark County’s unemployment rate to the most current figure available at the time of implementation.
   b. We recommend incorporating the **2011 Clark County Economic Development Plan** as a guiding document for these policies.
   c. The policies should frame Clark County’s position in the Greater Portland Metropolitan Statistical Area, highlighting both the advantages of the region along with the competitive factors.

2. **The County’s Role**
   a. The CREDC supports the desire to partner with various organizations engaged in economic development:

   “The County has significant indirect effects on economic development. This is primarily through partnerships such as with the Columbia River Economic Development Council (CREDC), Southwest Washington Workforce Development Council (SWWDC), Vancouver USA Regional Tourism Office, chambers of commerce, ports and other jurisdictional relationships. Through cultivation of these relationships and extensive, ongoing public engagement, Clark County will develop and maintain an economic development vision and pursue it with strategy, discipline, and intentionality.”
d. We also support policies that provide for long term preservation of key industrials sites using tools such as a rural industrial land bank.

e. Policies 2.5 and 5.1 can be revised to better stress the importance of workforce development and education. Key leaders in the K-20 system should be engaged to provide feedback on their needs as it relates to creating better connections between educational institutions and private industry.

f. Land supply policies should reflect the need for a certain character/type/size/location desired by target industries, not just an aggregate acreage target. Policies 3.1 and 4.1 can be revised to better address a more strategic and targeted approach to ensuring that land is available to accommodate the various types of target sector employers identified in the economic development plan.

g. E.D. 4.3 / 4.4 – We recommend moving design guidelines and community appearance to a different policy section as it is more of an indirect benefit than a tool for economic development.

6. Technical Appendix –

a. The jobs numbers listed are not current. We would recommend contacting referencing total jobs by target sector (from the 2011 Economic Development Plan) rather than listing employment for individual companies.

b. If the intent of this section is to highlight the County’s high employment sectors, there appears to be some missing key sectors, most notably, construction and development. The County should consider largest employers vs. target industries depending on the purpose of including the data.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Mike Bomar, CREDC President

Attachments: 2012 Land for Jobs Committee Recommended Policies
Eric Fuller
Eric Fuller Inc., President, CREDC Board Chair

Lisa Nisenfeld
CREDC, President

Helen Devery
BergerABAM, Vice President, CREDC Executive Board Member
Lands for Jobs Committee

Helen Devery (Chair), BergerABAM
Sierk Braam, Norris, Beggs & Simpson
Carol Curtis, Commissioner, Clark Public Utilities
Bob Durgan, Andersen Construction
Mark Felchtinger, Stoel Rives LLP
Eric Fuller, Eric Fuller & Associates
Brent Grening, Port of Ridgefield
Bryan Halbert, Schlecht Construction
Garret Harper, Norris, Beggs, & Simpson
Steve Hill, Miller Nash
Steve Horenstein, Miller Nash
Alan Hughes, Maui Foster & Alongi
Todd Johnson, Group Mackenzie
Mark Lampton, Port of Camas-Washougal
Tim McMahan, Stoel Rives LLP

Steve Morasch, Schwabe, Williamson & Wyatt
Scott Nyseth, Miyamoto International
Jerry Olson, Olson Engineering
Dennis Pavlina, The Gold Medal Group
Alisa Pyszka, City of Vancouver
Kelly Sills, Clark County

Technical Advisory Group (TAG)
Brent Grening, (Chair), Port of Ridgefield
Helen Devery, BergerABAM
Todd Johnson, Group Mackenzie
Mike Mabrey, Clark County
Jerry Olson, Olson Engineering
Curtis Shuck, Port of Vancouver
Alisa Pyszka, City of Vancouver
Committee Goals and Process

Committee Goal & Goal # 5 Clark County Economic Development Plan:
- Determine how Clark County can meet its current and future employment lands needs and how the CREDC should be involved in ensuring that sufficient developable land is available for new job creation within the community.

Process:
- Inventory available lands, opportunities, and constraints.
- Use inventory to develop recommendations for the CREDC to implement.
- TAG developed inventory and draft recommendations.
- Lands for Jobs Committee, public jurisdictions, and CREDC to review recommendations.
Lands for Jobs Inventory

- Base information from Clark County's June 2010 Vacant Buildable Lands Model (VBLM) and GIS data
- VBLM – Clark County planning tool developed to analyze residential, commercial, and industrial lands
- Port properties are not included in VBLM
- Committee contacted ports and included vacant land details
- Using VBLM, County split into eight subareas
- Initial screen - properties with minimum of 20 acres (size determined to be regionally significant in terms of generating employment)
- Within the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB)
- Zoned appropriately
- Unconstrained
- Contiguous (not necessarily under single ownership)
Draft Results

- 70 potentially developable sites - 20 acres or larger
- Using GIS data and TAG members' knowledge - 70 sites screened for development readiness
- Scoring criteria applied
  - common ownership
  - size
  - constrained environmentally
  - water
  - sewer
  - arterial access
- 3 levels of development readiness
  - 0-18 months
  - 18-36 months
  - + 36 months
Key Issues

- Limited shovel ready land
  - 13 sites
  - 576 acres
  - development ready 0-18 months
  - constraints - infrastructure, ownership
- Need to increase shovel ready land
- CREDC focus on lands for jobs
1. Lands for Jobs Committee

The CREDC needs to work to ensure that there is sufficient readily developable land available for job creation in Clark County by:
1. Lands for Jobs Committee, continued

- Making the Lands for Jobs Committee a standing CREDC committee.
- Developing a work plan to address Committee recommendations to track and respond to land, zoning, and UGB changes.
- Developing conceptual layouts for the 13 most readily developable sites which could be provided to site selectors.
- Tracking new market credits to determine whether these could be applied to industrial land.
- Assigning a CREDC staff member to the Committee as a resource. Responsibilities for the CREDC staff member should be defined and should include keeping up to date on changing regulatory and policy issues related to lands for jobs and providing updates and suggested direction to the Committee.
- Including a report on lands for jobs in the CREDC annual report.

Draft Recommendations
2. Zoning/Permitting/Urban Growth Boundary

In the short term, zoning, permitting, and regulatory changes have positive and negative effects on the development readiness of land within Clark County. In the longer term, the UGB will define which areas provide potential opportunities for new lands for jobs. The CREDC should be influential in working with the community as coherent choices are made about the supply and availability of lands for jobs and the investment strategy needed to ensure their availability and readiness. This will be particularly important during future Urban Growth Area revisions. A local example of positive policy change is the fast track permitting program that was recently developed for projects of state-wide significance in Oregon. The CREDC needs to fully engage in land use policy, zoning, permitting, and UGB issues by:

Draft Recommendations
2. Zoning/Permitting/Urban Growth Boundary, continued

- Working with jurisdictions to ensure that zoning codes provide flexibility, particularly within industrial and mixed-use districts to preserve their use for lands for jobs.
- Working with jurisdictions as zoning codes are updated to ensure that lands for jobs are protected.
- Working with state and local agencies to determine opportunities for expeditious and pre-permitting of properties.
- Working with jurisdictions to simplify and expedite permit processing timelines.
- Implementing a standing subcommittee to track and advocate zoning/code revisions that could affect lands for jobs.
- Working with Clark County as future decisions on the UGB are made. When the Growth Management Act process is revisited, the CREDC should be at the table to advocate for lands for jobs.
- Working with Clark County to bring current urban holding lands into the UGB.
3. Infrastructure

The Lands for Jobs Committee noted that to encourage new job growth, we need to lead with infrastructure which is often constrained by our pay-as-you-go policy. For example, of the 13 readily developable sites within the inventory, 5 are in Ridgefield which is constrained by regional sewer capacity in north Clark County. The CREDC should be involved in developing creative and cost-effective solutions by:
3. Infrastructure, continued

- **Advocating for infrastructure investment** including new roads, rail, bridges, and utilities within the county.
- Working with public agencies to advocate and obtain **funding for key infrastructure projects** within the community, particularly for properties which could become shovel-ready and add to the available lands for jobs as a result.
- **Advocating for creative solutions to infrastructure needs.** (A good example is the non-gravity sewer system solution that made available lands for jobs in the City of Camas during the 1990s.)
- **Advocating for a solution to the regional sewer discussions** on-going in Ridgefield. A solution that is cost efficient and can be implemented within the short term is required.
4. Lands for Jobs Inventory

The Lands for Jobs inventory is a useful tool which took significant staff and volunteer time to prepare and review. The CREDC now has a good source for information about land within Clark County. Since land is bought and sold and infrastructure opportunities and constraints change constantly, the inventory should be seen as a living document and should be kept up to date by:
4. Lands for Jobs Inventory, continued

- Assigning a CREDC staff member to ensure that the inventory is updated regularly.
- Encouraging ongoing input about buildings into the inventory.
- Developing a useable and efficient tool to track project demand by property, size, and type.
5. Industrial Land

Of the 70 sites larger than 20 acres in the inventory, only 13 are potentially ready for development and only 7 of these are zoned for industrial use. The Plan notes that sites, including Centennial Industrial Park (Vancouver), 199th Street Industrial Area (Battle Ground), Ridgefield Industrial Park and Discovery Pointe (Ridgefield), and Camas Meadows (Camas), could be available for development in the short term. The Lands for Jobs Committee has concluded that there is a critical need to ensure an adequate supply of industrial land and the CREDC should be an advocate for this by:

Draft Recommendations
5. Industrial Land, continued

- Increasing the inventory of industrial land in the county.
- Ensuring that industrial lands within the 18-month timeframe remain ready for development and those within the 18-36 month timeframe can be made shovel-ready.
- Advocating for the preservation of industrial zoning/comprehensive plan designations.
- Encouraging retention of larger parcel sizes which are essential to this sector.
- Supporting Clark County ports which are critical in ensuring an adequate supply of industrial land.
- Advocating that Clark County ports work together to land bank industrial land for the future, within and outside existing port boundaries.
- Supporting Clark County ports in buying and aggregating land, developing infrastructure, and selling/leasing industrial land in the county.
- Supporting Clark County ports in obtaining financing to purchase and develop heavy industrial lands.
- Working with the City of Vancouver and Clark County to determine whether there are existing light industrially zoned properties that could be used for heavy industry.
6. Commercial Office/Business Park

The Lands for Jobs Committee concluded that the retail sector is well represented in the community. However, the CREDC should be forward-thinking and recognize that future job growth in Clark County is likely to result from new office and business parks in sectors such as software development, healthcare, and professional services. The inventory indicates that only 3 sites larger than 20 acres and zoned for business park use are potentially ready for development within 18 months. For commercial office/business parks, the CREDC should be:

Draft Recommendations
6. Commercial Office/Business Park, continued

- Increasing the inventory of shovel-ready lands for employment office/business parks in the county.
- Supporting Vancouver, Ridgefield, and Camas/Washougal as appropriate land for waterfront mixed-use development is purchased, planned, and developed.
- Ensuring that commercial office business park lands within the 18-month timeframe remain ready for development and those within the 18–36 month timeframe can be made shovel-ready.
- Refocusing on ensuring that land in the Discovery Corridor is developable for new office and business park uses.
- Working with educational institutions to find land for business parks, readily accessible to WSU Vancouver to leverage research and development opportunities.

Draft Recommendations
Next Steps

- **October – November 2011** – Lands for Jobs Committee review of inventory and recommendations
- **November – December 2011** – CREDC Executive Committee and Board to review and approve
- **October – December 2011** – CREDC review land inventory with each public jurisdiction and ports
- **January 2012** – Roll out to community
Dear Commissioners,

Resolution 2014-06-17 discusses in Table 2 the population and employment allocation, on page 2 of 4. It discusses the various cities population allocations and then describes the county population allocation of 12,556. This is in direct conflict of the Growth Management Act, which directs counties to use the population allocation numbers for urban growth, not rural growth. This was confirmed by the Washington State Superior Court and the Court of Appeals.

The Resolution also discusses the Rural Lands and states that the county must "minimize conversion of productive farmland". Rural land stands alone as a separate zone and landuse, not subject to population projections and independent of a resource zone. Neither is subject to population allocations, according to the laws governing the GMA. Productive farmland, under the GMA, is in a resource zone, not a rural zone. Clark County must not combine these categories, as they are most certainly separated in the GMA.

Sincerely,

Carol Levanen, Ex. Secretary
Clark County Citizens United, Inc.
P.O. Box 2188
Battle Ground, Washington 98604
Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: David Shroyer

Address: 17712 NW 41st Ave

Open house location: Ridgefield 08/27/2014

Comment:

I would like to see a network of walking/biking trails developed around the county. Tying into parks would be especially nice. Rural roads are not conducive to walking or riding because they lack shoulders and cars travel too fast and too close.

My family and I cannot go anywhere comfortably from our house without using a car. I would like to commute by bike to Battle Ground and let my children ride to school.

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: ________________________________

Other ways to comment:

• Submit a comment on the web:
  www.clarkwa.gov/planning/2016update/comments

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

Comments are due September 1, 2014.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the EIS scoping.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that the SEIS contains issues of importance to our community.
Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: 

Address: PO Box 339, Ridgefield, WA 98642

Open house location: Ridgefield

Comment: See attached

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address:

Other ways to comment:

- Submit a comment on the web: www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments
- Submit a comment in writing: Comprehensive Plan EIS Scoping Community Planning P.O. Box 9810 Vancouver, WA 98666

Comments are due September 1, 2014.

Thank you for taking the time to participate in the EIS scoping.

We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that the SEIS contains issues of importance to our community.
Scoping: Please consider the following in the EIS for the 2016 GMP.

Water, Adequate and Clean for the long-term: Is storm water controlled, cleaned and stored in “recharge areas” that return water to aquifers? Is emphasis on keeping natural wetlands rather than engineered ones?

Limiting factors:
Does the plan have a way of stopping/delaying development if:
There is no water on the land?
There is not sustainable water on the land?
Water use by the whole county is not sustainable?

A “smart growth view” of infrastructure delivered for least cost to taxpayers: An overview of the spider web of Clark County infrastructure for the future. Do alternatives foster an efficient web of larger pipes, wires, cables and roads between dense cities? Is the much smaller infrastructure within the green areas minimal (efficiently organized)?

Road functionality. Do they plan for upgrades with congestion? When congestion on the arterials reaches failure, then traffic avoids those intersections and comes through the collectors. When collectors fail, then traffic comes through the neighborhoods endangering children, pets and increasing stress from noise and need for vigilance.

Do they foster development of infrastructure to attract family wage jobs? A job in Clark County can mean someone does not have to go over any bridge.

Codes fostering working agriculture and forestry: Do they plan to reserve the best lands for the above? Consider the burgeoning markets for safe and digestible food (heritage and NGO). Our scattered farmlands are less endangered by genetically altered pollen than many others. Prices on safe food will increase with time relative to mass-market food. Farming is and may increase as a significant addition to family income.

Habitat, both wetland and upland. Do they foster places for wildlife and native plants, in general as well as for endangered species? Houses and businesses near green spaces are worth more than those without. Human health, both mental and physical, is better when there is access to natural areas. Do they leave large “unbuilt” places (native plant and animal places) at full “buildout”?
**Parks and Trails.** Do they foster development of neighborhood parks within ½ mile of all homes? Parks help children understand natural laws and expend energy. Are the parks and greenspaces linked by trails and/or bike lanes?

**Transportation diversity: private and public.** Does it plan for autos, active transport (bike lanes, sidewalks and paths for walking) and various forms of public transport?

**Density in cities.** Multi-unit housing for young and old. Does it prepare for the eminent "baby boomer" wave?

**Mixed use zones.** Does it plan for senior housing complexes near hospitals, stores and transportation?

**Energy:** Do they rewards energy efficiency and off grid energy production?
Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Amy Blankenship
Address: 19100 A NE Somme Lane, WA 98686
Open house location: Ridgefield

Comment: Our family is currently in the UGB area with an 20 acre overlay. We are zoned for multi-family and are very happy about that. Yet the overlay holds us back from removing any acreage that held us back from potential value of worth. The overlay needs to be removed and placed elsewhere. Our family has been holding out for 17 years.

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address:

Other ways to comment:
- Submit a comment on the web:
  www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments
- Submit a comment in writing:
  Comprehensive Plan EIS Scoping
  Community Planning
  P.O. Box 9810
  Vancouver, WA 98666

Comments are due September 1, 2014.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the EIS scoping.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that the SEIS contains issues of importance to our community.
Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Barbara Wright
Address: 2901 S Cornett Dr. Ridgefield WA 98642
Open house location: Ridgefield

Comment:

- Please coordinate a parks and trail system countywide.
- Preserve green space with urban development
- Thank you for trying to plan for future development.

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: __________________________________________

Other ways to comment:

- Submit a comment on the web:
  www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments
- Submit a comment in writing:
  Comprehensive Plan EIS Scoping
  Community Planning
  P.O. Box 9810
  Vancouver, WA 98666

Comments are due September 1, 2014.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the EIS scoping.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that the SEIS contains issues of importance to our community.
EIS SCOPING INPUT FORM
August 2014

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Mike Bomar
Address: 2341 S Wind River Way, Ridgefield 98642
Open house location: Ridgefield

Comment:

[Redacted]

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address:

Other ways to comment:
- Submit a comment on the web: www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments
- Submit a comment in writing:
  Comprehensive Plan EIS Scoping
  Community Planning
  P.O. Box 9810
  Vancouver, WA 98666

Comments are due September 1, 2014.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the EIS scoping.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that the SEIS contains issues of importance to our community.
EIS SCOPING INPUT FORM
August 2014

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Susan Russman
Address: 3031 NE Clancy Rd, La Center
Open house location: Ridgefield

Comment:
- Resource + rural lands have been neglected in past updates.
- Need to revisit rural + resource lands
- No metadata attached to county's land use plan maps.
- No definition of "prime ag" and "prime forest" soil. How does the county define these?
- No soils maps attached to landuse maps. Metadata "created by planning staff" brief project. "Answer data" is not sufficient.

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: sprazz@4ds.net

Other ways to comment:
• Submit a comment on the web:
  www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments
• Submit a comment in writing:
  Comprehensive Plan EIS Scoping
  Community Planning
  P.O. Box 9810
  Vancouver, WA 98666

Comments are due September 1, 2014.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the EIS scoping.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that the SEIS contains issues of importance to our community.
EIS SCOPING INPUT FORM
August 2014

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Susan Ramussen
Address: 
Open house location: Ridgefield

Comment:
- Need more public miles out in the rural resource lands
- Hatch
- La Center
- UN
- Downtown
- Dollar Corner

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your name below:

E-mail address: 

Other ways to comment:
• Submit a comment on the web:
  www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments
• Submit a comment in writing:
  Comprehensive Plan EIS Scoping
  Community Planning
  P.O. Box 9810
  Vancouver, WA 98666

Comments are due September 1, 2014.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the EIS scoping.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that the SEIS contains ...
Search by layer name, keywords or display layers grouped alphabetically.

Layer Name: [Landuse]
Layer Keyword(s): [Landuse]
Attribute Keyword(s): [GMA Landuse]

Description:
Landuse polygons created for 1994 GMA Depicts land uses within Clark County as determined by the Planning Department. It is a combination of the Assessor's Landuse (Primary Property Type) and the mapping departments Photo Interpretation.

History:
Assessor's PT1 code was aggregated into approximately 25 land use categories. Parcels > 1 acre were classified using photo-interpretation, Vancouver and Clark County Planning also used limited field surveys to update the database.

Other Links:
Data Type: ShapeFiles
Derived From: Landuse - Arc/Info Coverages
Intended Use: Growth Management and Land Use Planning The Photo Interpretation coverage is from 1:24000 Aerial Photos, this is makes the product unsuitable for display with the parcels coverage.

Intended Scale: 24,000
Metadata Restrictions: None
Data Restrictions: Not Maintained
Keywords:
Landuse gma growth management

http://gis.clark.wa.gov/gishome/Metadata/?pid=metadata.layer&dbsID=328
EIS SCOPING INPUT FORM
August 2014

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Jeff V. Scott

Address: 55 S 11th St Ridgefield 98642

Open house location: Ridgefield

Comment:
I think it is my sincere hope that all parties are included and listened to when adopting a future plan. I prefer Option 3 - Cities, as I believe it is best for our country. I feel it's important to include trails, parks, farms in the conversation.

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: jeffvscott@comcast.net

Other ways to comment:
• Submit a comment on the web:
  www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments
• Submit a comment in writing:
  Comprehensive Plan EIS Scoping
  Community Planning
  P.O. Box 9810
  Vancouver, WA 98666

Comments are due September 1, 2014.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the EIS scoping.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that the SEIS contains issues of importance to our community.
EIS SCOPING INPUT FORM
August 2014

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: CAROL L EVAN - Clark County
Address: P.O. Box 2188
City in white

Open house location: Ridgefield

Comment:

1) Rural land zoning and designations need to be revised in the 2016 update

2) Resource land zoning and designations need to be revised in the 2016 update

3) Existing rural parcels need to be recognized and zoned according

4) Resource maps need correction

5) Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: 

Other ways to comment:
• Submit a comment on the web:
  www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments
• Submit a comment in writing:
  Comprehensive Plan EIS Scoping
  Community Planning
  P.O. Box 9810
  Vancouver, WA 98666

Comments are due September 1, 2014.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the EIS scoping.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that the SEIS contains issues of importance to our community.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRINT NAME</th>
<th>MAILING ADDRESS</th>
<th>ZIP CODE</th>
<th>e-mail list?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Sarvis</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jsarvis@ci.laconner.wa.us">jsarvis@ci.laconner.wa.us</a></td>
<td>98629</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Blankenship</td>
<td>19100 NE 50th Ave</td>
<td>98086</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naomi Hansen</td>
<td>414 E Cedar Ave, Suite A201</td>
<td>98629</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Stunt</td>
<td>200 Pilot Knob Rd Ridgefield</td>
<td>98642</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Setterberg</td>
<td>2201 S. Sauk Way Ridgefield</td>
<td>98642</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danielle Smith</td>
<td>3909 NW 289th St Ridgefield</td>
<td>98642</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Bomar</td>
<td>2045 5th River Way Ridgefield</td>
<td>98692</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Allen</td>
<td>P. O. Box 61552, Vancouver WA 98666</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathan McCann</td>
<td>2306 N 4th Way, Ridgefield, WA 98672</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly Punteney</td>
<td>9215 SE Evergreen       Hartford, WA 98664</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRINT NAME</td>
<td>MAILING ADDRESS</td>
<td>ZIP CODE</td>
<td>PRINT - E-MAIL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Anderson</td>
<td>105 105th Ave S</td>
<td>98685</td>
<td><a href="mailto:barbara.anderson@sw.com">barbara.anderson@sw.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff V. Gut</td>
<td>55 S 11th St</td>
<td>98642</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jv.gut@gmail.com">jv.gut@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Rose</td>
<td>4512 NW 179th St</td>
<td>98642</td>
<td><a href="mailto:JohnRose@cs.com">JohnRose@cs.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhiannon Morgan</td>
<td>PO Box 428</td>
<td>98642</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rmorgan@hotmail.com">rmorgan@hotmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juanita Wertz</td>
<td>PO Box 1676, Ridgefield WA 98642</td>
<td>98642</td>
<td><a href="mailto:juanita.wertz@gmail.com">juanita.wertz@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darren Wertz</td>
<td>PO Box 1676, Ridgefield WA 98642</td>
<td>98642</td>
<td><a href="mailto:d.wertz@gmail.com">d.wertz@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Richard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy Garrison</td>
<td>1186 S 30th Place</td>
<td>98642</td>
<td><a href="mailto:galroy@netscreek.com">galroy@netscreek.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Nancy Koch

Address: PO Box 287 Brush Prairie 98606

Open house location: Battle Ground

Comment: The Ag land needs to go to A-10 or 5 over Aq-20 as large farms can no longer get the inputs necessary for their continuing use as a farm. Most of us are becoming older so the young farmers can usually have time & money for a smaller farm instead.

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: 

Other ways to comment:

- Submit a comment on the web: www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments
- Submit a comment in writing: Comprehensive Plan EIS Scoping
  Community Planning
  P.O. Box 9810
  Vancouver, WA 98666

Comments are due September 1, 2014.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the EIS scoping.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that the SEIS contains issues of importance to our community.
EIS SCOPING INPUT FORM
August 2014

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Don Hardy
Address: 1111 Main St, Suite 300, Vancouver, WA 98660
Open house location: Battle Ground

Comment:
Please include an analysis of full 20-year buildout of the Fairgrounds and Salmon Creek Subareas and future zoning and zoning-text amendments in the SEIS.

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: don.hardy@abam.com

Other ways to comment:
- Submit a comment on the web: www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments
- Submit a comment in writing:
  Comprehensive Plan EIS Scoping
  Community Planning
  P.O. Box 9810
  Vancouver, WA 98666

Comments are due September 1, 2014.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the EIS scoping.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that the SEIS contains issues of importance to our community.
EIS SCOPING INPUT FORM
August 2014

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: MARK GAWIECKI

Address: 17706 NE HOMESTEAD DRIVE, Gresham, OR 97080

Open house location: BATTLE GROUND

Comment:

SINCE THE POPULATION GROWTH DID NOT MEET EXPECTATIONS, WHY NOT ADJUST THE URBAN GROWTH boundary AND PUT MORE LAND INTO AGRICULTURAL USE.

PLEASE CONSIDER THE QUALITY OF LIFE WHEN MAKING DECISIONS TO CREATE JOBS. BUILDING MORE SHOPPING CENTERS MAY CREATE SOME TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION JOBS AND LOW PAYING, PERMANENT JOBS BUT COVERING THE COUNTY WITH ASPHALT DOESN'T DO ANYTHING FOR THOSE WHO LIVE HERE.

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: msgawiekl@comcast.net

Other ways to comment:
• Submit a comment on the web:
  www.clark.wo.gov/planning/2016update/comments
• Submit a comment in writing:
  Comprehensive Plan EIS Scoping
  Community Planning
  P.O. Box 9810
  Vancouver, WA 98666

Comments are due September 1, 2014.
Thank you for taking the time to participate in the EIS scoping.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that the SEIS contains issues of importance to our community.
EIS SCOPING INPUT FORM
August 2014

Please fill out this sheet in ink and drop it in the comment box. PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.

Name: Gary Lawhead

Address: 21414 NW 67th Ave Ridgefield, WA 98642

Open house location: RG

Comment:

Strongly support reduction in AG minimum from 20 to 10

Would you like to be added to our notification list? If so, please print your E-mail address clearly below:

E-mail address: _________________________________

Other ways to comment:

- Submit a comment on the web:
  www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments
- Submit a comment in writing:
  Comprehensive Plan EIS Scoping
  Community Planning
  P.O. Box 9810
  Vancouver, WA 98666

Comments are due September 1, 2014.

Thank you for taking the time to participate in the EIS scoping.
We appreciate your input and will use it to ensure that the SEIS contains issues of importance to our community.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRINT NAME</th>
<th>MAILING ADDRESS</th>
<th>PRINT - E-MAIL</th>
<th>e-mail list?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marvis Case</td>
<td>13700 NE 319th St.</td>
<td>98604 MarvisCase @ msn.com</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy Kennon</td>
<td>P.O. Box 247 Neissan</td>
<td>98622 bjKennon @ msn.com</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herb Kennon</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot; &quot;</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot; &quot;</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo Moon</td>
<td>11814 NE 177th Cir</td>
<td>98604 LMOON 533@ Q.COM</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Lawhead</td>
<td>2141 NE 82nd Ave.</td>
<td>9862  CgLawhead @ msn.com</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Ryan</td>
<td>1146 NE 177th Cir</td>
<td>98604 DRYANDERS510 @ GMAIL.COM</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Kochi</td>
<td>PO Box 287 B.P.</td>
<td>98606</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kris Richardson</td>
<td>4004 48th NE 125th Cir</td>
<td>98606 KrisRichardson @ msn.com</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicki Caldwell-Kraft</td>
<td>2204 NE 184th St. (Salmon Creek Apartments)</td>
<td>98606 VickiCaldwellKraft @ GMAIL.COM</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Wowz</td>
<td>22300 NE 216th Cir</td>
<td>98604</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Val Hammelley</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>98604</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRINT NAME</td>
<td>MAILING ADDRESS</td>
<td>ZIP CODE</td>
<td>PRINT - E-MAIL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Boxer</td>
<td>22508 NE 24th Circe, WA</td>
<td>98604</td>
<td>j Stevensboxer. Box 50 @ Outlook.com</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Gawewski</td>
<td>17703 NE Homestead Bush Prairie, WA</td>
<td>98606</td>
<td>mgawecki.com</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joy Russell</td>
<td>501 NW 11th St. BG, WA</td>
<td>98604</td>
<td><a href="mailto:joy@bgfour.com">joy@bgfour.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred Pickering</td>
<td>21596 NE Lelia Fel, Yacolt</td>
<td>98675</td>
<td><a href="mailto:fredp@yacolt.com">fredp@yacolt.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben McGough</td>
<td>5709 Buena Vista Vancouver WA</td>
<td>98661</td>
<td>Buyibo 75021 @ Ador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray Steiger</td>
<td>16101 NE 183rd St EP 98606</td>
<td>98606</td>
<td><a href="mailto:steiger@teleport.com">steiger@teleport.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth Quim</td>
<td>POBOX 2188 98604 <a href="mailto:CECUJSO@YAHOO.COM">CECUJSO@YAHOO.COM</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRINT NAME</td>
<td>MAILING ADDRESS</td>
<td>ZIP CODE</td>
<td>PRINT - E-MAIL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah Frisch</td>
<td>11612 NE 177th Circle</td>
<td>98604</td>
<td><a href="mailto:debora_d_frisch@yahoo.com">debora_d_frisch@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brad Frisch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:brad_frisch@msn.com">brad_frisch@msn.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Hardy</td>
<td>1111 Main St, Suite 300</td>
<td>98660</td>
<td><a href="mailto:don_hardy@ubam.com">don_hardy@ubam.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon Lewis</td>
<td>300 W 15th St #201</td>
<td>98660</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gordonl@cbcwildowww.com">gordonl@cbcwildowww.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Case</td>
<td>13700 NE 3195 E</td>
<td>98604</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Frisch</td>
<td>On Record</td>
<td>98642</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric M.</td>
<td>25410 NE 297th St</td>
<td>98604</td>
<td><a href="mailto:eric@highward.com">eric@highward.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry Keeney</td>
<td>8515 NE 217th St</td>
<td>98604</td>
<td><a href="mailto:terry@sun4ialtime.com">terry@sun4ialtime.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL Rasmussen</td>
<td></td>
<td>98604</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
July 10, 2014

Clark Board of County Commissioners
P.O. Box 9810
1300 Franklin Street
Vancouver, WA 98660-9810
Sent via email

Re: Comprehensive Plan – 2016 Urban Growth Area Changes

Dear Commissioners:

Recently, the La Center Planning Commission approved multiple motions to evaluate the following UGA expansion and zoning amendments during the 2016 Comprehensive Plan Update process:
1. A small expansion of its UGA at the I-5/La Center Road Junction for employment purposes,
2. Potential up-zoning land in the downtown core from Residential Professional to Commercial to encourage additional employment opportunities, and
3. Zoning options to increase multi-family housing opportunities in or near the city center.

UGA Expansion and City Zoning

Clark County requested the cities to identify whether a city will propose changes to its Urban Growth Area (UGA) and Comprehensive Plan during the 2016 Comprehensive Plan Update. As shown in the attached figure, the properties under consideration for UGA expansion are owner-endorsed and include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessor #</th>
<th>Owner (address)</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Gross Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>209705000</td>
<td>Fudge Estate, C/o Griffith Trust, PO Box 180, La Center, WA 98629</td>
<td>AG-20 (Ind. Reserve)</td>
<td>24.10 Ac.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209748000</td>
<td>Fudge Estate, C/o Griffith Trust, PO Box 180, La Center, WA 98629</td>
<td>AG-20 (Ind. Reserve)</td>
<td>20.00 Ac.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All three parcels abut the city limits and are currently zoned AG-20 with an Industrial Reserve Overlay. The City will evaluate the properties consistent with their 2007 Commercial Comprehensive Plan designation and with a C-2 zone. A commercial (C-2) zoning district at the
La Center Junction is intended to serve a broader semi-regional population. The City, in conjunction with the property owners, will analyze the potential of the parcels for long-term commercial significance.

In 2007 the La Center Comprehensive Plan forecast a 2024 population of 9,827 persons and 4,065 total jobs which would be consistent with the County’s 2035 Planning Assumption of 1.1 jobs per household. However, La Center lost a significant amount of employment lands as a result of a successful court challenge to the County’s 2007 Comprehensive Plan and the jobs to housing balance in La Center is out of balance.

Currently, there are approximately 825 jobs in the La Center UGA. The County proposes to allocate 1,367 jobs to La Center based on current Vacant Buildable Lands (VBL) analysis. The resulting 2,192 total jobs are far below the 2007 projection of 4,065 total jobs in the La Center UGA. Consequently, to help address the shortfall, La Center will propose a small expansion of its UGA for employment purposes and will evaluate up-zoning land in the downtown core.

Principles and Values
The City applauds the Principles and Values statement before the Board of Clark County Commissioners (BOCC). Among those most relevant to the La Center’s present request are:

- **Employment Lands:** Equalize land allocation and jobs/population ratio so that cities have equitable share of jobs – diverse job base
- **Other Land Use:** Respect cities’ investment in capital facilities by not shrinking the 2007 urban growth boundaries
- **Mapping Implications:** La Center needs greater economic diversification opportunities and multi-family land use designations

County-Wide Plan Policies (CWPP)
We have reviewed the proposed amendments to the County-Wide Plan Policies and offer the following comments into the record:

- **CWPP 1.1.18.** As a consequence of the legal challenge to the 2007 County Comprehensive Plan, La Center lost a significant portion of its job creating UGA. There is no longer any need for a new bridge across the East Fork of the Lewis River. The City proposes that CWPP 1.1.18 should be deleted.

- **CWPP 1.1.19.** In 2007, the BOCC was aware that the federal government may establish a tribal reservation within the La Center UGA. Consequently, the BOCC offered to make La Center whole by adding new employment lands into the City’s UGA if the federal government established trust land near La Center. The possibility of establishing of trust land at the La Center I-5 Junction still exists. However, the proposed tribal reservation would not technically be created out of the La Center UGA; it would be created on lands currently designated as Industrial Reserve. Consequently, the City proposes to preserve the intent of CWPP 1.1.19 while clarifying the language of the existing policy as follows: “An additional 120 acres +/- of industrial land shall be added to the La Center Urban Area as an out-of-cycle subarea amendment if the United States government recognizes a new tribal
reservation on land currently designated for Industrial Reserve near the La Center Urban Area."

We appreciate this opportunity to comment and look forward to working with you again.

Sincerely,

Jeff Daris
Jeff Sarvis,
La Center Public Works Director

Attachment
Copy: Mayor James Irish
     Oliver Ojasko
     Laurie Lebowsky
From: Carol Levanen [mailto:cnldental@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, August 29, 2014 2:20 PM
To: Madore, David; Mielke, Tom; Barnes, Ed; Carol Levanen; Susan Rasmussen; Leah Higgins; Rick Dunning; Rita Dietrich; Jerry Olson; Fred Pickering; Jim Malinowski; Frank White; Benjamin Moss; Lonnie Moss; Melinda Zamora; Nick Redinger; Curt Massie; Marcus Becker; Clark County Citizens United Inc.
Subject: Fw: WFB Ag Spotlight

Dear Commissioners,

CCCU has been researching information regarding clean water, water availability, water contamination and irrigation as it regards agriculture. These new rules from the federal government need to be seriously considered by the county as it relates to small and large farm operations. Any public food provider will more than likely be affected by these new rules, which will add another layer of costs and regulation associated with growing and selling of food. Please read the full article to have an understanding of what is being proposed.

Best Regards, Carol Levanen, Ex. Secretary, CCCU, Inc.

--- Forwarded Message ---
From: Washington Farm Bureau <tdavis@wsfb.com>
To: cnldental@yahoo.com
Sent: Friday, August 29, 2014 1:11 PM
Subject: WFB Ag Spotlight

Farm Bureau’s Ag Spotlight focuses on a story from our print publications, FB News and Neighbors magazine. Look for the April 2014 edition of Farm Bureau News and details the concerns Washington farmers and ranchers.
August 29, 2014

Washington Farm Bureau’s Ag Spotlight focuses on a story from our print publications, FB News and Neighbors magazine. Look for Ag Spotlight approximately once a week.

This week’s story is from the April 2014 edition of Farm Bureau News and details the concerns Washington farmers and ranchers have over the revised Food Safety Modernization Act, with some new regulations going into effect now.

Food Safety Modernization Act:
Deadlines defined, but uncertainty remains

The first regulatory impacts of the federal Food Safety Modernization Act (FSMA) will arrive in late August.

Prompted by several cases of food-borne illnesses in recent years, Congress passed the FSMA in 2010 to update the nation’s food safety laws. The bill was signed into law in early 2011, and the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) has begun writing rules to govern the way foods are grown, harvested and processed. The FDA has divided the rulemaking into several different issue areas, each with its own set of details and timeline.

In February, as part of a settlement agreement with consumer groups, the FDA agreed to implementation due dates for when the new rules will go into effect. The agreement extends and stagers the final rule deadlines beyond the June 2015 deadline set by the U.S. District Court of Northern California last year. In exchange, the agency will drop its Ninth Circuit appeal in the dispute with the two consumer groups.

For more information on the various due dates, ranging from Aug. 30, 2015 to May 31, 2016, go to the FDA’s website at: http://ir20.rs6.net/ltn.jsp?tf=001Pk1XXTikiHv_G8YysjRNJbKkRu6dCAihhvyYiU-PzOISvSexFW6ZyA7QWgWx3q1K0i9P6z7rvqf6eAEd_irEdIu4k2RNVMG94yppxFn8uOJ1P-x9e7ueQhivspu11/-G_XDpCexbSzMek1THNj72hyebox8l3rd0YqeiQseZuPqWqXsfNKBm XFfjq6hvdd23Ux5k1NC
a2eU7YERp7DEMLvSVsrSkRQ&c=D_bjdF-zWars00HT7N/O8a4Uq2e39j/ZVWmZErjDNxMz9Wolu5jiaHhCXg==&ch=qLFSADAYlL048m-
JE4Kdr5fBxrl49egGocvp4LyOrCNkGErC_R4Hzw==:

Many farmers and ranchers in Washington remain concerned about the impact of a gargantuan and expensive set of new regulations. The new rules cover such issues as preventative controls for human and animal food, imported food and foreign suppliers, produce safety, food transportation, intentional adulteration of food, and the potential requirement that irrigation water meet drinking water standards.

In comments submitted last year to the FDA, Washington Farm Bureau urged that any new rules adopted be practical and not impose any undue hardships on farmers.

"Agriculture is the largest employer in our state, providing more than 160,000 jobs and accounting for 13 percent of the state’s economy," WFB wrote. "Exports alone count for at
O'Donnell, Mary Beth

From: LaRocque, Linnea on behalf of Barnes, Ed
Sent: Tuesday, September 02, 2014 8:45 AM
To: O'Donnell, Mary Beth
Subject: nonconforming lots

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

for your file

From: Carol Levanen [mailto:cnidental@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, September 01, 2014 2:39 AM
To: Fred Pickering; Madore, David; Mielke, Tom; Barnes, Ed; Carol Levanen; Susan Rasmussen; Leah Higgins; Rick Dunning; Rita Dietrich; Jerry Olson; Fred Pickering; Jim Malinowski; Frank White; Benjamin Moss; Lonnie Moss; Melinda Zamora; Nick Redinger; Curt Massie; Marcus Becker; Clark County Citizens United Inc.
Subject: Re: nonconforming lots

Thanks Fred,

In addition, while looking through old documents, I found there were proposals that 2.5 acres or smaller had to have fire sprinkling systems, and hook up to CPU water if they were 1500 feet within a "zone. This was multiplied with more lots, times 750 feet. So, a 4 lot short plat area would be required to hook up if the distance was 3000 feet. As long as there is a non-conforming lot ordinance, the potential for abuse by the county is great. In looking through the large collections of maps in my newly created county map book, I noted that there is so much inconsistency among all of the maps, that they are basically useless. But, they all consistently show that the rural area has a massive number of small parcels and we know that the majority of them were created long before the GMA.

Best Regards, Carol

From: Fred Pickering <fredp@yacolt.com>
To: Carol Levanen <cnidental@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, August 31, 2014 12:32 AM
Subject: nonconforming lots

A good meeting and talks the other night.
After thinking a little overnight and taking a quick looking at the code there are several restrictions that jump out.
The 40 and 80 acre timber zones have 50 foot set backs. It can be hard to meet these on narrow lots. A 100 foot lot leave you no place to build. New lots in a forest zone need to be 140 feet wide. Which leaves you a 69 foot spot to build on.
A 5 acre zone set backs are (20) feet, and fifty (50) feet for accessory buildings (barns)
A 2.5 acre zone set backs are ten (10) feet, and fifty (50) feet for accessory buildings (barns)
So 2.5 acre lots in a forest zone has a much greater set back requirements than it would if it was zoned right. For some reason there are more restrictions on other usages such as B&Bs in a forest zone have to be smaller than in forest zones than it would in a 2.5 zone.
O'Donnell, Mary Beth

From: Euler, Gordon
Sent: Tuesday, September 02, 2014 8:00 AM
To: O'Donnell, Mary Beth
Cc: Orjako, Oliver; McCall, Marilee
Subject: FW: Comp Plan EIS scoping comments
Attachments: Clark Co Comp Plan EIS scoping Food System CARE 1Sept 2014.pdf

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Mary Beth:

For the index:

Gordy

From: Jude Wait [mailto:info@foodsystemcare.org]
Sent: Monday, September 01, 2014 4:43 PM
To: Euler@foodsystemcare.org; Euler, Gordon
Subject: Comp Plan EIS scoping comments

Gordy,

Comments attached.

Respectfully submitted,

Jude Wait
Food System CARE <info@foodsystemcare.org>
Food System CARE co-convened a task force to pursue immediate and long-term food system strategies. Our goal is to facilitate greater support for sustainable food production agriculture and community resilience in Clark County’s food system.

Clark County food system stakeholders are endeavoring to retain and increase local food production and sourcing in a region with significant food insecurity and development pressure (Clark_County_Food_System_Council, 2012; Public Health, 2012). Initiatives to influence the Clark County Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update process motivated us to coalesce and activate now. Indeed the Food System Council has already submitted documents to the County (Clark_County_Food_System_Council, 2013), and we agree with their content and intent, including the handout from the Open House Scoping sessions (hereby additionally included as Scoping comments).

1. Public scoping comments are due on Labor Day 2014—after Scoping “Open House” meetings on August 20, 21, 28, 29 provided the public an opportunity to learn from County Planning staff about the issues and alternatives. The purpose is “to define issues related to the comprehensive plan update that will be addressed in the draft SEIS (Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement). The comment period was way too short between information sessions and due date.

2. We will interact with the Comp Plan Update process as it proceeds. For instance, we will provide input to the official record on the revised Comprehensive Plan and the revised (and/or Supplemental) EIS to be released by the County.

3. Given the changes in the system since 2007, we recommend the old documents be scrutinized for accuracy and applicability. How well were the impacts of the huge GMA expansion predicted? What has transpired since 2007? There is new information in reports produced since then, but they too are outdated now (Berk_Consulting, 2012; Gilroy, 2008; Globalwise_Inc, 2007; Meter, 2008; Moser, 2010). Furthermore, the actual impacts on the agri-food system, such as farm and home foreclosures, land sales, conversions to other uses, etc., should be investigated. What is really going on with Current Use taxation designations?

4. Within the County planning context, we support maintaining and enhancing the “long term commercial significance” of the agricultural sector as directed under the Growth Management Act. However, we suspect the County has fallen tragically short on their intent to meet the mandate. Farmland has been lost across the County, in part through conversion to other land uses, and incorporating viable farmland into the UGA without acknowledging the importance of ongoing urban and urban-interface agriculture. As the nature of agri-food system commerce has changed over recent decades—with an upsurge in local and direct marketing strategies, a greater variety of operational scales and diversified cropping, for examples—we would offer a broad inclusive definition of “commercial” and “significance.”


Mary Beth:

For the index:

Gordy

-----Original Message-----
From: Sydney Reisbick [mailto:reisbicks@comcast.net]
Sent: Monday, September 01, 2014 7:46 PM
To: Euler, Gordon
Subject: Input for scoping for 2016 GMP

Greetings Gordy:

Good day to you. As you can see, this note and its attachment was sent in on Monday, Sept 1. We cannot send this comment letter through the website. Only 500 characters (not words) are allowed. This is very strange and unusual! As you see, the attached letter from Friends of Clark County has many more than 500 characters.

We expect you to accept the attached below and put it in the record. As a board, we have done a lot of thought and work to make it clear and concise and do want it submitted.

Note: This is different from my personal input.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Sydney Reisbick, President
Friends of Clark County
Scoping for Growth Management Plan EIS for SEPA: From

Friends of Clark County
PO Box 513
Vancouver, WA 98666

Please consider the following in the EIS for the 2016 GMP SEPA.

Friends of Clark County supports GMP options that do the following.

**Sustainable, adequate clean water for all uses.**
Allow development only if there is available water, already State code.
Hold that there must be sustainable available water.
Where possible, consider senior water rights.

**Storm water:**
Control storm water and remove pollution before putting it into waterways.
Control or store storm water in “recharge areas” that return water to aquifers.
Foster keeping natural wetlands rather than engineered (concrete) ones.

**Working agriculture and forestry:**
Reserve the best lands for agriculture and forestry.
Continue “right to farm”. Allow roadside stands.
Do not de-designate lands without fulfilling all state required criteria.

**Parks and Trails:**
Provide for sufficient parks and places for children to play.
Discourage the development of housing complexes that lack places for children to play. Older people also need natural areas as well, for their mental wellbeing.
Link the parks and green spaces by trails and/or bike lanes.
In case you don’t have this one yet. I don’t think it’s a duplicate.

Linnea LaRocque, Administrative Assistant
Clark County Board of Commissioners
300-397-2232
P.O. Box 5000, Vancouver WA 98666

SAVE PAPER - Please do not print this e-mail unless absolutely necessary

From: Carol Levanen [mailto:cnidental@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, August 29, 2014 6:11 PM
To: Madore, David; Mielke, Tom; Barnes, Ed; Carol Levanen; Susan Rasmussen; Leah Higgins; Rick Dunning; Rita Vetrich; Jerry Olson; Fred Pickering; Jim Malinowski; Frank White; Benjamin Moss; Lonnie Moss; Melinda Zamora; Nick Redinger; Curt Massie; Marcus Becker; Clark County Citizens United Inc.
Subject: EIS - This information to be placed into public record

Dear Commissioners,

Clark County Citizens United, Inc. is researching EIS documents from the 1994 Comprehensive Land Use Plan, which was rolled over to the 2004 Plan, which was rolled over to the 2007 Plan, and is now being considered for the 2016, 20 year update of the GMA Comprehensive Land Use Plan.

On page 11-10 of the DRAFT SEIS June 15, 1994 the draft discusses RURAL.

It states, "Clark County appointed a Rural and Resource Lands Advisory Committee which reviewed existing lot patterns and land uses in rural and resource lands and developed recommendations for which areas should be designated for resource use and which should be rural. These land use recommendations are reflected in this alternative. They did not recommend lot sizes for rural areas, those were developed by staff."

It further states, "Resource Lands Advisory Committee recommendations, Clark County staff developed minimum lot sizes for Resource lands%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%

Oliver Orjiako was misinformed regarding who decided what the parcel sizes would be for rural and resource lands and the record needs to reflect that. The June 2014 Memorandum forwarded to the commissioners will need to be corrected to reflect what actually happened and is recorded in the June 15, 1994 Draft SEIS.
O'Donnell, Mary Beth

From: Orjiako, Oliver
Sent: Tuesday, September 09, 2014 1:47 PM
To: O'Donnell, Mary Beth; Cook, Christine
Cc: Euler, Gordon; Alvarez, Jose
Subject: FW: Memorandum to the Commissioners - Information to be placed in the public record

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Just FYI. Mary Beth for index.

From: Madore, David
Sent: Tuesday, September 02, 2014 12:52 PM
To: Orjiako, Oliver
Subject: FW: Memorandum to the Commissioners - Information to be placed in the public record

FYI.

From: Carol Levanen [mailto:cnldental@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 27, 2014 10:46 PM
To: Madore, David
Subject: FW: Memorandum to the Commissioners - Information to be placed in the public record

----- Forwarded Message ----- 
From: Carol Levanen <cnldental@yahoo.com>
To: David Madore <david.madore@clark.wa.gov>; Tom Mielke <tom.mielke@clark.wa.gov>; "ed barnes@clark.wa.gov" <ed.barnes@clark.wa.gov>; Carol Levanen <cnldental@yahoo.com>; Susan Rasmussen <sprazzr@tds.net>; Leah Higgins <leahyhomes@gmail.com>; Rick Dunning <ralan1953@gmail.com>; Rita Dietrich <bilinta@pacifier.com>; Jerry Olson <wcoioams@tds.net>; Fred Pickering <fredp@yacolt.com>; Jim Malinowski <j.malinowski@ieee.org>; Frank White <frarfarmer@yahoo.com>; Benjamin Moss <benjaminmoss@johnscott.com>; Lonnie Moss <lon@moss-wriston.com>; Melinda Zamora <mzamora1001@gmail.com>; Nick Redinger <nickredinger@holmail.com>; Curt Massie <cmassie331@gmail.com>; Marcus Becker <marcusb35@man.com>; Clark County Citizens United Inc. <cccouinc@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 10:14 PM
Subject: Memorandum to the Commissioners - Information to be placed in the public record

Clark County Board of Commissioners August 22, 2014
P.O. Box 5000
Vancouver, Washington 98666
For the Public Record
Re: June 26, 2014 Memorandum from Oliver Orjiako, Director of Community Planning, regarding Resource Land Designations
The memorandum to the commissioners begins with a statement that Clark County Citizens United, Inc. says the county should "revisit... parcel sizes of one and 2.5 acres that were in effect prior to... adoption of the first Comprehensive Plan under the Growth Management Act.
CCCU’s position is that existing parcelization be recognized in a zone that reflects predominant parcel sizes. Currently, almost 100% of rural lots in Clark County are substandard to their designated zone. Even though there are hundreds of one
acre parcels throughout the county, CCCU is recommending that a one acre lot size be reserved for a cluster ordinance in all zones.

Mr. Orijiako indicates his report is a "revisit of the records from approximately 1993 to 1998 relating to designation of resource land and rural parcel size. He mentions an appeal to the Superior Court and Clark County’s responses to the appellate rulings.

Mr. Orijiako failed to mention the 1999 ruling from the Washington State Court of Appeals that states, "Based on the foregoing, we conclude that the GMA does not require counties to use the OFM’s projections as a cap on non-urban growth. The Board exceeded its authority, and the trial court did not err in reversing the Board’s ruling. In that reversal, the Superior County states that"

"It is evident the rural land use density regulations were driven in part by earlier Growth Management Hearing Board Decision requiring urban population plus rural population to equal Office of Financial Management population forecasts... This formulaic view of the GMA requirement is fatally flawed. 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 are adequately sized and infrastructure in those growth areas is provided for. This Board decision, however, compelled the County to downzone substantial portions of the rural areas in order to meet the Board's apparent requirements.

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. By trying to comply with the board’s errant decision the County violated the GMA planning goal.

Through no fault of the County’s, 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 Plan land use densities. 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 of the terms of the GMA."

In essence, the Court of Appeals upheld all of the passage of the OFM language as it identifies and relates to both the Superior Court and the Court of Appeals decisions.

Mr. Orijiako discusses the 1993 creation of the Rural and Natural Resource Lands Advisory Committee, and indicates that the 1993 Forest Focus Group and the Farm Focus Group were direct subcommittees of that creation.

The Rural and Natural Resource Lands Advisory Committee was not part of the actual Focus Groups. Two of CCCU’s Board members, Fred Pickering and Dan Dupuis, were on the original Forest Focus Group and one of CCCU’s members, Don Kemper, was on the original Farm focus Group. CCCU has extensively interviewed these people to get an accurate accounting of what happened during their tenure. They confirmed their work followed the GMA guidelines contained in the WAC Chapter 365-190, but insist that a few days prior to submitting their recommendations to the county, an attorney, John Karpinski and Planning Director, Jerri Bohard, approached the groups and introduced a packet of different recommendations. The result was massive downzoning of all of the resource and rural lands, which was very different than what the focus groups intended. Members of those groups gave public testimony protesting those changes.

Mr. Orijiako discusses the response of the Farm Focus Groups report and the criteria used. The memo to Jerri Bohard of October 25, 1994 was made after the submittal of the report. The Forest Focus Group issued its report on December 5, 1993. In addition, the Department of Community Development decided to require the use of the private forest land grading system from the Department of Revenue, which was not a criteria within the GMA.

In RCW 38.70A.050 Guidelines to classify Agricultural, forest and mineral lands and critical lands, it states, "The department shall consult with the Department of Agriculture regarding guidelines for Agriculture lands, the department of Natural resources regarding forest lands and mineral resource lands. (2)... the department shall consult with interested parties, including but not limited to ... (a) cities... (b) counties... (c) developers... (d) builders... (e) owners... (f) environmental organizations... (h) special districts... (i) state agencies... (j) Indian tribes... In addition, public hearings... the public input obtained at such public hearings. (4) The guidelines... regarding classification of forest lands shall not be inconsistent with guidelines adopted by the Department of Natural Resources.

He report further states "the Rural and Natural Resource Lands Advisory Committee (not the focus groups) began the process of designating Agri-Forest for areas north of the East Fork of the Lewis River. The process was completed by staff..."
This committee was not part of the Focus Groups and was not part of the original work of the groups. But, it was given the power, with the help of staff, to designate virtually all of rural Clark County, and particularly 35,000 acres of Agri-Forest resource lands. Craig Greenleaf, Planning Director, attempted to justify the designations by claiming the committee selection process left "land improperly considered", "the farm focus group did not include heavily forest lands, role of soils...found to be uniformly of high quality, and "long term commercial significance lead to severe difficulty in defining agriculture land". Instead, he allowed unknown persons, to the public, to determine the outcome of these rural lands.

The memorandum then discusses the 67 appellants and CCU's issues. Three items regarding designation of ag resource land, agri-forest resource lands and forest resource land were noted.
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It followed with the September 9, 1995 GMHB ruling.

Clark County Citizens United, had many other issues in the appeal and only agriculture lands designation was dismissed.

But, Justice Poyfair made comment during the hearings that he believed the agriculture designations did need further review by the county, but there was not enough evidence in the record to rule against the designation. The appeal decision included numerous Findings of Facts and Conclusions of Law stated here:

#3 - Statutory Mandate - The Board is not above the law....; #4 Agri-Forest Lands - The agri-forest resource designations violate the GMA.; Additionally, failure to solicit meaningful public participation....violated the public participation provisions of the GMA.; #6 - Comprehensive Plan EIS - The County failed to comply with SEPA's requirement...regarding the agri-forest designations and changes to the pattern of rural development was clearly erroneous. (These are two separate items). #7 - rural Land Densities - The County's rural and resource development regulations are inconsistent with the GMA......requires a variety of residential densities and housing types, ...by identifying pre-existing small development patterns in rural areas and creating rural activity centers with a variety of rural densities. (These are two separate items); *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 are adequately sized and infrastructure in those growth areas is provided for. 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 of the term of the GMA.

The discussion then goes to the Superior Court appeal and the subsequent April 4, 1997 ruling.

It states, "The EIS issued by the county was in violation of the SEPA because the agri-forest designation was disclosed subsequent to the publication of the Final EIS". The county put together two task forces, one to deal with agri-forest and the other with rural centers.

The 35,000 acres of agri-forest didn't have an EIS applied to it in 1994, and even though task forces were formed to address the court ruling and change the parcel sizes and designations, the actual land mass that was affected, has never gone through an EIS.

The report mentions that "Staff...recommended elimination of rural centers due to....OFM forecasts.... The courts ruled that it was illegal to use OFM projections to eliminate the rural centers. But, it is interesting to note that in response to planner, Peggy Scolnick's request for recommendations to the Comprehensive Plan, attorney, John Karpinski issued on March 16, 1994, the "CCNRG Green Alternative Details". He states, "As you know, CCNRG's Green Alternative has four elements: (1) reduced Urban Growth Boundaries; (2) enhanced Ag and Forest land protections; (3) increased Critical Land protection; (4) vigorous rural development limitations."

In item III, C. he directs the county to "Substantially reduced or eliminated "rural activity centers". He thanks the County's apparent consideration of including this alternative as a full and complete alternative in the Growth Management DEIS."

Mr. Orijako states that in CCU's court issues of land use densities in rural areas...,"more than seventy percent (70%) of the properties in rural areas are non-conforming", and noted the Page 4 of 5

"Comprehensive Plan which basis its' land use densities strictly on OFM populations projections, ...disregard its' adopted framework plan policies" ....plan that ignores existing conditions in rural areas...do not comply with the requirements of State Environmental policy Act. But, then discusses that the GMHB stated that was no evidence in the record to support 5 acre minimum parcel size....

This is like putting apples and oranges together in the same basket. The Courts and the Hearing Board are two different agencies and the court ruled the Hearing Board was wrong and "not above the law". The court did not support the Hearing
Board decision and told the Board to remand all of the illegal and incorrect items noted in the court ruling, back to the county to correct. That has never happened. But with little change, the Board validated the plan anyway. This report discusses that in the April 1997 ruling...the Superior Court states that the county needed to provide a variety of rural densities to be compliant with the GMA, and that could be achieved by designating rural centers as envisioned in the community Framework Plan...Specifically, it states the court said "The eradication of the rural activity centers violates the planning goal requiring a variety of residential densities". This is not what the ruling said. It does say the county needed to provide a variety of rural densities. But, it does not say that the designation of the rural centers can be used to achieve that goal. Unfortunately, the county has combined what the ruling does say, into one action. The ruling states, "One of the planning goals requires a variety of residential densities and housing types...met by identifying pre-existing small development patterns in rural areas...and...creating rural activity centers with a variety of rural densities".
The word "and" in this sentence means, "as well as, or, in addition to", according to Webster’s College Dictionary. The decision language was written by CCCU attorney, Glen Amster, and the intent of that sentence was confirmed further on in the decision, where justice Poyfair states, "The result is a plan that gives little regard for the realities of existing development in direct contradiction of the term of the GMA."
In the report it says that "to comply with the Superior Court ruling, the BOCC convened a 13 member task force which in March 1998 reported it's recommendations.... There were two minority reports issued by members of the task force....the other recommended five to ten acres zoning similar to the 1980 Plan.
CCCU, Inc. Board members, Carol Levanen and Jim Malinowski were on that task force. At the first meeting of the group, commissioner Betty Sue Morris was in attendance and gave the order that the group could not consider any parcel size less than five acres. Even though many members thought 2.5 acres was appropriate, given the existing parcels, they were bound to the five, ten and twenty acre designations. But, the group was lopsided to the no-growth side. Whenever a pro-growth member was absent, the opposition took advantage of the situation and designated parcels in large lot zoning, regardless of the criteria and existing conditions on the ground. If there was a large parcel, it was locked up. There was so much of this activity, that the pro-growth group members simply couldn't sign their names to such a process. This resulted in the drafting of a minority report. The no growth members then drafted their own minority report, in response to the first one, thus resulting in the two reports.
In the Summary, it states that "regarding resource designations, both the GMHB and the Superior Court decisions affirmed the county's designations as compliant with the GMA. The Ag 20, FR 40 FR80 in place today are the same as adopted in 1994 and upheld by both the GMHB and the Superior Court. It also states that "The updates of 2004 and 2007...readopted the previous land use actions...."
This statement is only partially true. The GMHB affirmed the designations as compliant, but the court did not weigh in on the changes and it would have taken another court action to involve the courts in the process again. When the original appeals were filed against the Plan, the Hearing Board rolled all of the resource land appeals into the one Agri-Forest appeal filled by CCCU. There were numerous appeals regarding agriculture and forest resource lands, but none of those other appeals were heard by the Hearing Board or the courts. The Hearing Board followed their own lead, regardless of the reprimand and directives from the court, and enabled the county to create a plan that does not reflect the court decisions. The county continues to use the OFM projections to plan rural areas and continues to ignore the existing development patterns and existing parcels.
It is unfortunate that the hearings board is the avenue by which remands travel, because in Clark County's case, "The result is a plan that gives little regard for the realities of existing rural development in direct contradiction of the term of the GMA.
Clark County Citizens United, Inc. was told by the Board of Commissioners and staff that rural lands were not being considered in the 2004 and 2007 updates. CCCU was given directions by the county, not to submit any testimony for the purpose of discussing the rural lands. Regardless of the directives, CCCU did provide public testimony over rural lands concerns and the EIS. But, in reviewing a copy of the 2004-2007 Clark County Comprehensive Land Use Plan, given to CCCU at the time, to a current copy, it’s clear that additional pages have been added to the Rural and Resource Element of the Plan to include language regarding the equine community. In addition, the current Plan is much larger than the same Plan distributed in 2004 - 2007.
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Clark County Citizens United, Inc has waited long enough for the county to comply with the law. Since 1999, the Clark County Board of Commissioners, has promised that those corrections will be made with each update, but it has never happened. Instead, the county has formed many advisory councils, focus groups and “studies” to justify the Plan, to assure that the changes never will be made and the law can continue to be ignored. The public has no idea that any of this land use activity has taken place since 2004, because it has been disguised within a legitimate county agency. CCCU urges the county to honor the court mandates and GMA and make necessary corrections and changes to rural lands in the 2016 Clark County Comprehensive Land Use Plan.

Sincerely,
Carol Levanen, Ex. Secretary
Clark County Citizens United, Inc.
P.O. Box 2188
Battle Ground, Washington 98604
Today, August 12, 2014 CCCU gave testimony regarding the hiring of the BERK consulting firm and voiced CCCU's disapproval. Our research of this group gave us very good reason for doing so. One of the many reasons was submitted into the record to the hearing clerk. It consisted of two additional maps from the BERK rural lands study. One map depicted supposed agriculture land and supposed crops growing on those lands. These illustrations were not correct. In addition, they did not take into account prime ag soil in their review. The other map depicted forest resource in an area that has no forest soils. Reports were given over this resource in those areas that were also incorrect. Their "scientific" source was the Washington State Agricultural Department, which is only a marketing organization in the state, and the other "source" was BERK 2011, the very consulting firm who publishes the report. In fact most of the "source" for the BERK studies came from BERK itself. Where they got the information is anyone's guess and not mentioned, nor is credit given to the authors.

A consulting firm is to collect credible and scientific data and put in into some type of usable form to determine actions and outcomes. Bias subjectivity has no place in these types of paid studies. CCCU believes the county would have been much better served, if it had hired a different firm, that came to conclusions and recommendations via credible reports and scientific data.

'In sincerely, Carol Levanen, Ex Secretary
Clark County Citizens United, Inc.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>EVENT</th>
<th>TOPIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07/11/13</td>
<td>E-MAIL Invitation</td>
<td>E-invitations to attend the BOCC Worksession on 7/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/17/13</td>
<td>BOCC Worksession</td>
<td>Introduction to GMA and Issue Paper #1 GMA Overview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/09/13</td>
<td>BOCC Worksession</td>
<td>Vacant Buildable Lands Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/03/13</td>
<td>E-MAIL Invitation</td>
<td>E-invitations to attend City/County Coordination meeting on 10/25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/22/13</td>
<td>Camas Washougal Post Record</td>
<td>Planning commission lift Livingstom Mountain from mining overlay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/25/13</td>
<td>City/County Coordination</td>
<td>Countywide Planning Policy Draft Proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/30/13</td>
<td>BOCC Worksession</td>
<td>Discovery Subarea Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/06/13</td>
<td>BOCC Board Time</td>
<td>Public Participation Plan and Issue Paper #2 Population Projection discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/07/13</td>
<td>Press Release 6771 for 12/18</td>
<td>County kicks off growth plan update due to state by mid-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/08/13</td>
<td>Rural Census</td>
<td>Community Survey focusing on Agriculture and Forest resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td>E-MAIL Information</td>
<td>E-Cities Public Participation Draft, Issue Paper 1 and Issue Paper 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/03/13</td>
<td>E-MAIL Invitation</td>
<td>E-invitation to attend BOCC WS on 12/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/12/13</td>
<td>E-MAIL Invitation</td>
<td>E-invitations to attend BOCC WS on 12/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/18/13</td>
<td>BOCC Worksession</td>
<td>Public Participation Plan and Issue Paper #2 Population Projection discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/06/14</td>
<td>E-MAIL Invitation</td>
<td>E-invitation to attend City/County Coordination meeting on 01/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/06/14</td>
<td>Columbian Legal Notice for 01/21</td>
<td>BOCC Hearing on the population forecast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>EVENT</td>
<td>TOPIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/09/14</td>
<td>Press Release 6794 for 1/21</td>
<td>Commissioners to choose population forecast to update growth plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/11/14</td>
<td>Columbian Article</td>
<td>County growth plan: Pick a number Revised 20-year plan will rely upon updated population projection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/17/14</td>
<td>City/County Coordination</td>
<td>Countywide Planning Policy Draft Proposal (Rev2), Commerce Checklist, Issue Paper #3 Employment Forecast, BOCC Hearing 01/21/14 materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/21/14</td>
<td>BOCC Hearing</td>
<td>Issue Paper #2 Population (RES 2014-01-09), Public Participation Plan (RES 2014-01-10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/22/14</td>
<td>Columbian Article</td>
<td>County studies zoning in rural area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/22/14</td>
<td>BOCC Worksession</td>
<td>Rural lands census summary and analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/23/14</td>
<td>Columbian Article</td>
<td>20-year growth projection ok'd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/27/14</td>
<td>E-MAIL</td>
<td>Department of Commerce acknowledge receipt of RES 2014-0109 and RES 2014-0110 under RCW36.70A.106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/27/14</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Department of Commerce acknowledge receipt of RES 2014-0109 and RES 2014-0110 under RCW36.70A.106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/27/14</td>
<td>E-MAIL Information</td>
<td>E-notes from the City/County Coordination meeting on 01/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/29/14</td>
<td>BOCC Board Time</td>
<td>2014 Board meeting calendar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/03/14</td>
<td>E-MAIL Invitation</td>
<td>E-invitation to attend the City/County Coordination meeting on 02/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/07/14</td>
<td>Columbian Public Meeting Notice</td>
<td>Notice for Planning Commission worksessions through 04/3/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/11/14</td>
<td>E-MAIL Invitation</td>
<td>E-invitation reminder to attend the City/County Coordination meeting on 02/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/12/14</td>
<td>School Consortium Presentation</td>
<td>Introduction to GMA and timeline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>EVENT</td>
<td>TOPIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/14/14</td>
<td>City/County Coordination</td>
<td>Issue Paper #3 Employment Forecast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/20/14</td>
<td>Planning Commission Worksession</td>
<td>Countywide Planning Policy Draft Proposal (Rev2), and policies for Annexation, Rural Lands, and Environmental Elements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/21/14</td>
<td>E-MAIL Information</td>
<td>E-notes from the City/County Coordination meeting on 02/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/25/14</td>
<td>E-MAIL Invitation</td>
<td>E-invitation to attend the BOCC WS on 02/26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/26/14</td>
<td>BOCC Worksession</td>
<td>Issue Paper #3 Employment Forecast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/26/14</td>
<td>Comprehensive Plan Website</td>
<td>New Comp Plan website up and running</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/03/14</td>
<td>E-MAIL Invitation</td>
<td>E-invitation to attend the Employment Forecast Numbers meeting on 03/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/03/14</td>
<td>E-MAIL Invitation</td>
<td>E-invitation to attend the City/County Coordination meeting on 03/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/05/14</td>
<td>E-MAIL Announcement</td>
<td>E-announcement NEW Clark County Comprehensive Plan 2016 web pages LIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/06/14</td>
<td>Planning Commission Worksession</td>
<td>Policies for Land Use, Historic, Community Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/09/14</td>
<td>Clark County Focus</td>
<td>CVTV countywide March broadcast - Comprehensive Plan Overview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/10/14</td>
<td>Neighborhood Associations of Clark County</td>
<td>Introduction to GMA and timeline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/10/14</td>
<td>E-MAIL Invitation</td>
<td>E-invitation to attend Employment Forecast Meeting 03/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/10/14</td>
<td>Columbian Legal Notice for 04/17</td>
<td>Joint BOCC/PC WS on SMO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/12/14</td>
<td>Columbian Article</td>
<td>County job count above 2007 levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/13/14</td>
<td>Development Engineering Advisory Board</td>
<td>Introduction to GMA and timeline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>EVENT</td>
<td>TOPIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/14/14</td>
<td>Clark County Comprehensive Plan 2016 Update</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/18/14</td>
<td>City/County Coordination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/18/14</td>
<td>E-MAIL Invitation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/19/14</td>
<td>Public Health Advisory Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/19/14</td>
<td>BOCC Worksession</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/19/14</td>
<td>Regional Growth Forum Presentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/20/14</td>
<td>Employment Forecast Meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/20/14</td>
<td>Planning Commission Worksession</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/20/14</td>
<td>Press Release 6844 for 04/1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/24/14</td>
<td>E-MAIL Information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/27/14</td>
<td>E-MAIL Invitation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/27/14</td>
<td>BOCC Hearing on the employment forecast</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/28/14</td>
<td>E-MAIL Information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/31/14</td>
<td>School Consortium Presentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>EVENT</td>
<td>TOPIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/01/14</td>
<td>BOCC Hearing</td>
<td>Issue Paper #3.1 Employment Forecast (RES 2014-04-XX)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/03/14</td>
<td>Planning Commission Worksession</td>
<td>Policies for Housing, Public Facilities, Procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/08/14</td>
<td>Columbian Legal Notice for 04/22</td>
<td>BOCC H continued from 04/1 on Employment Forecast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/08/14</td>
<td>E-MAIL Information</td>
<td>E-notes (revised) from the City/County Coordination meeting on 03/14, BOCC WS 04/16 presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/11/14</td>
<td>City/County Coordination</td>
<td>Issue Paper #4 Allocation and prep for BOCC WS on 04/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/14/14</td>
<td>E-MAIL Invitation</td>
<td>E-invitation to attend BOCC WS on 04/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/15/14</td>
<td>Columbian Article</td>
<td>Opposition to mining runs deep on Livingston Mountain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/16/14</td>
<td>BOCC Worksession</td>
<td>Principles and Values and Planning Assumptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/17/14</td>
<td>Press Release 6868 for 04/29</td>
<td>Next week’s Board of County Commissioners meetings canceled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/18/14</td>
<td>Columbian Legal Notice for 04/29</td>
<td>BOCC H continued from 04/1 on Employment Forecast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/18/14</td>
<td>E-MAIL Invitation</td>
<td>E-invitation to attend BOCC H on 04/29 city partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/22/14</td>
<td>E-MAIL Information</td>
<td>E-notes from the City/County Coordination meeting on 04/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BOCC Hearing - Cont. 04/1 -CANCELLED TO 4/29</td>
<td>Issue Paper #3.1 Employment Forecast (RES 2014-04-XX)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/22/14</td>
<td>NO Quarum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/28/14</td>
<td>E-MAIL Invitation</td>
<td>E-invitation to attend BOCC H on 04/29 METz list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/29/14</td>
<td>BOCC Hearing - Cont. 04/1</td>
<td>Issue Paper #3.1 Employment Forecast (RES 2014-04-01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/30/14</td>
<td>Columbian Public Meeting Notice</td>
<td>Notice for Planning Commission worksessions through 08/21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Clark County Comprehensive Plan 2016 Update
Public Involvement Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>EVENT</th>
<th>TOPIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>05/07/14</td>
<td>E-MAIL Invitation</td>
<td>E-invitation to attend City/County Coordination meeting on 05/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/09/14</td>
<td>City/County Coordination</td>
<td>Issue Paper #4 Allocation and BOCC H presentation 05/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/12/14</td>
<td>E-MAIL Invitation</td>
<td>E-invitation to attend BOCC WS on 05/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/14/14</td>
<td>BOCC Worksession</td>
<td>Principles and Values and Planning Assumptions #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/14/14</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Department of Commerce acknowledge receipt of RES 2014-0401 under RCW36.70A.106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/15/14</td>
<td>E-MAIL Information</td>
<td>E-notes from the City/County Coordination meeting on 05/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/02/14</td>
<td>Press Release 6903 General Update</td>
<td>County, cities to discuss options to update local growth plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/02/14</td>
<td>Vancouver Business Journal</td>
<td>County to discuss growth plan options with local cities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/03/14</td>
<td>E-MAIL Invitation</td>
<td>E-invitation to attend BOCC WS on 06/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/03/14</td>
<td>E-MAIL Invitation CORRECTION</td>
<td>E-invitation to attend BOCC WS on 06/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/05/14</td>
<td>Development Engineering Advisory Board</td>
<td>Update on GMA timeline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/05/14</td>
<td>Planning Commission Worksession</td>
<td>Update on GMA timeline, Principles &amp; Values, Planning Assumptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/09/14</td>
<td>E-MAIL Invitation</td>
<td>E-invitation to attend City/County Coordination meeting on 06/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/09/14</td>
<td>E-MAIL Information</td>
<td>E-notes from the City/County Coordination meeting on 05/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/09/14</td>
<td>Columbian Legal Notice for 06/24</td>
<td>Issue Paper #4 Allocation, Principles &amp; Values, Planning Assumptions, Suspension of A/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/12/14</td>
<td>Press Release 6913 for 06/24</td>
<td>Public hearing to focus on moving forward with growth plan update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>EVENT</td>
<td>TOPIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/13/14</td>
<td>City/County Coordination</td>
<td>Issue Paper #4 Allocation and BOCC H presentation 06/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/17/14</td>
<td>E-MAIL Invitation</td>
<td>E-invitation to attend BOCC H on 06/24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/17/14</td>
<td>The Reflector</td>
<td>Press release 6913 printed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/17/14</td>
<td>Camas Washougal Post Record</td>
<td>Press release 6913 printed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/18/14</td>
<td>BOCC Worksession</td>
<td>Issue Paper #4 Allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/19/14</td>
<td>Planning Commission Worksession</td>
<td>Issue Paper #4 Allocation, Suspension of Annual Reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/24/14</td>
<td>BOCC Hearing</td>
<td>Issue Paper #4 Allocation (RES 2014-06-17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Suspension of Annual Reviews (RES 2014-06-16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/25/14</td>
<td>Columbian Article</td>
<td>County listens to growth concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/01/14</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Department of Commerce acknowledge receipt of RES 2014-0616 and RES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2014-0617 under RCW36.70A.106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/02/14</td>
<td>E-MAIL Information</td>
<td>E-notes from the City/County Coordination meeting on 06/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/02/14</td>
<td>E-MAIL Invitation</td>
<td>E-invitation to attend City/County Coordination meeting on 07/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/02/14</td>
<td>E-MAIL Invitation</td>
<td>E-invitation to attend BOCC H on 07/08 ~SMO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/08/14</td>
<td>E-MAIL Invitation</td>
<td>E-invitation to attend BOCC WS on 07/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/11/14</td>
<td>City/County Coordination</td>
<td>Issue Paper #5 SEPA Scoping and BOCC WS presentation 07/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/16/14</td>
<td>BOCC Worksession</td>
<td>Issue Paper #5 SEPA Scoping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/17/14</td>
<td>Planning Commission Worksession</td>
<td>Issue Paper #5 SEPA Scoping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>EVENT</td>
<td>TOPIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/28/14</td>
<td>E-MAIL Invitation</td>
<td>E-invitation to attend City/County Coordination meeting on 08/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/29/14</td>
<td>Press Release 6946 for 08/01</td>
<td>Open Houses to gather public input on scope of growth plan update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/29/14</td>
<td>Camas Washougal Post Record Legal Notice for SEPA</td>
<td>Clark County Comprehensive Plan SEPA Threshold and Scoping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/30/14</td>
<td>The Reflector Legal Notice for SEPA</td>
<td>Clark County Comprehensive Plan SEPA Threshold and Scoping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/30/14</td>
<td>Columbian Legal Notice for SEPA</td>
<td>Clark County Comprehensive Plan Re-Adopt 2007 EIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/30/14</td>
<td>Columbian Legal Notice for SEPA</td>
<td>Clark County Comprehensive Plan SEPA Threshold and Scoping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/05/14</td>
<td>Camas Washougal Post Record</td>
<td>Camas host growth plan update workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/08/14</td>
<td>City/County Coordination</td>
<td>SEPA Scoping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/10/14</td>
<td>Columbian</td>
<td>Open House Ad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/12/14</td>
<td>Camas Washougal Post Record</td>
<td>Open House Ad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/13/14</td>
<td>The Reflector</td>
<td>Open House to gather public input on scope of growth plan update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/13/14</td>
<td>The Reflector</td>
<td>Open House Ad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/15/14</td>
<td>Columbian</td>
<td>Open House Ad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/17/14</td>
<td>Clark County Focus</td>
<td>CVTV countywide March broadcast - Comprehensive Plan Overview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/19/14</td>
<td>OPEN HOUSE: SEPA Scoping ~ Vancouver</td>
<td>Clark County Comprehensive Plan SEPA Threshold and Scoping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/20/14</td>
<td>OPEN HOUSE: SEPA Scoping ~ Camas</td>
<td>Clark County Comprehensive Plan SEPA Threshold and Scoping</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Clark County Comprehensive Plan 2016 Update
### Public Involvement Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>EVENT</th>
<th>TOPIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08/27/14</td>
<td>OPEN HOUSE: SEPA Scoping ~ Ridgefield</td>
<td>Clark County Comprehensive Plan SEPA Threshold and Scoping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/28/14</td>
<td>OPEN HOUSE: SEPA Scoping ~ Battle Ground</td>
<td>Clark County Comprehensive Plan SEPA Threshold and Scoping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/04/14</td>
<td>E-MAIL Invitation</td>
<td>E-invitation to attend City/County Coordination meeting on 09/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/11/14</td>
<td>E-MAIL Information</td>
<td>E-notes from the City/County Coordination meeting on 08/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/12/14</td>
<td>City/County Coordination</td>
<td>SEPA Update, Issue Paper 4.1 Allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/18/14</td>
<td>Planning Commission Worksession</td>
<td>SEPA Scoping Summary/Review Draft supplemental EIS process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/18/14</td>
<td>Press Release 6977 for 09/24</td>
<td>Staff to brief commissioners on public input for growth plan update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/19/14</td>
<td>E-MAIL Invitation</td>
<td>E-invitation to attend BOCC WS on 09/24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/23/14</td>
<td>School Consortium Presentation</td>
<td>CFP Coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/24/14</td>
<td>BOCC Worksession</td>
<td>SEPA Scoping Summary, Issue Paper 4.1 Allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/01/14</td>
<td>Columbian Public Meeting Notice</td>
<td>Notice for Planning Commission worksessions through 12/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/02/14</td>
<td>Development Engineering Advisory Board</td>
<td>Update on GMA timeline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/02/14</td>
<td>E-MAIL Invitation</td>
<td>E-invitation to attend City/County Coordination meeting on 10/10 and notes 9/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/06/14</td>
<td>E-MAIL Information</td>
<td>E-City/County Coordination meeting notes 9/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/10/14</td>
<td>City/County Coordination</td>
<td>Alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/10/14</td>
<td>E-MAIL Invitation</td>
<td>Planning Commission Worksession 10/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>EVENT</td>
<td>TOPIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/13/14</td>
<td>Neighborhood Associations of Clark County</td>
<td>Update on GMA timeline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/13/14</td>
<td>Press Release 6992 for 10/29 and 10/30</td>
<td>County prepares more information on growth plan alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/13/14</td>
<td>E-MAIL Invitation</td>
<td>E-invitation to attend the open houses 10/29 and 10/30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/14/14</td>
<td>Camas Washougal Post Record</td>
<td>Public Notice for Alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/14/14</td>
<td>Camas Washougal Post Record</td>
<td>Open House Ad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/15/14</td>
<td>The Reflector</td>
<td>Public Notice for Alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/15/14</td>
<td>Columbian</td>
<td>Public Notice for Alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/15/14</td>
<td>The Reflector</td>
<td>Open House Ad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/15/14</td>
<td>Press Release 6994 for 10/22</td>
<td>Planners to brief commissioners on maps of growth plan proposals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/16/14</td>
<td>Planning Commission Worksession</td>
<td>Policies for Transportation, Alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/17/14</td>
<td>Columbian</td>
<td>Open House Ad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/17/14</td>
<td>Mailers to Property Owners</td>
<td>Open Houses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/19/14</td>
<td>Columbian</td>
<td>Open House Ad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/21/14</td>
<td>E-MAIL Invitation</td>
<td>E-invitation to attend BOCC WS on 10/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/22/14</td>
<td>BOCC Worksession</td>
<td>Alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/29/14</td>
<td>OPEN HOUSE: Alternative ~ Vancouver</td>
<td>Clark County Comprehensive Plan Alternatives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Clark County Comprehensive Plan 2016 Update
### Public Involvement Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>EVENT</th>
<th>TOPIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/30/14</td>
<td>OPEN HOUSE: Alternatives - Ridgefield</td>
<td>Clark County Comprehensive Plan Alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/06/14</td>
<td>Planning Commission Worksession</td>
<td>Alternatives Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/07/14</td>
<td>E-MAIL Invitation</td>
<td>E-invitation to attend City/County Coordination meeting on 11/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/14/14</td>
<td>E-MAIL Invitation Reminder</td>
<td>E-invitation to attend City/County Coordination meeting on 11/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/14/14</td>
<td>City/County Coordination</td>
<td>Alternative Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/26/14</td>
<td>E-MAIL CANCELLATION</td>
<td>E-Cancellation City/County Coordination meeting on 12/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/05/15</td>
<td>E-MAIL CANCELLATION</td>
<td>E-Cancellation City/County Coordination meeting on 1/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/15/15</td>
<td>E-MAIL Invitation</td>
<td>E-invitation to attend BOCC WS on 1/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/19/15</td>
<td>Facebook Post</td>
<td>Major zoning and land use plan in the works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/21/15</td>
<td>BOCC Worksession</td>
<td>PA response to CCCU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/27/15</td>
<td>E-MAIL CANCELLATION</td>
<td>E-Cancellation BOCC WS on 02/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/27/15</td>
<td>E-MAIL Invitation</td>
<td>E-invitation to attend City/County Coordination meeting on 2/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/30/15</td>
<td>Facebook Post</td>
<td>Clark County farms shrinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/03/15</td>
<td>BOCC Consent</td>
<td>City of Ridgefield request for UGA expansion for 102 acres designated AG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/04/15</td>
<td>E-MAIL Invitation Reminder</td>
<td>E-invitation to attend City/County Coordination meeting on 2/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/05/15</td>
<td>Development Engineering Advisory Board</td>
<td>GMA update</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Clark County Comprehensive Plan 2016 Update

### Public Involvement Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>EVENT</th>
<th>TOPIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02/06/15</td>
<td>E-MAIL City Request Letter</td>
<td>UGA boundary expansion letter due March 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/10/15</td>
<td>E-MAIL Invitation</td>
<td>E-invitation to attend BOCC WS on 2/18 (note rescheduled)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/11/15</td>
<td>Press Release 021115 for 02/18</td>
<td>Board to discuss an additional alternative for environmental review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/13/15</td>
<td>City/County Coordination</td>
<td>Stop Work order Draft SEIS, possibility of Alternative 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/17/15</td>
<td>Columbian Article</td>
<td>Clark County working on comprehensive growth plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/17/15</td>
<td>Facebook Post</td>
<td>Recognizing existing parcels - common sense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/18/15</td>
<td>Columbian Article</td>
<td>County plans for growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/18/15</td>
<td>BOCC Worksession</td>
<td>Alternative 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/18/15</td>
<td>Facebook Post</td>
<td>Rural Landowners - property rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/19/15</td>
<td>Columbian Article</td>
<td>Landowner group slams growth plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/23/15</td>
<td>Press Release 022315 for 03/11</td>
<td>Board to discuss scope of rural options in growth plan study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/23/15</td>
<td>E-MAIL Invitation</td>
<td>E-invitation to attend BOCC WS on 3/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/03/15</td>
<td>Columbian Article</td>
<td>Farmers, food advocates to rally for agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/04/15</td>
<td>Columbian Article</td>
<td>Farmers urge County Council to protect agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/05/15</td>
<td>Planning Commission Worksession</td>
<td>Comprehensive Plan Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/06/15</td>
<td>E-MAIL Invitation</td>
<td>E-invitation to attend City/County Coordination meeting on 3/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>EVENT</td>
<td>TOPIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/08/15</td>
<td>Columbian Article</td>
<td>County's 20-year plan due in 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/09/15</td>
<td>Facebook Post</td>
<td>Clark County to buy Fresh Farm Products from Northwest farms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/11/15</td>
<td>BOCC Worksession</td>
<td>Alternative 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/11/15</td>
<td>Facebook Post</td>
<td>Clark County finally fixing our out of date rural zoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/12/15</td>
<td>Columbian Article</td>
<td>County to send growth plan to public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/12/15</td>
<td>E-Information</td>
<td>City/County meeting notes from 2/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/13/15</td>
<td>City/County Coordination</td>
<td>SEPA Process #2, Buildable Lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/13/15</td>
<td>Press Release 031315</td>
<td>County sets open houses to expand scope of growth plan study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/16/15</td>
<td>E-MAIL Invitation</td>
<td>E-invitation to attend open houses 3/25, 4/1 and BOCC Hearing 4/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/17/15</td>
<td>Camas Washougal Post Record</td>
<td>Public Notice for (2) Open Houses on Alternatives and Board Hearing 4/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/17/15</td>
<td>Camas Washougal Post Record article</td>
<td>Open houses will expand scope of growth plan study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/18/15</td>
<td>The Reflector</td>
<td>Public Notice for (2) Open Houses on Alternatives and Board Hearing 4/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/18/15</td>
<td>Columbian</td>
<td>Public Notice for (2) Open Houses on Alternatives and Board Hearing 4/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/20/15</td>
<td>Facebook Post</td>
<td>Its' alive! The new proposed zoning maps for rural Clark County!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/20/15</td>
<td>The Grid</td>
<td>Alternative 4 posted on Board of Clark County Councilor webpage - The Grid March 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/20/15</td>
<td>E-MAIL Information</td>
<td>Comprehensive Plan Update ** website updated to include Alternative 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>EVENT</td>
<td>TOPIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/23/15</td>
<td>The Grid</td>
<td>Alternative 4 posted on Board of Clark County Councilor webpage - The Grid March 11 with new header</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/23/15</td>
<td>The Grid</td>
<td>Alternative 4 posted on Board of Clark County Councilor webpage - The Grid March 25 and April 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/25/15</td>
<td>Reflector Article</td>
<td>Rural landowners push for alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/25/15</td>
<td>Columbian Article</td>
<td>Madore planning proposal joins mix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/25/15</td>
<td>Reflector Legal Notice for 04/14</td>
<td>Issue Paper 4.2 Allocation (RES 2015-04-XX)-Amends (RES 2014-06-17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Issue Paper 5 and 5.1 SEPA Alternatives (RES 2015-04-XX)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/25/15</td>
<td>OPEN HOUSE: Alternatives ™ Ridgefield</td>
<td>Clark County Comprehensive Plan Alternatives #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/25/15</td>
<td>Facebook Post</td>
<td>Alternative 4 Plan enthusiastically embraced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/26/15</td>
<td>The Grid</td>
<td>Alternative 4a posted on Board of Clark County Councilor webpage - The Grid April 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/27/15</td>
<td>Facebook Post</td>
<td>Alternative 4 Plan enthusiastically embraced (edited post)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/27/15</td>
<td>The Grid</td>
<td>Alternative 4a removed from Board of Clark County Councilor webpage and Alternative 4 reposted - The Grid April 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/28/15</td>
<td>Columbian Article</td>
<td>New growth plan maps pulled from site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/31/15</td>
<td>E-MAIL Invitation</td>
<td>E-invitation to attend BOCC H on 4/14 and MapsOnline Tool updated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/01/15</td>
<td>Reflector Article</td>
<td>Area residents split on growth changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/01/15</td>
<td>Reflector Editorial</td>
<td>Alternative 4 wouldn't ruin rural life as we know it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/01/15</td>
<td>OPEN HOUSE: Alternatives ™ Hockinson</td>
<td>Clark County Comprehensive Plan Alternatives #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/03/15</td>
<td>E-MAIL Invitation</td>
<td>E-invitation to attend City/County Coordination meeting on 4/10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Clark County Comprehensive Plan 2016 Update
Public Involvement Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>EVENT</th>
<th>TOPIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>04/03/15</td>
<td>Facebook Post</td>
<td>Hockinson High School Open House - a great turnout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/08/15</td>
<td>Press Release 04082015</td>
<td>New online forum opens for community comment, participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/10/15</td>
<td>City/County Coordination</td>
<td>Buildable Lands Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/14/15</td>
<td>BOCC Hearing</td>
<td>Issue Paper 4.2 Allocation (RES 2015-04-XX)-Amends (RES 2014-06-17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Issue Paper 5 and 5.1 SEPA Alternatives (RES 2015-04-XX)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CLARK COUNTY
STAFF REPORT

DEPARTMENT: Community Planning

DATE: April 14, 2015

REQUEST: Approval of contract amendment with ESA for the completion of a supplemental environmental impact statement in support of the 2016 Clark County Comprehensive Plan update.

CHECK ONE: X Consent ______ CAO

BACKGROUND

Clark County is required to review and if necessary update its Comprehensive Growth Management Plan, with a deadline of June 30, 2016. One of the requirements of the update process is an analysis of potential environmental impacts from policy and land use changes proposed as part of the update.

The Board of County Commissioners approved a contract with ESA (of Seattle) on August 19, 2014 in the amount of $100,000 to complete a supplemental environmental impact statement (SEIS) as part of Clark County’s review and update of comprehensive plan. The contract specified that the analysis would be done on a no action alternative and no more than two action alternatives.

Four scoping meetings were held in August of 2014. The Board agreed on three alternatives at an October 22, 2014 work session. This information was given to ESA and work commenced on the SEIS. The proposed release date was set for February 4, 2015. At a work session on January 21, 2015, the Board requested that work on the SEIS be halted so that a fourth alternative be developed that was more responsive to requests from certain rural property owners.

The fourth alternative has now been developed. The contract with ESA needs to be amended so analysis of the fourth alternative can be added to the work already underway on the SEIS. Completing the draft SEIS with a fourth alternative will require an additional $41,267 in funding. The amendment will also extend the time of the contract.

Funds for this project will come from overall update funding. Details of the project are contained in the attached Professional Services Contract, Exhibit A.

COMMUNITY OUTREACH

None. The consultant was originally selected through a competitive bid process.

BUDGET AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS

Funds available to Community Planning will be used for the comprehensive plan update. Preparation of the SEIS will be funded as part of the update process per the contract agreement between ESA Inc. and Clark County dated August 19, 2014 and ending on March 31, 2016.
FISCAL IMPACTS

☒ Yes (see attached form) ☐ No

ACTION REQUESTED

Approval of the attached contract amendment with ESA in the amount of $41,267 to a supplemental EIS as outlined in RFP #675, with the County Administrator provided authority to sign any subsequent amendments thereto.

DISTRIBUTION

Please return both signed original contract documents to Community Planning.

ATTACHMENTS: Two original copies of the contract with ESA.

\[Signature\]

Name: Oliver Ojito
Title: Director

Approved:

CLARK COUNTY
BOARD OF COUNCILORS
FISCAL IMPACT ATTACHMENT

Part I: Narrative Explanation

The funds for the project were approved by the Board in the 2013-14 biennium budget for the completion of the comprehensive plan update. The deliverables to the county are those listed in Exhibit A of the attached contract amendment.

Part II: Estimated Revenues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund #/Title</th>
<th>Current Biennium</th>
<th>Next Biennium</th>
<th>Second Biennium</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GF</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>GF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. A – Describe the type of revenue (grant, fees, etc.)

Part III: Estimated Expenditures

III. A – Expenditures summed up

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund #/Title</th>
<th>FTE's</th>
<th>Current Biennium</th>
<th>Next Biennium</th>
<th>Second Biennium</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GF</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>GF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0001 000 545.558611.411 088156</td>
<td></td>
<td>$20,633.50</td>
<td>$20,633.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0001 000 545.558612.411 088156</td>
<td></td>
<td>$20,633.50</td>
<td>$20,633.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$41,267</td>
<td>$41,267</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. B – Expenditure by object category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund #/Title</th>
<th>Current Biennium</th>
<th>Next Biennium</th>
<th>Second Biennium</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GF</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>GF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary/Benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other controllables</td>
<td>$41,267</td>
<td>$41,267</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlays</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-fund Transfers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$41,267</td>
<td>$41,267</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3
Amendment No. 1 to Contract No. RFP #675  
Dated 8-19-14

Clark County, Washington, after this called “County,” a political subdivision of the State of Washington and Environmental Science Associates (ESA), after this called “Contractor,” entered into an agreement on August 19, 2014 for preparation of a supplemental environmental impact statement (SEIS) as part of the 2016 Clark County Comprehensive Plan update.

WITNESSETH

WHEREAS the Contractor provided most of the required services as outlined in the original scope of work; and

WHEREAS the contract allowed for extension when approved in writing; and

WHEREAS the scope of work for has changed in that the Board has asked for a fourth alternative to be considered in the SEIS in addition to the original three; and

WHEREAS the contract contemplated allowing more compensation by written agreement of the parties NOW, THEREFORE,

THE COUNTY AND THE CONTRACTOR HEREBY AMEND THE CONTRACT AS FOLLOWS:

1. Services. The Contractor shall perform the additional services as set forth in Exhibits A and C, which are attached hereto and incorporated herein.

2. Compensation. County shall pay the Contractor for services upon receipt of a written invoice. Fees paid to Contractor shall include those on the attached pay request dated April 3, 2015, which is attached hereto and incorporated herein as
Exhibit B, in the amount of $41,267, and when added to the original contract of $99,936 will not exceed a total contract amount of $141,563.


4. *Unamended Contract Provisions.* Except as explicitly revised by this Amendment No. 1, Contract No. RFP #675 between County and Contractor shall remain in full force and effect.

APPROVED AS TO FORM ONLY:

Anthony F. Golik  
Prosecuting Attorney

Christine Cook  
Deputy Prosecuting Attorney

CLARK COUNTY, WASHINGTON  
Board of County Councilors

David Madore, Chair

Jeanne E. Stewart, Councilor

Tom Mielke, Councilor

Environmental Science Associates

By

Title

(print name)
EXHIBIT A

SCOPE OF WORK - AMENDMENT

Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) for the 2016 Clark County Comprehensive Growth Management Plan Update

Project Understanding

Clark County is updating its 2007 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan, a process required by the Washington Growth Management Act (GMA). The GMA requires that jurisdictions identify and plan for projected growth through 2035. The purpose of this project is to develop a supplemental environmental impact statement (SEIS) for the Clark County Comprehensive Plan Update. The SEIS will be based on the DEIS and FEIS prepared for the 2007 plan update. The SEIS will inform the choices among alternative paths that the County could take in its planning policies and practices.

Through input during the public scoping process, Clark County has elected to add a fourth alternative to the SEIS. ESA proposes to amend the Preliminary Draft SEIS, submitted in February 2015, in compliance with the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA). The following narrative describes the additional work required to incorporate the fourth alternative into the tasks described in ESA’s previous scope of work. Only tasks requiring amendment are included. A separate cost schedule is provided in Exhibit B. A revised project timeline is provided in Exhibit C and is based upon receiving a notice to proceed on April 15, 2015.

General Assumptions

- Clark County is the lead agency for the SEPA SEIS;
- Unless otherwise stated, all deliverables will be provided in electronic format to the County Project Manager. Clark County will be responsible for production of hard copies;
- Clark County will provide GIS data files for the new alternative;
- Assistance from various Clark County agencies for information may be required;
- Assistance from utility and other service providers may also be required, and we assume that Clark County will be able to assist in obtaining access to key staff;
- Clark County will provide one consolidated set of comments for each review draft;
- Delays in end of comment periods and/or public hearings and other County proceedings may result in delays in delivery of ESA work products;
- The project is scheduled to conclude by December 31, 2015.

Scope of Work

Task 1 – Draft SEIS

Task 1.1 Develop Alternatives and Scope of SEIS Analysis

ESA will develop one additional alternative scenario for accommodating growth in Clark County. This will be done in coordination with County staff who will ensure recent Board policy decisions are accurately reflected.

Assumptions

a) No more than one additional Action Alternatives will be developed.

b) County staff will provide the parameters of proposed land use changes for Alternative 4.
**Deliverables**

1) Memorandum describing Alternative 4 and elements of the environment to be amended in the Draft SEIS document.

**Task 1.2 Prepare Preliminary Draft SEIS**

This task involves revisions to the previously submitted (February 2015) environmental analysis for the comprehensive plan. It will rely on GIS-based data and graphics to convey information. For each element of the environment analyzed in the Revised Preliminary Draft SEIS, ESA will describe the affected environment, analyze potential impacts and propose mitigation measures.

The analysis of potential impacts will consider direct, indirect, long-term, short-term, and cumulative impacts of Alternative 4, including a general analysis of potential capital facilities in each of the jurisdictions. ESA will compare the impacts of the No-Action Alternative to Alternative 4. The analysis of potential impacts will be general and qualitative given the programmatic nature of the actions, i.e., implementation of policy options. After impacts are disclosed, mitigation measures will be proposed as appropriate.

The Revised Preliminary Draft SEIS will be provided to Clark County for internal review.

**Assumptions**

a) The analysis will supplement that provided in the February 2015 Preliminary Draft SEIS_v2.

**Deliverables**

1) One electronic version of the Preliminary Draft SEIS_v3 for internal County review.

**Task 1.3 Prepare Public Review Draft SEIS**

ESA will incorporate Alternative 4 and produce a revised version of the Preliminary Draft SEIS referred to as Draft SEIS_v3 for final approval. Minor revisions will be incorporated into a Draft SEIS_v4 for public review. ESA will organize the document into a format that is readily accessible both electronically and as hard-copy.

**Assumptions**

a) Clark County will provide one consolidated set of comments on the Preliminary Draft SEIS_v3 within two weeks of receipt of the PDSEIS_v3;

b) ESA will participate in one (1) coordination meeting with County staff to review their comments on the PDSEIS_v3;

c) County comments on the Preliminary Draft SEIS_v3 will not result in changes to the alternatives without revision to this scope and budget;

d) Clark County will provide one consolidated set of comments on the camera-ready Draft SEIS_v4 within 3 days of receipt of the DSEIS_v4; the comments will be minor;

e) Clark County will be responsible for notification, publication, and distribution of electronic and hard-copy documents.

**Deliverables**

1) One electronic camera-ready version of the camera ready Draft SEIS_v4 for final internal County review.

2) One electronic pdf printer-ready version of the Public Review Draft SEIS_v4 for hard-copy production; and one electronic bookmarked version for on-line viewing and publication as a CD.
Task 3 – Public Involvement & City Coordination

Additional time and effort for Alternative 4 is anticipated for coordination with County staff to provide the County Councilors, other jurisdictions, and community members with revised information on the project alternatives, process and opportunities to provide input.

Assumptions
a) ESA will not be required to attend additional SEIS scoping meetings;

Task 4 – Project Management

Task 4.1 Project Team Coordination

This task incorporates additional time and effort for both ESA Team and Clark County team communication and coordination to ensure a smooth working relationship. Coordination will be required to refine the project description and analysis of Alternative 4.

ESA staff will attend a meeting with Clark County staff to obtain an overview of Alternative 4 and to better understand the County’s goals for integration in the Revised Draft SEIS.

Task 4.2 Progress Reports & Invoicing

ESA will require additional time to prepare and submit monthly invoices and progress reports, due to the extended project timeline.

Deliverables
1) Monthly invoices and progress reports.
EXHIBIT C

Project Timeline

Revised as of April 9, 2015

The following deliverable dates are approximated and subject to change based on coordination with the County as well as County review times. Delays in end of comment periods and/or public hearings and other County proceedings may result in delays in delivery of ESA work products

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Notice to Proceed with Amended Scope of Work</td>
<td>April 15, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised Preliminary Draft SEIS_v3</td>
<td>May 13, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Draft SEIS_v4 (camera ready)</td>
<td>June 10, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft SEIS_v4 for Public Review</td>
<td>July 1, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-day Comment Period</td>
<td>August 14, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Final SEIS_v1</td>
<td>November 1, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised Preliminary Final SEIS_v2 (camera ready)</td>
<td>December 1, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final SEIS</td>
<td>February 1, 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ATTACHMENT B

### ESA Budget Estimate

**Version:** Proposed amendment for Alternative #4

**Project No.:** D140506  
**Project Title:** Comp Plan SEIS  
**Client:** Clark County  
**Date of Est.:** April 9, 2015

**Project Manager:** Sharese Graham  
**Contract No.:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task 1</strong></td>
<td>Draft SEIS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Natural Environment</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Built Environment</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Revise DSEIS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Finalize DSEIS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Task 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$7,400</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task 2</strong></td>
<td>Final SEIS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Final SEIS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Revise Final SEIS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Finalize Final SEIS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Task 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>34</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$4,100</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task 3</strong></td>
<td>Public Process &amp; City Coordination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Task 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$2,620</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task 4</strong></td>
<td>Project Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Task 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$3,760</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Hours</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>336</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$40,960</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reimbursable Expenses:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodging</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mileage (340 mi/ft)</td>
<td></td>
<td>340</td>
<td>$0.55</td>
<td>$187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Reimbursables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$307</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$41,267</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>