

**JOINT BOCC/PC MINUTES OF PUBLIC HEARING
2016 COMP PLAN UPDATE
THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 3, 2015**

Public Services Center
BOCC Hearing Room
1300 Franklin, 6th Floor
Vancouver, Washington
6:00 p.m.

CALL TO ORDER

MADORE: Good evening, and welcome to the September 3, 2015, joint public hearing of the Board of Clark County Councilors and Planning Commission. Please rise for the pledge of allegiance. Thank you. You may be seated. We'll start out with the introductions going around the table. Gordy, you can start.

EULER: I'm Gordy Euler with Clark County Community Planning.

GRAHAM: Sharese Graham with Environmental Science Associates.

COOK: I'm Christine Cook. I'm a Deputy Prosecuting Attorney for the County.

ORJIAKO: And I'm Oliver Orjiako, Community Planning Director.

MIELKE: Tom Mielke, County Councilor.

STEWART: Jeanne Stewart, County Councilor.

MADORE: And we skipped our County Manager, Mark McCauley, who's checking to see if we can have public access for the Wi-Fi network. We'll let you know if he's successful in that.

I'm David Madore, Clark County Council.

MORASCH: Steve Morasch, County Planning Commission.

BARCA: Ron Barca, Planning Commission.

BLOM: John Blom, County Planning Commission.

WRIGHT: Bill Wright, County Planning Commission.

JOHNSON: Karl Johnson, County Planning Commission.

MADORE: Okay. Thank you very much. The purpose of this evening is to make sure that we receive testimony from you. It's our turn to hear from you.

There are two opportunities for the citizens to make sure you've been heard. This is one of two meetings, September 3. If you testify here, you have an opportunity to speak for three minutes. Thank you. There will be another opportunity, an identical meeting essentially, September 10 at the same time, same location, here at 6:00 p.m. as well.

If you testify tonight, the idea is that you've been heard, so leave opportunity for someone else to testify on the 10th. It's not an election. So speaking more won't help what we're doing as we're trying to make sure that each issue, each point, each insight that you can offer us will be heard. So take a turn tonight. You can invite your friends and neighbors to make sure they've been heard next week.

The time for -- that's the two opportunities for verbal testimony. And at the end of the meeting next week, that will be the end of that opportunity. There will be an opportunity still for written testimony, and that ends one week later on the 17th of this month.

If you have a what could potentially be a conflict of interest, which I think translates to are you a member of the Planning Commission, we would just like you to note that and let us know if you think you can proceed with your testimony or make with a -- make decisions if you participate or if you should recuse yourself. And if there be any question or any insight from that, we invite Chris. Chris, do you want to add anything to that? Chris is our --

COOK: No. I was just going to add that that comment was not directed towards people in the audience.

MADORE: Oh.

COOK: Just the Planning Commission and decision-makers.

MADORE: Yes. Can everybody hear okay? That's a reminder. You can all hear okay? Raise your hand if you cannot hear very well. Okay. I don't see any hands, so I think the audio system is working well.

If for some reason one of us doesn't speak up to the microphone well enough and you can't hear, remind us, raise your hand or go like this and help us to see, oh, we've got to get this device closer to us and we can speak louder so you can hear. It is being recorded on CTV and it will be posted I assume on The Grid. And so anyone not here tonight can watch this at any time thereafter, and the same thing for next week. Okay.

The opportunity -- we ask each person to stay to the three-minute time frame. We've been extending grace at times in the past for our normal hearings, but there are a number of people that want to speak tonight, and so we need to be more rigid tonight and we ask that you please pay attention. And when you hear -- there is two beeps that show up first. And the beep -- I'm sorry -- one beep -- and we're going to use our timer, right, our standard timer?

EULER: Sonja --

MADORE: Sonja can run our timer for us.

EULER: -- are we using the timer?

MADORE: I think we need to. So while they're sorting that out, if they can get the timer, somebody to operate it, normally at 2 minutes and 30 seconds you'll hear beep, and that says you got 30 seconds to wrap up. When you hear two beeps, that says your time's up, it's time to be respectful of others. And so wrap it up between the one beep and the two beeps since it says you're done even on that.

And by the way, if you've already heard someone speak and say the same thing, rather than you saying the same thing, you can simply say I agree with what was said and it's been covered, so you don't have to repeat it. It's not an election. The number of times that you say something doesn't really influence because there's 450,000 people out there and we want to make sure that each point gets heard rather than a number of points times how many people said it.

Oh, okay. If you want to access the Internet, or should I say via our Wi-Fi, there is a way to do so. There is a user name -- well, first of all, you've got to turn on your Wi-Fi. I'll give you a moment here to know how to do that. So you go to your Wi-Fi at it will ask and it says Clark - you'll identify this - I think it says Clark Guest.

There is a user name. It's BOCC, that stands for Board of Clark County Councilors, Wi-Fi, boccwifi@clark.wa.gov, and you're going to need a password. It's all upper case except for one character. The password is S like Sam, like Sierra, and the number 4, lower case z like zebra, all the rest of the characters are upper case, AUN like Nancy, D like David, that's S4zAUND, z is lower case. If anyone else needs this and you missed it, we'll make sure it's out at the table out there so you can get it.

MCCAULEY: If you have trouble, I'll come and help you get on.

MADORE: Great. So if you need help, raise your hand and somebody will help you with that. Okay. Have we covered everything and now you're ready, Oliver, to present? Okay. Then you have the floor, sir.

MORASCH: Well, should we do the conflicts first or --

MADORE: Yes. Okay. Good. Feel free to speak up to make sure we cover all the basis because we don't know what we don't know.

MORASCH: You mentioned the conflict of interest first, and I had one I just wanted to disclose to the audience, you know, before we, you know, start the public hearing.

I'm an attorney by day at the Landerholm Law Firm, and I'm sure my law firm has, you

know, many clients that may or may not be affected by, you know, the new comp plan, but there's two in particular I was going to point out. One is a friend of mine, Monte Phillips, called me, oh, several months ago just for some general advice. He owns AG-20 property and just for some general advice. I didn't actually open a file to represent him.

HOLLEY: Closer to the microphone.

MORASCH: Do I need to sit closer to this? Is that better? Okay. So anyway, as I was saying, I have a friend with AG-20 property and he called with some general advice. I have a client south of Ridgefield that also owns AG-20 property. And at some point, both of these individuals may be seeking inclusion in the UGB, but not presently this cycle, that would be something in a future cycle.

But one of these individuals is in favor of Alternatives 2 and 4, and one of them is actually opposed to Alternatives 2 and 4. So I've got people on both sides of the issue that are either friends or clients and I just wanted to disclose that. I don't think it is going to be a conflict of interest that's going to, you know, interfere or affect my ability to render a decision in this matter, but I wanted to disclose it on the record. Thank you.

MADORE: Okay. Anyone else want to speak to the conflict of interest potential issue? Okay.

COOK: I have a question. And since you're not representing either of these people in this comp plan update, I assume that you don't think that that affects your fairness in listening to the testimony and to making a decision based on the law?

MORASCH: That's correct.

COOK: Okay. Thanks.

MADORE: Okay. I'd like to add one thing also, and that is what not to expect tonight. What not to expect is a two-way dialogue between us. If you ask questions, this is really not the time for us to answer those questions. We will take your questions and we'll collect those and we will provide written answers to those questions. And if you don't get an opportunity here, or if you're listening at home and you want to be able to make sure that you submit that, you can submit that via e-mail. Is that right, Oliver?

ORJIAKO: That's correct.

MADORE: What e-mail address would they send it to?

ORJIAKO: It will be www.clark.wa/planning.

MADORE: Okay. That's the website. What's the e-mail then? They can click there in order to get to the e-mail address?

ORJIAKO: It will get to us, yes.

MADORE: Okay. So that was clark.wa.gov/planning?

ORJIAKO: Yes.

MADORE: Okay. All right. Very good. I think -- yes, ma'am.

STEWART: If we could just briefly describe the difference between the meeting we're having tonight on the 3rd and next week on the 10th. So that are we going to cover the same material in both meetings and just give the interested parties two different dates where they can come and testify, or are we going to be discussing different material?

MADORE: And that's a good question. And, Oliver, you're shaking your head. In other words, these two meetings are identical.

ORJIAKO: That's correct.

MADORE: And it just gives the citizens two identical opportunities to be heard and be exposed to the same information. So there's nothing different about these two meetings. It's just some people might be able to have a -- might have a conflict of interest in or not be able -- not a conflict of interest -- might have a schedule conflict or might find a more convenient time next week.

ORJIAKO: That's correct.

MADORE: Okay. All right. So, Oliver, you're going to present an overview, and then we'll open it up for public comment; is that correct?

ORJIAKO: That is correct. And good evening, Councilor members and members of the Planning Commission. For the record, my name is Oliver Orjiako, the Clark County Community Planning Director.

So what I will do this evening is just provide the Council and members of the Planning Commission an overview of the proposal of the hearing tonight, and then Gordy will go over the highlights of the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement, and then the Council or the Board will open it up for public testimony.

Before I do that, let me walk the Councilors and the Planning Commission members what is in your packet. The packet was submitted for this hearing. The first tab is the staff report. The second tab is the actual Draft Environmental Impact Statement dated August 15th. The third tab are all the comments that we've received at the date of the staff report which was dated August 27th.

We purposely left Tab 4 and 5 blank so that as we receive comments, you can insert them in Tab 4 and 5. I can say that you did receive additional comments today. So please,

Councilors and members of the Planning Commission, if you don't have that, let us know, but the comments that you receive today, please insert that in Tab 4.

We have comments scheduled to be closed on the 17th of this month. So there will be additional comments coming in, and we would like you to have a copy of that and read it, and particularly for the Planning Commission members, that will help you in your deliberations starting on the 17th of this month. And we, staff, will also have access to that.

And I'm glad that our consultant are here or is here from ESA. They will also receive all these comments and that will help us in responding to when the Planning Commission makes a recommendation to the Board on the preferred alternative and the Board choosing -- after deliberating on the recommendation of the Planning Commission, choosing a preferred alternative. All the comments that we receive relating to this process - particularly the DEIS - will be responded to in the final document. Just want to make that very clear.

As Councilor Madore indicated, the purpose of this joint Planning Commission and Board of County Councilors hearing is to take testimony on the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement relating to the Clark County 2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan Update.

You hear me say this often, Clark County is a GMA county. We are required to fully plan under the State statute. That State statute requires Clark County by RCW 36.70A.130(5)(b) to on or before June 30th, 2016, and every eight years thereafter to review, and if necessary, to update the existing comprehensive growth plan. So that's what we are operating under. We are required by the State statute to complete review and, if necessary, update the current comprehensive plan and to submit our plan to the State on or before June 30th, 2016.

We, when I say "we," I mean the County and staff from all the local jurisdiction - this case cities - began the plan update in 2013 with the Board of County Councilors. The Board provided us directions and decisions on population projections, jobs, planning assumptions and public participation process.

The Board also I believe in 2014 suspended the site-specific annual review or plan amendment cycle for 2015 and 2016. Staff used those decisions in collaboration with partners, stakeholders and the public to develop alternative or options to study and present for public hearing. So that's part of the process that get us to here.

In terms of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, the DSEIS, was developed in accordance with the State Environmental Policy Act known as SEPA under RCW 43.21C.120 and RCW 43.21C.135, Requirements. I will not go in details in terms of the summary of all the alternative, Gordy will do that, but I will say that the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement provides a project description, summary evaluation of all of the four alternatives to manage growth to 2035.

So let me turn it over to Gordy to go over the PowerPoint presentation and provide a detail overview or highlight of the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement, then we'll open it up for public testimony. Gordy.

EULER: Thank you, Oliver. For the record, I'm Gordy Euler with Clark County Community Planning. To reiterate, the purpose of tonight's hearing is to take your comments, public comment, on the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement, and that's something we're required to do as part of the comprehensive plan update process. This is, as Oliver said, by the State Environmental Policy Act. And completing the SEPA process moves us one step closer to completing the 2016 comprehensive plan update.

We schedule these hearings to do several things. One, we held them in the evening so to maximize our turn out. The second thing is to give folks two nights to come and testify rather than just saying you have to come here. And the other thing we did is we've, with the approval of both the Board and the Planning Commission, we're holding a joint hearing so that you only have to give your testimony once. You don't have to come and speak and give your testimony twice. So that's the reason that these hearings are structured the way they are.

So next. The first slide. So I'm going to give a brief overview of our progress to date, talk about the chronology of the SEPA process, just brief highlights of what the alternatives are and kind of what the next steps and then it will be your turn to speak.

So as Oliver indicated, the Board decided on a population target and several other planning assumptions early in 2014. And these are in the DSEIS as Table 1-1. If you have the document, it's on Page 1-2. The population target was revised by the Board in 2015 of this year. As most of us know, the Growth Management Act requires that urban growth areas contain a 20-year land supply. And using of the vacant and buildable lands model that the County has developed, it was determined given the population target and jobs target that the Board picked, that we had enough land inside current urban growth areas to accommodate that growth through 2035, which is this planning horizon.

And as Oliver pointed out, we've worked closely with our city partners, many of whom are here tonight and who will speak, as collaboration and consultation with our city partners is one of the main tenets of the Growth Management Act.

So why a supplemental EIS? In 2007 many of you may remember UGAs - that's urban growth areas - were expanded by about 12,000 acres, 19-square miles, and we did a full Environmental Impact Statement at that time on the potential impacts of urbanizing that much land. Unfortunately, we had a recession - don't have to speak to what happened there - but most of the land that we brought in in 2007 is still there, it's still in urban growth areas, it's available to be developed. And given that UGAs don't need to be expanded - again we've got enough land to accommodate 20 years of population and jobs - we made a decision to re-adopt the 2007 EIS and to prepare a supplemental

document that looks at changes that we're proposing for the 2016 update.

So this was a document, this was the final supplemental environmental impact -- Final Environmental Impact Statement that was prepared in 2007. The document you're speaking to tonight is a supplement to this document because we've already -- because we're not proposing to expand urban growth areas. We've already documented the impacts of what development, full development would be in this document, so...

A little bit of a chronology of how we got to where we are tonight. Back in July of 16, July 16th - this is in 2014 - we began discussions with the Board about EIS alternatives. We did a notice of scoping and a notice of re-adoption of the 2007 EIS also in July.

In August we had a contract was let -- we hired ESA as the consulting firm to help us prepare the supplemental. We held four scoping meetings. Those are the dates are there. In September, we had another, we presented the scoping report. And in October of last year, the three alternatives were agreed upon by the Board at a work session.

We had two more open houses at that point in October. And in October, ESA commenced work on the draft. So the issuance date that was originally for February 4th of this year, I think the dates there is what we were planning on.

So next slide. In January at a Board work session, the Board asked that we hold a process while we developed a fourth alternative. And there were work sessions on the fourth alternative in February and March, and we had a couple of more open houses on a potential fourth alternative. And the Board in April then by resolution salvaged the EIS, the DSEIS would cover four alternatives. ESA went to work.

On August 5th, the draft was issued, available primarily online, but we did put hardcopies of the documents at city halls and at the various branch libraries. We had a work session with the Planning Commission on August 20th. And then the rest of the dates you can see we've already touched on. Tonight's joint Board/PC public hearing. We're doing this again next Thursday night as Councilor Madore said, 6:00 p.m. for those that couldn't be here tonight.

The comment period ends on September 17th. That's actually the same day the Planning Commission will begin their deliberations and discussion on picking a preferred alternative. And at this point, October 20th is a scheduled Board hearing date basically to do the same thing.

Once a preferred alternative is picked, we prepare a Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement that talks about what the effects would be. We'd begin to work then on a capital facilities plan and move towards a comp plan adoption.

Next slide. I'm not going to spend a lot of time on these. There are maps in the hall. They're in the packet. They're in the EIS. They're on The Grid. So Alternative 1, when it says "No action," it really means we're going to maintain the status quo, we don't have to

take an action I guess, so... And we talk about, this graphic shows a comprehensive plan map and a zoning map. What you'll see in the hallway is a zoning map for the County.

Alternative 2 does a number of things. This is - I'm not going to talk about each one of these individually - but there are a number of map clean ups, technical changes. We're proposing to establish a public facility zone, but none of these expand the boundary in Alternative 2. Perhaps the from the environmental perspective the biggest change would be a proposal to change the minimum parcel size from agricultural parcels from 20 acres to 10 acres, and from Forest Resources from 40 acres to 20 acres. Again, these are kind of County sponsored, County initiated actions, so...

Let's just roll through these. Go up to Alternative 3. Keep going. Alternative 3 are we went to our city partners and said we, the County, aren't interested in expanding the boundary, but are you interested? And we heard from four of the cities to add collectively about I think 250 or 260 acres. Battle Ground wants a piece for jobs there. La Center wants a piece for jobs and for a school district site. Next slide. Ridgefield and Washougal, they are interested in small areas for residential expansion. So essentially that's Alt 3.

Alternative 4, this proposes to make changes to rural and resource lands in the county. The -- again, the maps are in the hall if you want to study this in more detail. The map on the left, there is agricultural lands. The proposal here is to make AG-5 and AG-10 zones in agricultural designation and do away with the AG-20 minimum parcel size. In forest, which is the map on the right, in addition to the Forest 40 and Forest 80-acre zones that we have, the proposal is to add a 10 acre and a 20-acre zone.

Next slide. And this is rural lands in the county. The proposal here is to do away with the R-10 and R-20 and to add an R-1 which is one acre, R-2.5 and in addition then and keep the R-5. So pretty much those are the proposals in Alt 4.

Next slide. I wanted to specifically highlight this table. There's been some confusion around what this is actually telling us. And this the table should really be titled Potential New Rural Lots Allowable Under Each Alternative if that helps clarify it. So roughly if under the no action, or if the County took no action, today there is if everybody in the rural area developed or subdivided their parcels to what is allowed by their zoning, there could be 7,000 lots created in the rural area. That's what this says.

Under Alternative 2, that goes up to 8200 and change. The reason that goes up is that because of AG-20 going to AG-10 and Forest 40 going to Forest 20, there would be a potential to create more lots.

Alternative 3, the number actually goes down a little bit because here we're proposing to move some area from the county into urban growth areas, so there's a small decrease in the number of lots.

In Alternative 4 as proposed, in addition to the 7,000, there would add about 54, roughly 5400 lots. So the idea is to keep these, in terms of looking at all of the alternatives, even if we did nothing, there's still the potential to create 7,000, more than 7,000 lots in the rural area.

So next slide. These are just the summaries that are this table S-2 which are in the impact statement. Let's scroll through these. There's Earth Resources. There's Transportation. There's fish and wildlife. Go ahead, scroll through them. Next slide. A lot of resources. Keep going. Fish and Wildlife Resources, and these are all in the Draft EIS. Keep going. Energy and Natural Resources. Keep going. Land and Shoreline Use. And then we should have Transportation and Public Facilities.

Okay. Next slide. In terms of our next steps, this is kind of a timeline. We've touched on this. Here we are in the upper right-hand corner, joint Council and Planning Commission hearing on Draft SEIS, the next two Thursdays. Comment period ends on the 17th of September, and the Planning Commission will begin their deliberations and make a recommendation on the preferred alternative. The same scenario for the Board, that's tentatively scheduled for October 20th.

ESA will take the information then, the comments, and prepare a Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement. I don't know whether that will be December, it says so on this slide. We have to notify Commerce then. There's some other things that aren't on here like the capital facilities plan, but 60-day Commerce notification. And the goal is to be done, NLT is no later than, June 30th of 2016.

So next slide. This is all the places that you can comment. There's a number of ways you can do it. You could go online. There's the website. And there's actually from there there's a form you can click on and fill out, submit a comment. We're using Peak Democracy which is a public involvement tool, again there's the website for that. And we'll leave -- when we get done with the presentation, we'll leave this slide up.

You can do an e-mail, it's comp.plan@clark.wa.gov. If you like to write letters and want to put a stamp on it and submit it in an envelope, you can do that. That's kind of fun to get every now and again is an envelope from somebody that's handwritten or typewritten, there's the address. And of course you've got the opportunity to testify tonight and next Thursday night. So let's see. I think that's it.

Next slide. All right. Good. So that concludes my presentation, Mr. Chair. Let's go back one slide. Nope. Let's go back to that last slide if we can. There we go. So people can copy it and copy the e-mail addresses or any of the addresses down. These are in the document, these are on the website, but that concludes my presentation.

MADORE: Okay. Thank you very much. When you do testify, you do not need to give your address. Most everybody here provided some means for us to communicate with you either with your physical address or your e-mail, it's not necessary, you don't need to state it here. Just simply do clearly state your name. I guess that's mainly the

instructions.

Three minutes. We do have our timer working. And what we'll do is we'll just have you start out and call one person, and actually two people at a time. The first person will speak first, and the other person will be waiting for their turn, that way we don't have to wait every time.

We do have two Number 1 sheets here. We have a Number 1 sheet for elected officials, we have three individuals signed up there. And then we have a Number 1 sheet that starts out with citizens. So I'll start with the first elected official, Ron Onslow followed by Anne McEnerny-Ogle.

HOLLEY: Could they spell their names too, because otherwise I have to look them up and it takes a lot of time. Sometimes you can't read their writing. So if they could spell their names so I'm not looking them up.

MADORE: So when you speak your name and you spell your name, we won't start the timer until you're done with that. So do spell your name because we have a word-by-word, letter-by-letter notes being taken. Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

ONSLow: Hi. My name is Ron Onslow, O-n-s-l-o-w. And thank you very much, and it's great to be before the Planning Commission and the Council. Just a little tidbit of information about Ridgefield.

We had a guy moving out of town, I just can't imagine why. But anyway, we had a planning commission seat open. I had 12 applicants which is -- and they're phenomenal, which is just great. I have never seen such a great return on that, so it's really exciting to interview all of them.

Supporting Ridgefield's, my comments would be we support Alternative 3. According to the analysis under Alternative 1, 7,000 new lots can be created; and Alternative 3 would be 7,000 lots to be created. The impacts are similar; however, the DSEIS evaluates the city's requested expansion as low, medium and mixed use residential, that's not the zoning requested by Ridgefield and skews the analysis of potential impacts. So that should be taken into account.

And then I'll just give you my bullet points and then we will follow that up with a formal letter that we will submit so that you'll have that. Division of large parcels immediately outside our jurisdiction will impact future economic development opportunities. We ask for a thorough economic analysis of this potential impact to urban areas resulting from parcel fragmentation. The other thing is new parcels outside the Ridgefield UGA will have an impact on our transportation network.

The DCSEIS states infrastructure costs would be prohibitive for Alternative 2; and

Alternative 4 has cumulatively greater impacts. So more impacts and more expenses to the city with those alternatives. And under Alternatives 2 or 4, with an increased number of households in the rural area surrounding Ridgefield, our police and fire services will really be impacted.

The city must and would like to see a detailed analysis of these costs to maintain current levels of service and response times for emergency services. Water and septic services under Alternatives 2 and 4 will face significant impacts. An analysis of current capacity of groundwater resources is necessary as this makes clear there is an increased chance of groundwater contamination where rural housing is increased. And thank you very much for listening to me.

MADORE: Very good. Anne.

MCENERNY-OGLE: Anne McEnery-Ogle, A-n-n-e, M-c-E-n-e-r-n-y hyphen O-g-l-e. Good evening. Good evening Councilors and Commissioners. While I'm a councilor for the City of Vancouver, I was also a planning commissioner for the city for five years.

As the City of Vancouver continues our work with our comp plan, we wanted to provide an overall long-term vision and policy direction for managing the built and natural environment in Vancouver while providing the necessary public facilities, but our plan is also intended to coordinate development and to smooth the transition of services between the incorporated and unincorporated in urban areas as annexation is considered. We want to make sure that our comp plan is consistent with the concepts put forward in your adopted plan so that development can occur at varying densities throughout the region.

As you know, the GMA requires jurisdictions to include capital facilities and utility elements in their comp plans. Under the GMA, water service is one of the public utilities which is subject to the concurrency requirement. Development may not be approved unless plans are in place and financing secured, and at the same time we cannot decrease our current levels of service below our established standards.

The RCW identifies concurrency and requires us to adopt a level of service standard. I'm sure you know that virtually all of the water used in Clark County supplied by both private and public systems come from underground sources. And although adequate water can be found in most parts of the county, aquifers capable of providing large amounts of water for long periods of time are few.

The principal aquifers are in the southern part of the county along the Columbia River, and surface water is not a desirable source of water because it requires more extensive treatment prior to use than groundwater does. Providing an adequate supply of water to meet future demand is essential to ensure the continued growth and economic vitality of our county. Because many of the most readily available sources have been developed, new sources will need to be found.

In the past, waterlines were extended to serve development with little consideration of the expected ultimate density of an area. As a result, there are areas with water service which will need to be upgraded in order to support additional development, and this is particularly in case when water for fire suppression is considered.

Two of your proposed changes create sweeping impacts to urban areas. Alternative 4 allows for the creation of more than 12,000 new lots throughout the rural area, almost twice as many as the current zoning allows. It increases zoning densities on over 100-square miles of land; Vancouver is 50-square miles. Alternative 2, 2,000 new. Alternatives 2 and 4 both have potentially prohibitive infrastructure costs. And since the EIS lacks basic information on the location or implications of those impacts, we're prevented from being able to give reasonable input on those rural changes.

MADORE: Anne, your time is up.

MCENERNY-OGLE: We're not able to determine the level of service within the changes especially for water treatment.

MADORE: Ma'am, your time is up.

MCENERNY-OGLE: Thank you.

MADORE: Thank you. Jim Irish.

IRISH: Good evening, Councilors and Planning Commissioners. My name is Jim Irish, I-r-i-s-h. I'm mayor of the City of La Center. I'm here tonight to submit written comments on behalf of the City of La Center on Clark County's Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement.

Before I submit our written comments, I would like to say that the City of La Center is in support of Alternative 3 because it will help us create jobs and it will assist La Center's school district in providing space for an increasing number of children in their elementary school. Alternative 1, 2 and 4 do not directly help La Center in creating new jobs, and will not prevent the city from falling short of the countywide jobs to housing balance.

Our written comments also address a few technical mapping errors, along with some of the more substantive comments requesting that a more robust assessment of actual impacts, financial burdens to local governments, the groundwater, septic, soils and transportation be addressed in the next iteration of the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement. Please note that the City of La Center is looking forward to working cooperative toward the coordinated growth management plan. Thank you for your time.

MADORE: Thank you, sir.

IRISH: And you don't get to ding me.

MADORE: You beat the clock. Chuck Green followed by Howard Jones.

GREEN: Good evening. Chuck Green. I live on 170th Street in Ridgefield. G-r-e-e-n, just like the color. And I am a candidate for Clark County Council District 2, and so I'm speaking tonight both as a candidate as well as a citizen of Clark County in District 2.

My first thing I want to say is I want to reiterate a request I made back in April. I am running to be one of those seats that are going to be up at the table. And at this point, the preferred alternative decision is going to be made before we have seats at the table. So I'm requesting that any -- that a delay on the adoption of a preferred alternative until we have both new councilors seated in January. By making a decision before then, you've left out probably a third of the geographic area of the county, and as much as a quarter of the population being represented in those decisions.

How do you do that and still meet State mandates? I'm suggesting that you adopt the current comprehensive plan as call it an interim plan, but adopt it, re-adopt it for up to two years and work on developing the preferred alternative with the two new councilors. That being said, I do have input on the EIS and I've provided that in my handout.

Just to give you a little bit of my qualifications. I was the County's transportation manager back in the '90s. I've worked on every comprehensive plan update that this county has had since the 1994 adoption. My involvement with the 2007 plan was leading the Ridgefield and Washougal transportation plans. So in this - my handout - I have taken the EIS and the land use alternatives and attempted to quantify some of the differences between the four alternatives.

I am concerned that 2, Alternatives 2 and 4 will increase rural traffic. When I was at the County, I co-led with the RTC, Regional Transportation Council, rural arterial study and not much has been done since then to improve rural arterials. Yet, Alternatives 2 and 4, especially Alternative 4 with the creation of up to 12,000 new lots without a public transportation system, bike, shoulders for bicycling or ability to walk to land uses will increase automobile traffic on rural arterials that are substandard, and in some cases, high accident locations.

So my proposal is that we work on trying to pull together the best of each of the alternatives into what I call a value based plan when you have the two new councilors sitting at the table. I'd be happy to facilitate those discussions because I think there are merits for each of the alternatives that we can pull into what I would call a value based alternative, but we have the appropriate stakeholders at the table and you'll be hearing from a lot of those stakeholders tonight who I think should be at the table. So again, I thank you for your time and thank you for your participation and your involvement with our government.

MADORE: Thank you. Howard Jones.

JONES: Yes. My name is Howard Jones, you spell that J-o-n-e-s. When I bought my property on NE Kelly Road, it was zoned two and a half acres. In '97 with no notice whatsoever to me, it was changed from two and a half to R-5. I only own 9.23. So you've got me right between a rock and a hard spot. I can't sell it. I can't develop it. I can't literally do anything with it.

And all I'm asking is for it to be put into Alternative 4 so I have a chance of getting it -- everything on the south side of my property is two and a half acres. Everything on the north side was 20-acre forest until one year ago. I'm in R-5, and I really don't think that's right that I would be singled out with one strip of 9.23 acres into R-5 when the land below me is two and a half and the land above me is 20 until, up until one year ago. And that's all I'm asking for is for Alternative 4 so I do have a chance some day. I'm only 80. I got time to go of getting it back to two and a half acres so I can sell it. Thank you.

MADORE: Thank you. Donald Mclsaac followed by Carol Levanen.

MCISAAC: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Councilors and Commissioners and staff. For the record my name is Donald Mclsaac, D-o-n-a-l-d, last name M-c-l-s-a-a-c. I'm a landowner in rural Clark County, and I'm here to testify on behalf of my family members, neighbors and friends who also own property in rural Clark County.

My primary goal here is to speak in favor of Alternative 4 conceptually, but to say that it needs to be improved, refined and enhanced to better provide reasonable growth management opportunities in rural areas. I urge you to focus on Alternative 4 for rural areas from this point forward and not Alternative 1 or Alternative 2 in setting your preferred alternative for rural areas later this fall -- in settling on your preferred alternatives later this fall.

For example, I urge you to improve Alternative 4 so it provides for more and better use of land currently designated as forest lands. In the particular case of one important parcel owned by my family, the status quo alternative has it zoned F-40. I think Alternative 2 calls it to be zoned F-20, but Alternative 4 calls for it to be zoned F-40, the same as status quo.

Alternative 4 should be modified to correct this kind of oversight and zone this parcel and others that meet the same kind of predominant lot size consistency criteria as F-10 as in the case with others rezoned to F-10. At the highest level, you should ultimately adopt a properly adjusted Alternative 4 because it represents a very reasonable 20 year growth management policy decision for rural areas; status quo does not.

The first comprehensive management plan essentially froze rural growth options for 20 years. Adopting another 20-year period targeting little or no growth in rural areas would mean calling for a 40-year period of no planned growth for us out in the country. This is not growth management; it's moratorium management. So the status quo should be ruled out.

Alternative 2 is barely different than status quo for the rural areas. Alternative 3 I won't speak to. The GMA contains many provisions providing counties the opportunity to do what Alternative 4 is designed to do; thus, we urge you to adopt the properly adjusted Alternative 4 as your final preferred alternative on October 20th.

The open house meetings in Ridgefield and Hockinson earlier this year showed very strong support for something in the theme of Alternative 4, although there were those present critical of Alternative 4 and those meetings were not properly designed to provide direct public comment to the Councilors. In support of rural areas -- though support in rural areas has grown since then, the people in rural areas do not want to be closed out for another 20 years.

Mr. Chairman, I think I heard two beeps there, I think I know what that means. So in closing, I'd just like to strongly recommend that on October 20th, the Councilors select a preferred alternative that is a reasonably enhanced Alternative 4 that provides for fair interpretation of the goals stated in the SEIS.

MADORE: Thank you, sir. Carol Levanen.

LEVANEN: Hi. Carol Levanen for Clark County Citizens United, L-e-v-a-n-e-n. Clark County Citizens United extensively participated in the 2016 GMA comprehensive plan update and believe Alternative 4 is the only alternative meeting the rural and resource goals of the Growth Management Act, 1993 framework plan and court orders saying the county cannot disregard existing development in place prior to 1994.

The draft SEIS and existing resource maps don't meet the GMA and framework criteria, nor do the comprehensive plan proposals meet 1993 community framework plan goals, the GMA or court orders. Testimony on these items is submitted in the record. The draft SEIS does not demonstrate consistency, but it does demonstrate bias against Alternative 4.

Adjustments are needed to the document to comply with all parameters using accurate logistics and scientific data. Most parcels in Alternative 4 have infrastructure; therefore, the environmental impact is minimal and similar to Alternative 1.

Rural and resource land has been locked in status quo over 20 years, but housing demand in these areas is growing. The market can't meet the demand. The framework plan says small farms and acreage home sites are to be maintained for diverse lifestyle opportunities for present and future generations. It says the responsibility of the community is to strive for the highest quality of living environments for all citizens is still and shall recognize existing development.

The economic element of the framework plan says to promote area-wide economic environment which is conducive to the well-being of the region based on private ownership of property and the freedom of the person to choose his own profit and well-being. The rural and resource economic climate is suffering as a result of the 1994

comprehensive plan, and only Alternative 4 can help.

The purpose for the GMA 1993 framework plan was to allow cities as well as the county to create their own growth policies and plans. The May 26th, 1993, community framework plan says the plan does not change the existing 1979 comprehensive plan or zoning of Clark County. It says, outside the urban areas, land is predominantly rural with farms, forests and open space and large lot residences, and most of northern Clark County would remain as it was then. But the 1994 comprehensive plan disregarded the '93 framework plan and locked many thousands of acres of rural and resource land into very large lot zoning.

The 1993 framework plan said the county shall recognize existing development and provide lands which allow rural development in areas which are developed or committed to development of a rural character. That didn't happen. Alternative 4 is the only alternative that would recognize these requirements. The 1977-'79 framework plan, and subsequent '93 plan, discussed resource lands at length and soil guidelines were set. In Section C of the framework plan those soils are listed. CCU submitted this into the record.

MADORE: Ma'am, your time is up.

LEVANEN: I know.

MADORE: Thank you.

LEVANEN: Thank you.

MADORE: Steven Boynton, B-o-y it looks like n-t-o-n is what I read here followed by Carolyn Crain.

BOYNTON: I don't want to testify.

MADORE: Oh, okay. So Steven's not going to testify. Okay. Carolyn Crain, and then Jean it looks like Matthews, J-e-a-n. No. Okay.

MATTHEWS: She didn't sign up either.

MADORE: Okay. Some of these are not marked as to yes or no. Greg Weber, W-i-b-e-r.

WEBER: W-e-b-e-r.

MADORE: W-e-b-e-r. Okay. Ms. Crain.

CRAIN: Carolyn Crain, C-r-a-i-n. Thank you. I have been doing an awful lot of research and shown up at many of your public forums that you were holding with regards

to the comp plans and the Growth Management Act, and I'm telling you I want to advocate for Alternative 5.

There's a lot of great things happening in Alt 4. There's a lot of great things happening in Alternative 3 around the cities I thought were incredible. I happen to live in the urban growth boundary and feel like right this minute you've already, you know, fenced me in, and you would not like what you've done to me. I don't like what you've done to me over the last ten years of living in this place that used to be more comfortable and have more space, and you've crammed in all these houses.

I want to tell you that when I look at the different things that you're doing, I think it's important that not only we meet the needs of water and utilities and transportation, but that we be reasonable about what we're doing, and somewhere between 3 and 4 is the reasonable. That 5,000 extra lots is a lot to consider. They may be needed, they may be available, but it's a lot to consider. And can we budget and can we sustain that, and that is an issue.

I also want to tell you that in some Supreme Court rulings over eminent domain, I find that you cannot actively, substantially, financially harm someone in a rural area. The U.S. Supreme Court has ruled that under Growth Management Acts and with zoning and coding rules, you cannot do substantial financial harm to their ability to profit in their future. They've been sitting in their future waiting and waiting and waiting for 20 years now and I think you should consider that.

So I want Alt 5 and I just thought I'd come and tell you that. Tweak Alt 3, tweak Alt 4 and come up with Alt 5 and I think you might be able to have a really good plan. Thank you.

MADORE: Okay. Thank you. Greg Weber. Is it Weber or Wiber?

WEBER: Weber, W-e-b-e-r. First name Greg, G-r-e-g. And I'm a rural landowner in Clark County in Ridgefield. And I've dealt with the county for the last ten years on a multitude of issues from my business which is a winery in the county as well as some land use issues over the last ten years.

Not to reiterate what was just said, but there are some great things about all plans to some extent. I see some -- everyone has special interests here to some extent. The cities needs for the La Center and Ridgefield plan, what they need is appropriate I think for what their pursuing. But to have that, but to have no other alternative with plan 4 - which I support as a rural landowner - there's things that need to be looked at to overlay both of those plans in my opinion.

There's been -- for myself, I'm surrounded by properties that are basically zoned inappropriately for what they, for the lot sizes. And the ability for me to move forward with my property and land use has been pretty much restricted for about the last ten years. And it's zoned as an R-10 parcel, but not allowed to divide it because of an AG Forest Remand Act of 1997. And that changed a handful of properties that didn't have

the ability to divide under the zoning, which they are now because of the AG Forest Remand Act as a remainder parcel from a previous subdivision.

And the time frame of going another 20 years to wait until the urban growth boundary moves out in that area or to have it really appropriately looked at for what the parcels really are is inappropriate. The length of time from development from my initial development in 1990 on my property and maybe have to wait another 40 to 50 years to develop that property again, that's too slow of movement, I'm sorry, for development of a county.

This is a county comprehensive plan; not what's in the city. We have to look at the county as well, and unfortunately the rural landowners are the minority voices in the county. Most of the land out there is owned by a minority of people. So we have to let those folks have an appropriate voice that own those parcels to give them a future for their land use. Thank you.

MADORE: Okay. Thank you. Susan Rasmussen followed by Joe Levesque.

RASMUSSEN: Susan Rasmussen, CCCU, R-a-s-m-u-s-s-e-n. In 1977, Clark County had a pretty good growth plan and property rights were upheld. When the Clark County community framework plan was being designed around 1990, the citizens expressed support regarding property rights. It was identified as one of six top issues then. However, by 1992, county staff refined the concepts and composed three community framework plans, each with different goals. Listed as components: Preservation of open space; compact development patterns; preservation of rural lands; development of alternative types of transportation, and property rights were suddenly gone. However, listed in the GMA, there are 13 goals, and they all hold equal weight; private property rights is one of those goals.

Somehow the citizens concerns as written in the '77 community framework plan have become distorted. The comp plans have failed to demonstrate requirements as stated in the guiding principles of the countywide planning policy. This 1977-79 framework plan designated prime and good soils Class I and II. That's what is stated in the GMA. It speaks to the productivity of the farms. It speaks to their economic viability and their long-term commercial significance. CCCU has a 1980 county map that shows the record where these soils are located, but GMA continues to require prime resource soils be conserved only using the NRCS soil, county soils manual as a guideline.

At the open house in Camas, we talked to one of the authors of the Draft SEIS, I believe her name was Ikuno Masterson, we talked to her at quite length about the discrepancies that we have found in our soils, the NRCS soils manual and the county designated resource soils for all ag and forestry lands. When we looked at the metadata for the county, it said that they were designated via aerial photographs and some staff reports. The NRCS soils manual is not mentioned, nor are any corrections mentioned in the Draft Supplemental EIS, even though we spoke at length to Ms. -- to Ikuno out at the Camas open house.

Thank you for your attention this evening. Oh, I support Alternative 4. Even though it's not complete yet, it still needs some work, but we wholeheartedly support it. Thank you.

MADORE: Thank you very much. Joe Levesque.

LEVESQUE: Yeah. Joe Levesque, Camas. I've been over here, I've been living in this county for over ten years. My background's building and developing affordable homes. Five years ago I tried to build affordable homes. They won't let you build affordable homes out here. They want it, there's a want out here and there's a need. I know how to build affordable homes and they're not doing that.

Anyhow, the past ten years of my life living in this community have been the worst ten years of my life. I used to know this country when it was a free country. There's a lady right here that's got to crawl to you to give her her freedoms. That's not right. That's what people are doing around here. There's too many can't dos and not enough can dos.

Here's a letter that I wrote to the Supreme Court. This is addressed to the Supreme Court regarding a \$2 billion shortfall concerning the McQueary (phonetic) case; justice is not being served. It's a fast letter. I'll try to read it fast. I have created two tax free revenue programs that could generate hundreds of millions of dollars for local schools and universities. I have been all over the political map with these two programs with disappointing results. No one has ever told me that these programs could not work.

My request for the Washington State Board of Regents to do a preliminary evaluation of both programs has been completely ignored. I need your help to motivate the Washington State University Board of Regents to do a simple evaluation of these two programs to find any legitimate reasons as to why they would not work or would not work less effectively than the policies already in place. Several multimillion dollar pledged donations have been made subject to both programs being approved and implemented on a State and national basis. Enclosed is a copy of those pledged donations and a copy of the outlined benefits of each program. No one has ever told me this program can't work. We had it checked out by your legal firm here in the Clark County, they didn't see anything wrong with it. It could be done.

Anyhow, I'm very disappointed. I used to know this country when it was a free country. It's not right. I can give you -- you talk about plans. I had one situation in Disneyland years ago and Anaheim at one time was losing a lot of money. They were looking for a new source of revenue. They didn't know what to do. Walt Disney comes along and starts digging this Jungle River for Disneyland, and somebody from the Sierra Club says you can't do this. We won't let you do it. You won't do it. So Walt Disney just picked up his hat and he went to Florida. The same thing happened with (inaudible) Campus Crusade, 1500 employees went back. And I could tell you other stories and all that, but, anyhow.

MADORE: Sir, your time is up.

LEVESQUE: Okay. I'm sorry. I used to know this country when it was free. It's not free like it used to be.

MADORE: Sorry to have to cut you off.

LEVESQUE: Thank you.

MADORE: Sean it looks like it might be Darcy, D-a-r-c-y it sounds like, it looks like.

DARCY: It is.

MADORE: It is. Okay.

DARCY: Am I the last one?

MADORE: It appears so.

DARCY: Sean, S-e-a-n. Darcy, D-a-r-c-y.

HOLLEY: I'm sorry, I didn't hear you.

DARCY: Sean, S-e-a-n. Darcy, D-a-r-c-y. It's just a ploy to get longer time. Thank you very much. County staff has done a fantastic job with all of the urban growth boundary information. It's really very accessible. I can get all the information at my fingertips. It's really a tremendous resource.

With that said, I would love to support Alternative 2 and 4 but I can't. And what began -- and I'm going to call this the cozy camp quest. Because as I was looking through the maps, I couldn't find all the proposed parks. Just one specifically, and it was a five-acre proposed park that got stopped in 2009. So how many proposed parks are not in the comprehensive plan? I don't know. But it started me going through the different layers and layers, and I can't find everything, but that's because mainly I don't have enough time. So sadly this is what I've been able to come up away with.

I don't know how you can support Alternatives 2 and 4 because they don't meet the community framework plan in my opinion. And the primary goal of the framework plan is to provide housing in close proximity to jobs resulting in shorter vehicle trips and allowing densities along corridors that support transits. And there are tools available that are listed within the plan that aren't detailed enough when it comes to a comprehensive plan.

I'm going to refer this to, you know, everything kind of goes around the proposed measures to reduce transportation impacts, and there's not enough detail going into what measures are going to reduce those transportation impacts. Some of the tools that are available are associated with pedestrian traffic, and that's -- and the concept within there

is the 20-minute neighborhood, walking and biking to key attractions. And without having a comprehensive plan that addresses that, to have that vision associated with it, I don't know how you can support Alternatives 2 or 4. Thank you very much.

MADORE: Okay. Thank you very much. That's the last person that we have signed up. Is there anyone here that has signed up and you haven't had a chance to speak, somehow we missed you? You can indicate by raising your hand. Okay. It looks like that wraps up our public comment time. Oliver, is there anything else we need to cover?

ORJIAKO: No. This is, Councilor, this is just taking testimony on the Draft Supplemental Impact Statement. No dialogue, nothing. We will repeat this on September 10th, same time. And then you will go away, the Planning Commission will deliberate and make a recommendation to you Councilors.

MADORE: Okay. So very good. This wraps up --

BARCA: Mr. Chair, may I address staff before we close out?

MADORE: Yes.

BARCA: I do have --

MADORE: Speak into the microphone, please.

BARCA: I think I'm covered. I'm okay? Okay. I do have a question concerning our adoption of the changes to the goals and policies. To me it seems very relevant that we're actually adopting these changes before we try and pick an alternative, because I think there's genuine relevance on the choice of what alternatives are picked based on the proposed changes, and I'm a little concerned that we're not getting any kind of testimony on these proposed changes, but we're going to go forward with an alternative choice.

ORJIAKO: Planning Commission Member Ron Barca, that's a good observation. Those are preliminary draft propose edits, if you will, housekeeping in some cases. It is not complete. That will be refined. And I think we made that very clear to the PC that that will be refined as we know what the preferred alternative is, and we'll come back to the PC and go through that one more time before the final adoption. We don't even have the capital facilities plan. There's so many things we don't have. We are now going through a process for the Councilors to adopt the parks plan. All that information is going to come back to you for re-adoption in a complete package.

So what you've seen was staff attempt to begin to do some housekeeping on the current plan document. So you will see a revision as we know what the preferred plan is, and the public will then have the opportunity to review that same document. The public haven't seen those housekeeping and restructuring that we're making to the comp plan document itself. I don't know if that answers your question.

Joint BOCC/PC Minutes
Thursday, September 3, 2015
2016 Comp Plan
Page 23

BARCA: Okay. I, yeah, I do think that there is genuine impact based on the choices that we make.

ORJIAKO: I agree. No, I agree. And we will come to the Planning Commission probably before your deliberation to provide you some what I may call some guidelines, if you will, in picking the alternative, that is yet to come.

ADJOURMENT

MADORE: Is there any other member of the body that wants to address anything? Okay. This meeting will be continued next week, September 10, 6:00 p.m., right here, identical meeting. If there are no objections, we will terminate this meeting to be continued. Okay. That wraps it. Thank you very much.

The record of tonight's hearing, as well as the supporting documents and presentations can be viewed on the Clark County Web Page at: <http://www.clark.wa.gov/planning/PCmeetings.html>.

*Proceedings can be viewed on CTV on the following web page link:
<http://old.cityofvancouver.us/cvtv/cvtvindex.ask?section=25437&catID=13>.*

*Minutes Transcribed by:
Cindy Holley, Court Reporter/Rider & Associates, Inc.
Sonja Wiser, Administrative Assistant, Clark County Community Planning*