



**Board of County Councilors and Clark County Planning Commission  
Joint Hearing on the Comprehensive Growth Management Plan**

**Thursday, September 10, 2015**

---

**Call To Order**

MADORE: Welcome to the September 10, 2015, Planning Commission -- we adjust things right at the beginning of the meeting, get it all out of the way. We want to make sure that everybody has an opportunity to hear. Can you all hear back there? Raise your hand if you cannot hear well. If you cannot hear well, raise your hand. Okay. It looks like -- well, they're still adjusting it, so... If you want to -- well, let me finish with the introduction.

We're here tonight to listen to you. We don't plan to answer questions verbally tonight. We'll write down your questions. And the idea is for us to hear, to receive your feedback so that we, as your elected representatives, can make things better. This is not just an exercise to get it done; this is an exercise for us to actually hear what you have to say and to make sure that it matters.

This has to do with the formal process for us to come up with a 20-year plan that ensures that our community has sufficient, useful land that will meet the needs of our community for the, in compliance with State law, the Growth Management Act, the GMA. Each person will have three minutes to speak. We ask that you be structured in that.

This is a little more formal than what we normally have. We normally have a significant amount of grace when citizens speak, but tonight we ask that when you hear the first beep, that says you have 30 seconds to wrap it up. When you hear the second beep or the two beeps, that says your time is up. We ask that you be very structured on that and yield to the next person.

Okay. We'll start out the meeting with the Pledge of Allegiance, so please stand.

Okay. This is basically a repeat of the meeting we had last week, and we're going to have a little presentation just simply to introduce as an overview what we call the DSEIS, the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement, basically a consultant, give us insight and we want to be able to hear from you. All this has to do with the comp plan. This is -- all these properties are your properties and what you have, your property rights and the flexibilities and how it all fits so that we preserve resources for

the future. All those things come together and the process involves this formality.

So we have last week, we invited any person from the Planning Commission to indicate to us if they have any potential conflict of interest, because they make decisions and they may be property owners. So I'm going to ask if there be anyone here that -- Chris, can you give us the right question or terminology what we're looking for?

COOK: Whether there would be anyone on the Planning Commission who believes that they have a potential conflict of interest that they would like to disclose.

MADORE: Okay. So this is that opportunity.

MORASCH: I disclosed last week, so I'll just refer to my comments last week.

MADORE: Okay. Here's your microphone.

MORASCH: I won't take time to repeat them, but...

MADORE: Okay. All right. That wraps that up.

And now I guess what we can do is have the brief presentation, just a summary overview, not very much in-depth of what this document is.  
Oliver.

### **Staff Presentation**

ORJIAKO: Good evening, Council members and members of the Planning Commission. For the record, Oliver Orjiako, Clark County Community Planning Director.

I will just make a very brief overview or remarks and then turn it over to my program manager, Gordy Euler, who is overseeing the SEPA process.

Councilors and members of the Planning Commission and the public, as you well stated, Councilor Madore, the purpose of this hearing, this joint hearing between the PC and the Board is to take testimony on the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement relating to the Clark County 2016 comprehensive plan update. I agreed. We are now setting the stage on selection of a preferred alternative to update the County's 20-year growth management plan required under the State law.

As you are aware, the last update was in 2007. The Growth Management Act requires, in this case, requires the County under RCW 36.70A.130(5), Subsection (b) to on or before June 30th of 2016, and eight years thereafter to review, update if necessary, the County's comprehensive growth management plan. The County and the cities, all the seven cities within Clark County, began the update effort in 2013 with participation of the Board of County Councilors.

Since 2013, the Board have provided us direction and decisions on population projections, jobs, planning assumptions. The Board also adopted a public participation process. You also, by Resolution, adopted suspension of the site-specific annual plan amendment reviews for 2015 and 2016.

What we have done since then was to use those decisions and directed from the Board to work with our city partners, stakeholders and the public to develop alternative or options to be studied and presented for public hearing. That's why we are here. I won't go into details in terms of the draft environmental -- Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement. Gordy will discuss that. But I will say that the Planning Commission gets the benefit and the Council of hearing the same testimony.

The Planning Commission, I will add, if they support that, will be to close public testimony today and begin your deliberation on the 17th. The comment, the written comment period, doesn't end until the 17th, and we will be compiling all the comments that have come in and will be presenting that to you when you begin your deliberation.

If you don't finish your deliberation on the 17th and continue that and make a recommendation on the preferred alternative, that is something we will look into in the future, but you are scheduled to begin your deliberation on September 17th and to make a recommendation to the Council.

The Board of County Commissioners or Councilors will then begin consideration of the recommendation coming out of the PC. We have tentatively scheduled that to begin October 22nd or 20th, Gordy?

EULER: October 20th.

ORJIAKO: October 20th. I will say that the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement was developed in accordance with the State Policy Act known as SEPA under RCW 43.21C.120 and 43.21C.135. The Draft Environmental Impact Statement provides a project description, summary of all the four alternatives, which Gordy will go over and provide you a highlight, and as you stated, we are not here taking any questions at this point. Maybe we'll do that during the PC and the Council deliberations. We'll have a consultant here to help us answer questions that you may have as well as our legal team. So I will stop there and turn it over to Gordy.

Before the PC begins their deliberation, we will submit a staff report helping you to guide you in the selection of the preferred alternatives that is yet to come which we will also make available to the Councilors.

Gordy, take it away.

EULER: Thank you, Oliver. Good evening, Councilors and Commissioners and

members of the audience. My name is Gordy Euler. I'm a Program Manager with Clark County's Department of Community Planning.

MADORE: Gordy, hold on a second. Commissioner Stewart has a question.

STEWART: I have a question. So are we, at the end of today, are we formally closing all public testimony on the SEIS? We're not. Okay. I ask that because I did get an e-mail late this afternoon that I have forwarded to planning, a person who felt their property hadn't been properly considered and wanted to let us know about it. So that will, of course, be entered into the record as well?

EULER: Public comment continues, Councilor, through next Thursday at 4:00 p.m. September 17th. So after tonight, there won't be another opportunity for oral testimony, so we're going to ask that the Council and the Planning Commission to close the oral testimony portion, but public comment on the draft, the public record remains open until 4:00 p.m. next Thursday.

STEWART: Thank you very much.

MADORE: Written versus oral.

EULER: That's correct.

ORJIAKO: Yeah, written versus oral.

One last thing I want to mention is that in your packet, you have the staff report. You have a copy of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, which I conclude you have read. You also have comments that we've received to date. I provided you another batch today to put into your binder, please do so. You have two blank binders, 4 and 5, so whatever you receive today, please insert those in Tab 5. Any additional comments that come in, we will make that available to both the Planning Commission and the Councilors, but what you have is what we've received as of 4:00 p.m. today.

Gordy.

EULER: Any other questions? All right. Thanks, Oliver.

We are indeed here tonight to take comments on the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement, and I just wanted to reiterate that we've set these hearings up to be held in the evening, provide a couple of opportunities for folks that couldn't be here last week, and as Oliver said, to set it up to have it be a joint hearing so that for those people that wanted to testify orally, you only have to give your testimony once, so I just wanted to throw that in.

Preparation of a Draft Supplemental EIS in this case is required by State law. It's the

State Environmental Policy Act, what we refer to as SEPA, and completing the SEPA process, which is what we're moving towards, moves us one step closer to completing the comprehensive plan update, so...

Next slide on the PowerPoint. So we'll talk a little bit about progress. I'll give you the chronology of in terms of the SEPA process. DSEIS alternatives, there are four and then kind of the next steps.

Next slide. And then we'll get on to public testimony. So the Board decided early on, as Oliver said, a population target and jobs target given the calculations that we do it was determined that we pretty much have enough land in current urban growth areas to satisfy demand for the next 20 years.

Growth Management Act requires that you have a 20-year land supply inside urban growth areas when you do a comp plan update. And, of course, we've continued to work with our partners, the cities, as we've gone through to figure out who's going to get what share of the population.

Next slide. So one of the questions is why a supplemental? And there's been a number of comments that have come in. In 2007, we expanded urban growth areas by about 12,000 acres, 19-square miles roughly, and we did a full Environmental Impact Statement at that point on the potential impacts on urbanizing that much land. Of course, everybody knows what happened to the economy, 2008, the recession.

The long and the short of it is most of that land is still available to be developed. And given the urban growth boundaries, urban growth areas or boundaries don't need to be expanded, we made the decision to re-adopt the 2007 Environmental Impact Statement. It looks like this. It's a fairly thick document. This is on the website right underneath the Draft Supplemental EIS, so most of the analysis and a lot of the information was already documented in 2007. And since that land hasn't been developed, the impacts are going to be relatively the same. And this, the draft supplemental then essentially supplements the 2007 Environmental Impact Statement.

Here's a bit of a chronology. The Board talked about three possible EIS alternatives back in July. We sent out a scoping notice and a notice of re-adoption of this document at the end of July last year. A contract was approved with the consultants who were ESA out of Seattle to write the draft supplemental. We held four scoping meetings. We presented the scoping report to the Board in September and three alternatives were agreed to at that time in October. We had two more open houses then on the alternatives, again at that point there were three. And in late in October ESA commenced work on the draft supplemental.

Next slide. In January, the Board asked that we poll the process, and until a fourth alternative could be developed, which was -- back one -- go back a slide. Thank you. We had two work sessions in February and March on what was going to be a fourth

alternative.

We held open houses on the four alternatives in late March and early April, and on April 14th, the Board approved four alternatives and an additional sum of money to help in the analysis. The DSEIS was issued on August 5th. We're in the middle of that comment period, which as we said earlier, ends on September 17th. We had a Planning Commission work session on August 20th and September 3 and 10. Those were our two public hearing dates. September 17th is when the comment period ends and the Planning Commission hearing will be held on discussion and making a recommendation on a preferred alternative. Tentatively we have October 20th for a Board hearing to do the same, so...

Next slide. I'm not going to spend a lot of time on these. These are in the document. Alternative 1, it says No Action, but essentially that continues the comprehensive plan assumptions, the policies and the development regulations that we currently have. So that just extends the current plan basically from 2024, which is the current planning horizon out to 2035.

Alternative 2, I'm going to skip through these. There's a number of essentially things that the County wants to do, what we call County Initiated Actions. Some of these are to make zoning match what's actually on the ground. Some of these are to correct mapping errors. One of the things, two of the things on here is to create a public facility zone. We have a parks and open space comp plan designation but really no zone that implements that. From the environmental perspective, one of the bigger proposals is to reduce the minimum parcel size from AG-20 to AG-10 and from Forest-40 to Forest-20, so...

Let's roll up to Alternative 3. Yeah, keep going. Keep going. Keep going. Alternative 3 is what are City Initiated Changes. Since the County came to the conclusion that we didn't need to expand the boundary, we went to the cities and said what would you like? And four cities came forward and Alternative 3 adds about, what, 250 or 260 acres in four cities for both jobs and residential.

Next slide. Next slide. Next slide. Alternative 4. I'll get back to that. Alternative 4 is primarily a rural alternative for rural parcels known as parcels zoned R. It creates a -- the proposal is to create an R-1 and an R-2 and a half acre, that would be acre size in addition to the R-5 and to do away with the R-10 and R-20 zoning size for property that's zoned R. For forest, we have Forest-40 and Forest-80. Alternative 4 would add a Forest-10 and a Forest-20 zoning categories. And for agriculture, which is the next slide, actually back, go back one, back one. Thank you. Though this is the left-hand slide. For agriculture, the proposal is to create AG-5 and AG-10 and do away with AG-20. So these are the things that Alternative 4 would do.

Next slide. Next slide. This is a rather important table. This is in the draft document. There's been some question as to how to read this. If in the Alternative 1, if we didn't do

anything today, if nothing happened, there's still the potential in the rural areas to create 7,000 new lots under current zoning. So if everybody that owned property in the rural areas subdivided down to what they were allowed to by zone, we could create 7,000 lots.

And it's important to remember that as you look at the impacts of the other alternatives, so that's -- I wanted to explain this table, Alternative 2 because it goes -- if Alternative 2 was chosen, it creates more ag lots and more forest lots, that number goes up to 8200.

In Alternative 3, the number of lots actually goes down because these areas would go into urban growth areas so the County would lose some parcels. And Alternative 4, the potential is for 12,400 lots. But remember, 7,000 of those could be created today without doing anything.

MIELKE: Gordy, if I might. Clarifying your chart up there, that time frame that you speak of, of the possibility of that growth is 20 years?

EULER: The planning horizon for a comprehensive plan is for 20 years, correct. And it assumes -- we make the assumption in a 20-year planning horizon that we will actually build-out to whatever the zoning is in 20 years. That's part of what goes into the Environmental Impact Statement. So, in other words, all of these lots would be developed at the end of a 20-year period.

Okay. Next slide. Let's just roll through these. These are nothing more than -- you've seen these before. These are in the document, so scroll through these. Earth Resources. These are the things we have to consider, what SEPA requires us to consider.

Next slide. Water Resources. Keep going. Keep going. So Energy and Natural Resources, Public Facilities, Fish and Wildlife, Transportation.

All right. Next slide. Keep going. These are our next steps which we've most of which we've covered. Here we are in the upper right-hand corner on September 10th. The comment period ends again. On September 17th is the Planning Commission deliberation on the preferred. October 20th is the Board's deliberation on the preferred. We prepare a Final Supplemental Impact Statement on the preferred alternative, and then the capital facilities planning begins and we streak to the finish line, so... And that's the NLT up there is Not Later Than June 30th of 2016.

Here's a way to share comments. You can do it online, and we'll leave this up here if you want to copy these down. These are also on our website and they're also in the document. You can engage Peak Democracy, which is a public involvement tool that where the County is sponsoring. You can send an e-mail. You can write it on a piece of paper and put it in an envelope and put a stamp on it, kind of a novel idea, but we have gotten a couple of comments through the U.S. Mail, which is great. And of course

the two public hearings there, the second of which is tonight, so...

Next slide. And I just want to mention, as it's already been mentioned before during tonight, both the PC and the Board will need to close oral testimony if that's their desire. The written record for the draft will close at 4:00 p.m. next Tuesday -- Thursday, sorry, September 17th, so... That ends my staff report. Happy to answer any questions.

MADORE: Okay. Are we ready for testimony?

ORJIAKO: Yes.

MADORE: All right. You don't need to give your address, you just simply need to specify your name and we would like that you spell your name because we are taking verbatim notes here. We want to make sure we get it entered into the public record correctly. Again, three minutes. You can hear one beep and it says you have 30 seconds to wrap it up. Two beeps says your time is up.

### **Public Testimony**

And we'll start out with Greg Thornton. Is he here? Okay.

ORJIAKO: Councilor.

MADORE: Yes.

ORJIAKO: I don't know whether we have a sign-in sheet for elected officials in case --

MADORE: That's what I'm reading from first.

ORJIAKO: Okay. Thank you.

MADORE: Okay. And if you have not signed a sheet and you would like to give testimony, there are sheets out in the hallway. Okay. I don't see Greg.  
Jack Burkman.

BURKMAN: Good evening. I'm Jack Burkman, B-u-r-k-m-a-n, representing the City of Vancouver this evening.

Our City supports the County's direction on regional forecast and the urban issues. This is what the GMA requires to be completed by June 2016 and what this update process is all about until this spring. The emphasis on jobs over housing and on keeping UGAs as they are unless requested makes sense. The adopted growth forecast that have been revised are consistent with this and they provide for ample growth. Vancouver is requesting no UGA changes but supports Alternative 3 of the SEIS.



The City of Vancouver cannot support sweeping rural zone changes that were inserted into Alternatives 2 and 4 this spring just before the Draft SEIS was released or started. We oppose these alternatives. The SEIS now reveals that Alternative 2 will increase zoning densities on 50-square miles of land. Alternative 4 will increase zoning densities on a 100-square miles of land, and this would allow for creation of literally thousands of more new small lots than created today or that could be created. And both Alternatives 2 and 4 would require prohibitively expensive infrastructure with transportation facilities needed all over the county.

The SEIS has a major flaw that needs to be corrected too because there's no SEPA required analysis of the location or magnitude of these potential or predicted impacts. Previous County EIS's did contain maps and listed its projected increases in traffic and other service demands, the facilities needed and the approximate cost in both the urban and the rural areas. This SEIS contains none if this, even though much of it's required by SEPA and it was included in the County scoping for this SEIS.

So we respectfully request that the County decision-makers explore procedural options beginning with the Planning Commission on September 17th. There's no legal or practical reason to continue to attempt to include sweeping rural upzones. This is a process designed to meet GMA requirements for updating regional forecasts and UGA reviews, and GMA does not require including rural growth estimates and countywide forecasts.

Any adjustments needed in the future can be made in any year. Removing the rural upzones now would allow the County to meet the required June 2016 deadline and avoid potential sanctions or grant ineligibility. It would allow cities to avoid having to restart the entire process if legal insufficiencies are found in the SEIS or if the adopted plan results in the entire process being remanded.

The County can pursuit the upzones in a separate process, and doing this would provide the opportunity to evaluate those potential upzones with enough information to allow for sound and legally defensible community input and decision-making. The City of Vancouver staff will be submitting more detailed comments. Thank you.

MADORE: Okay. John Karpinski.

KARPINSKI: K-a-r-p-i-n-s-k-i. Hi. Thank you for the opportunity to address you here today. My name is John Karpinski.

I've previously submitted comments on 4/13/15 that hopefully made it to the Planning Commission. I know the Commissioners have already seen them and I'm just going to be addressing a couple of specific issues that came up in the questions that Commissioner Madore asked last time and I want to make sure I can give an adequate response to those.

Yes, the purpose of this hearing is to determine, as Commissioner Madore indicates, that is there sufficient useful land for us to plan for our next 20 years? And the answer is because of the recession and the lack of growth that we had that we do have it and it is in existing Alternative 1 which is for legal reasons considered a no action alternative, but as staff pointed out, allows another 7,000 rural lots to be developed, so it's not a no growth scenario. It does provide all the housing and job opportunities we need for the next 20 years in Alternative 1, and I recommend that that be adopted as the preferred alternative.

What I want to do is focus specifically on the rural standards. These rural standards contained in RCW 36.70A.070 Sub (5) did not exist in 1992 when the County first passed its rural requirements. As a matter of fact, it was probably drawn up because of the laws, that the change in the law was resulting from the appeals of the various lawsuits that went back and forth on that.

So now we have these new rural standards that haven't been applied before. They haven't been required to be applied before. And the rural standards say that you can only -- that rural development shall be at appropriate densities not characterized by urban growth and that are consistent with the rural character.

They go on and say that you can only include rural development that controls rural development, assures visual compatibility, reduces inappropriate conversion of undeveloped lands into sprawling, low density development in the rural area. Now, that's not only, as the question was, is that obviously that's what Alternative 4 is, but it's also Alternative 2. We're allowing 1100 new lots under this reconfiguration. It has adverse impacts on resource lands and critical lands.

MADORE: Mr. Karpinski, your time is up.

KARPINSKI: Okay.

MADORE: Thank you, sir.

KARPINSKI: Thank you very much.

MADORE: Don S-a-s-s-e.

SASSE: Thank you. I'm Don Sasse. I live in northern Clark County.

I'm not super involved with all this, but I just really kind of made some observations reading the paper and listening to different folks talk, and it feels to me like there's some misunderstanding about Alternative 4. It feels like this whole thing has turned into an us versus them deal, and I don't think it should be that way and I think there's lots of us in the county that would prefer that it wasn't that way.

The essence -- well, first of all, whoever put Alternative 4 together has done a great job giving us an alternative that addresses everyone's needs. The essence of Alternative 4 is about private property rights as I see it. And I might be a little naive here, but I would guess that everyone in this room and everyone in the county would want to protect their private property rights.

Alternative 4 doesn't require landowners to divide the land; it allows them to to a point, and that -- even that has got some restrictions as we can see. It is simply returning or giving back some of the options that we once had, the way I see it.

My request for the County Councilors is pretty simple: Help us - us is all the landowners in Clark County - help us to preserve our private property rights. Please choose Alternative 4. Thank you.

MADORE: Okay. Thank you.

BARCA: May I ask a question?

MADORE: Yes, sir.

BARCA: Mr. Sasse, please, I need clarification. So you're saying that your property right is the right to divide your land?

SASSE: I'm saying that we should have a voice in that and that we should have the option to be able to do that, yes.

BARCA: Okay. So the right to do that is your option?

SASSE: Yes.

BARCA: Okay. Thank you.

MADORE: Applause is fine.  
Betty York.

YORK: No, I didn't want to. I'm sorry.

MADORE: Okay. Alan Greene.

GREENE: Hi. My name is Alan Greene. It's A-l-a-n, G-r-e-e-n-e.

My brothers and I, well, and my sisters too, are property owners in Clark County and we have 40 acres out in Yacolt that is currently in, I believe, FR-40 and all the neighbors around it, there's like 10, 20 and 5, and I would just like to have the option to be able to do something with that.

My brothers and I, we could have houses up there. Right now it's zoned to where we can only have one house because it's one house per 40 acres and there's 50 acres so really you can only have one house. And I think that -- I appreciate all the work that was done on this. There's a lot of numbers here and a lot of research that's gone into it.

I'm in favor of Alternative 4. It's really only increasing the possible number of total lots by about, what, 5,000 and right now we're in excess and we could still also be in excess in another 20 years. We could have all this land that's available to be developed or whatever's decided to do with it that is just still sitting there open fields or trees or whatever it is.

And so I just wanted to voice my opinion that that's what I'm in favor of and I'd like to be able to have the option to build houses for my family, for my brothers and sisters. And, you know, it's not to like put up apartment complexes or some big industrial buildings or anything like that, just family homes.

And so that's really just what I wanted to say is just that I'd like that option. And I think that, like I had already said, we are excess right now, and to me, that says a lot, like, the 12,000 number is really -- we could still have that same excess later on. So appreciate you guys taking public comment.

MADORE: Okay. Thank you.

GREENE: Thank you.

MADORE: George Espinosa.

ESPINOSA: George Espinosa, E-s-p-i-n-o-s-a.

Of all the alternatives, Alternative 4 would be my favorite; however, my appeal to you folks is that, you know, the people of this county have spoken very clearly in the last two election cycles about the direction that the county is going and the way our property rights are being subrogated.

Anyway, changing even the form of government going to the home rule and by releasing the incumbents from being in the chair of the Council, so I think that it's time that you maybe turn an ear towards us, and I see no reason pressing this decision until the entire Council is sworn and seated.

I would believe there's a number of people that would agree with me on that because we've just been, you know, we have twice in one area of the urban growth boundary petitioned the Board of Commissioners, the Planning Commission to be removed from the urban growth boundary. Those have been ignored. Even on the onset when the City of Vancouver was not in favor of taking in that property, we are now in the process

of preparing a petition for the City of Vancouver asking them to reconsider that and go back to their original.

I guess that's about all I have to say. But I really do resent the subrogation of property rights the way it has been done through this entire process. Thank you.

MADORE: Thank you. I'm trying to read this. It looks like R-o -- oh, okay. Robert Maul. Oh, actually, after Robert, I'm going to call Stan Greene. I skipped Stan. Okay. Go ahead, Robert.

MAUL: Good evening, Councilors, Commissioners. Robert Maul, M-a-u-l, I'm the planning manager with the City of Camas.

Once again would like to thank Mr. Orjiako and his team for all the efforts that they've done to be collaborative in this process with the cities and the public. We have gone on record throughout this process to support Alternative 3. We continue that support of Alternative 3. And I wanted to make sure that the City of Camas' interest of maintaining our current boundary with no expansion is maintained. That is it. Thank you very much.

MADORE: Okay. Thank you. Stan Greene.

GREENE: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Stan Greene, G-r-e-e-n-e.

Concerning the Draft Supplemental Environment Impact Statement, if Alternative 4 is approved as the SEPA applies to our land, only minimal impacts would occur and the general health of the forest on our land could be improved by close hands on management. We agree with the proposed changes in Alternative 4 except as applies to our family parcels No. 230277000 and 230282000 located in Section 5. We respectively request that Alternative 4 data and alternative maps please be modified to include these parcels as zoned as FR-10.

Our parcels are situated near Yacolt Mountain. Prior to the Growth Management Act of 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 proposed in Alternative 4 for FR-10 zoning. The parcels of our neighbors are predominant lot sizes of one and a half and five acres, although further to the north, there are some 20-acre parcels.

We've 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 five children in our family who live in Washington State, each of them should be allowed to build a home on the family property and manage each of their properties as one tree

farm to grow and produce commercial timber. We should have the right to build our own homes on our own land, but with that right, some of us may choose to build others while others may choose not to build. Just because a parcel is created does not mean that a person will actually build and live upon each and every parcel created.

We believe that it would be an alienation of our property rights if Clark County attempts to prohibit our sons and daughters from building homes on the property. We shall continue -- well, the property we've owned, my father bought it 60 years ago, so... We've had it a long time. We've been patient for the last 20 years. The time is now for a change.

We shall continue our major goal of growing timber on our land, but we want to live on our own land so that we can thoroughly and attentively manage our land as one timber management unit. We shall ensure that we have minimal environmental impacts upon the land and could build our homes on that portion of the land upon which conifer timber will not grow because of laminated root rot soil which kills conifer trees, and when I present my written statements on this, I will put some information about laminated root rot in from the U.S. Forest Service. Thank you.

MADORE: Okay. Thank you. This is T. Okay. Last name is R-o-o-s it looks like, T-e, Tedine. Okay.

ROOS: My name is Tedine Roos, R-o-o-s. I live in Vancouver.

There is some thinking around which considers agricultural land zoning as a temporary zoning until a subdivision is built. It's just waiting to be developed. Owners and developers should be able to convert farmland easily and profitably. I would like to give a couple of reasons why this practice is unwise.

Back in the day when I took Public Administration 101, I learned that tax revenue from residences does not pay for the services required, schools, roads, fire protection and so forth. So municipalities strive for a diversified tax base. Commercial and industrial entities provide revenue to make up that difference.

Tourism is good because tourists spend money but go home and some other municipality pays for their schools. So if decision-makers are really sincere about not raising taxes or decreasing taxes, they should make it as difficult as possible to turn farmland into subdivisions. Option 4 is especially like killing the cash cow.

The other reason to preserve agricultural land is more ominous and that is climate change. We know in a distant way that climate change is disrupting food production especially in areas near the equator, but that's far away, not here. But I have news. I have gardened for many years and the number of anomalies I have observed in my own garden this summer would take more than my three minutes to list. Locavore Index ranks states by the amount of citizens consume that's produced locally. Washington

should be up there with Vermont, New Hampshire, Main and Oregon, but Washington is down in the middle at 25.

As the extinction progresses, climate refugees are coming to the Northwest because there is some water here. Next time you see a license plate from, say, Louisiana or Mississippi, ask the car owners why they're here. Food could become the new currency. Option 4 which eases the conversion of farmland into subdivisions is a bad public policy especially in the light of the unfolding climate crisis.

MADORE: Oh, McIssac. It looks like A-d-a-n.

MCISSAC: Adam.

MADORE: Adam. I guess that spells Adam.

MCISSAC: Yeah. For the record my name is Adam McIssac, A-d-a-m, 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 wife and immediate family members as well as my extended family and neighbors and friends who also own property in rural Clark County.

I am here to speak in favor of the intent of Alternative 4, but to say that it needs to be improved to do a better job in providing changes in the zoning regulations for the rural areas of Clark County. I ask that you start with Alternative 4 for rural areas from this point forward and not Alternative 1 or Alternative 2 when you settle on alternative for rural areas and make that the decision on October 20th. It should be not less than Alternative 4 for our rural areas.

Growing up on a small farm in Hockinson, I enjoyed a great childhood of playing in the woods and working with my parents on the farm, getting fresh eggs for Saturday morning breakfast, watching the sheep lamb in the spring, planting and harvesting a garden were but a few of the activities that can build a deep appreciation for the land we live on. Splitting firewood, putting up hay and mucking out the barn forged a good work ethic, both attributes that would help support me and my walk through manhood. It is this kind of living I believe measure 4 would promote small sustainable farming.

In a world so caught up in the tech age, I believe our younger generation is forgetting their roots and grasping the feeling of entitlement. I feel Alternative 4 would promote the historical character of the area, country living is our heritage and part of what has made this country great.

So in summary, please don't freeze up the rural areas of Clark County for another 20 years. On October 20th, please vote for a new version of Alternative 4 that changes zoning for some of the large lots located in neighborhoods of many small lots. These larger lots should be able to be zoned like the other lots in the neighboring areas. These rural areas are where many of us came from and has shaped who we are, and I

would like -- and I want my children to be able to do the same thing I've been able to do or better. Thank you.

MADORE: Thank you. Gerry it looks like Coppedge, C-o-p-p-e-d-g-e.

COPPEDGE: Thanks. Thank you. This is Gerry Coppedge, C-o-p-p-e-d-g-e.

I'm just going to get this a little bit more down to realist things. Eight years ago I ended up with a 65-acre piece of property, and at that time, it was boundary adjusted to a 10 acre, a 20 acre and a 35 acre. I talked to the County people and they said no problem if you want to subdivide it further. This is just what we're doing now to let a person build on the 10-acre parcel that he wanted.

A couple of weeks ago I sent a two-page plus attachments into your board and reiterated what I see this -- I've got the 10 acre, was bought, and a nice house built on it. I ended up with a 20 and a 35. It's not agricultural. It's not forest. It's a bunch of scrubby old trees. It's bushes and that you can't get through the property.

And next door to the east of me is about 16 parcels that are between 2- and 5-acre parcels. To the west of me there's about five parcels or 5 acres each. Building permits were granted about three months ago. Houses are now built on those three 5-acre parcels. And off of the street, it's called Lockwood Creek Road a couple of miles east, I believe it's east to 40th Avenue and then a couple hundred yards, the Landerholm, I'm about two miles down Landerholm Road, and on the left-hand side, there's approximately nine or ten 5-acre horse farms, I guess that's what they call them.

But the gist of it is people were able to do certain things with their property, one acre, two acres, five acres. Just recently, like I said, three houses were built on the west side. It's about the 5700 block of Landerholm Road and that was granted and the houses are built, and I just want the same chance to do what I want to do with my property and I don't want somebody that doesn't even live in that area dictating or making decisions about what I can do with my property.

As far as I know, I still live in the United States and I don't live in Russia or somewhere else, that this lady wants me to leave property that's not agricultural, not anything else because she thinks it would be neat to do that. I guess that's it. Thank you.

MADORE: Okay. Thank you, sir.  
David Rogers. Oh, you're not going to speak. David Rogers. Sorry.

ROGERS: Good evening, Planning Commission and Councilors. I'm David Rogers, R-o-g-e-r-s.

I feel that whatever plan that is chosen should allow the lots that were available in the 1970s for two and a half acre rural housing be included in that plan. Some people that



plan their retirement are now being cheated out of an advantage of their chosen futures.

Alternative 4 appears to be the only plan that would allow this. This is the appearance that we are shown. A large fast growth would not be good as our roads are now crowded and our schools are full. We need to choose a future that moves slow enough that we can afford it. Thank you.

MADORE: Thank you.  
Marion K-o-s-m-a-l it looks likes.

KOSMAL: Greetings. Marvin Kosmal, K-o-s-m-a-l. I live on 10 acres just outside of La Center.

I want to thank you for all the good work that you've done here so far on a very, very complex issue, and I'm kind of late to the dance and I apologize for that. But after reviewing all the alternatives, the only alternative that makes any sense to me that I can support is Alternative 1. It's working for us now and I don't see how the other alternatives would be a superior improvement, so I suggest we just stay with Alternative 1. Thank you for your time.

MADORE: Thank you.  
Joe Levesque.

LEVESQUE: I don't like coming up here. I think the last time I talked, the last time I was here, I told you I was here for about ten years, the worst ten years of my life is living up here.

HOLLEY: How do you spell your last name?

LEVESQUE: L-e-v-e-s-q-u-e.

I believe in freedom. You know, I'm probably one of the oldest guys in this room. I don't like what's happening to this community and I don't like what's happening to this country. I'm planning on doing something about it.

You know, years ago when I was a sophomore in high school back in the early '40s, I had good friends of mine, juniors, seniors, college graduates. The war was on. Everybody was uptight. But everybody was convinced, we were altogether, we were free, we're going to make things happen, and I was brought up that way. I'm still that way. I don't like what the hell is happening right now. I'm not here to complain against you guys. You guys do your work, but I'm planning on doing something about it.

In the ten years, I've been all over the map with this thing, the whole political map with it. Ron Barca right now is kind of joking about it, but we're talking about affordable housing. And I met him in the airport in the elevator the other day, and I says the

community out here is putting in mini-mansions. And he made a statement, he said, what do we do after all these mini-mansions are in? How are we going to control that? How did this country grow to begin with?

Years ago when I started out in the building business, all we had to do was go to the city and there was a zoning map. You looked at the map and you say this is what you can do; this is what you can't do. The rich people lived in one part of town and the less rich would live somewhere else. It was north, east and west and south. That's the way the communities are built. We're trying to engineer our freedom here. There's freedom being endangered in this community right now. I don't like what's happening.

So what am I going to do about it? Right now I got two choices. One is take everything I've been -- I've been all over the map with this thing. I've been to the Washington City Council. I've been to Port of Camas/Washougal. I even made a motion to bring in affordable housing at the Port of Camas/Washougal where I could have sold them a condominium on the water for \$1500 down and the payments would be less than what they're paying for affordable housing right now. They are not building affordable housing in this community and that's a shame. But the yellow lights, see, I'm supposed to shut up.

Anyhow, I got a list of about 25 things. Anyhow, my grand jury's one choice that I've got; the other choice is if that doesn't work is constitutional class action lawsuit. And I'm going to tell you something, I got good friends of mine that died for this constitution. I get emotional when I talk about this stuff, but I mean everything I'm talking about. Thank you.

MADORE: Thank you, Mr. Levesque.

JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, for the record, I'd like to point out that was about the coolest picture with the little boy. I don't know who's he is or where he went, but with the older man, if we would have had a picture of that, that was kind of cool to see democracy in action from the older and the youngest, so... I don't know where he went. Is he lost?

MADORE: We are talking about our future. By the time this plan is executed, that young man may have a family of his own.  
Leah Higgins.

HIGGINS: I'm Leah Higgins, H-i-g-g-i-n-s. And good evening, Councilors, and staff. I do appreciate all the work that has been done on this.

I am in real estate, so of course the instant thought probably that's in the head is, oh, look, she's looking for smaller lots. I am also a landowner and I'm not looking for smaller lots as in Alternative 4 which I highly recommend you guys do choose. It's not going to affect my direct lot, but it does affect the citizens, the rural citizens of this county. The other people that are out there in the rural lands that if you do live in town

in the urban areas, you don't necessarily see us unless we're coming in to visit.

A couple of things that came up, and I did want to touch basis with, is I keep going back, and I wanted to confirm this multiple times, is that Number 1, the Alternative Number 1 has no change; correct? Alternative Number 4 actually helps the rural citizens.

So what I'm hearing is that the urban citizens, quote, unquote, don't need help because statistically the predicted planning if nothing was done seems to -- I can't think of the word, but anyways, it seems to be right on track, but the rural properties are not right on track. Being in real estate, I'm in it every single day and I think it's extremely important that we re-evaluate what's out there.

I met with three clients today who have acreages and they're asking me about what's going to change, Leah. It's been like this forever. And I happened to mention I'm coming down here. I am pleased that some people did come down, and I think we need to keep that in mind.

And as someone else mentioned, it's kind of an urban against rural. Why? If I wanted to live in urban, I would live in urban and I would abide by the urban rulings and zonings, but I don't. I want to live in the rural area where I want to raise my family or whatever I like to do. I have horses. I have a garden. I have a family. I enjoy my five acres and I think it's very important if that's the choice that people want.

Also on the real estate side, I have a lot of corporate and government clients coming in the area and they do like this area, but the question they ask me every time, Leah, I don't understand, every state that we have been in has one to five acres. Why doesn't Clark County have this? And my comment every time is, well, you have to talk to the County. I think that's very, very important and I can't answer that question.

Let's see. I think that was about it. But I do highly recommend that you guys do pick the Alternative 4. I believe us rural citizens need to have a voice and need to have this great option. Thank you.

MADORE: Thank you.  
Warren Neth. Is Warren here?

ORJIAKO: He's coming up.

NETH: Good evening. My name is Warren Neth, N as in Nancy, e as in Edward, T as in Thomas, h.

I'm here speaking for Slow Food Southwest Washington and in support of the comprehensive plan update that protects large acreage and economically viable farms that require that large acreage. So to that end, I'm in opposition to Alternative 2 and Alternative 4. Three components within those, the blanket removal of AG-20 and the

creation of R-1 and R-2.5, and we're advocating that the County consider a program that adds more flexibility to rural landowners that focuses on developing a transfer of development rights program for rural landowners that would allow them to add auxiliary dwelling units so that other family members can build houses on their larger acreage, focusing on creating agricultural production districts and using the conservation futures fund to consider farmland within those districts.

As Councilors and Planning Commissioners, you're in the process of the GMA update and you're weighing many different values and you need to bring those into balance, and it's my opinion that during this process, you've had more focus on protecting or developing tools within the GMA that give private property owners more rights and have not given as much weight to the value of your responsibility of protecting agricultural resource lands.

I think Alternative 4 was developed during -- primarily by Councilor Madore with trying to hear the concerns from rural land-owning group, Clark County Citizens United, to develop more flexibility for rural landowners, which I think is necessary. But I don't believe that the tools you've developed to that is really balancing the private property rights as well as your responsibility to protect agricultural resource lands.

I think during that process of working with CCCU, I don't think you spent as much time with the decades of research that have been put together during various citizens reports identifying numerous tools of how to support our large farms. We do still have numerous large farms that employ hundreds of people, hundreds and hundreds of thousands of dollars invested into their farms and require hundreds of acres to work, and we still have very minimal clusterings of economically viable farms where there's 500-plus acres clustered and we need to identify those and protect those areas. I think that's my time.

MADORE: Thank you.

BENDER: I have a question. You made the statement we advocate. Who is we?

NETH: Slow Food Southwest Washington.

BENDER: Say it again.

NETH: Slow Food Southwest Washington.

BENDER: Thank you.

MADORE: Is that a 501c3?

NETH: Yes, sir.

MADORE: Mitch K-n-e-i-p-p.

EULER: Kneipp.

MADORE: What's that?

KNEIPP: Kneipp.

MADORE: Kneipp.

KNEIPP: Kneipp.

MADORE: Kneipp. Okay.

KNEIPP: K-n-e-i-p-p. I'll be brief. My name is Mitch Kneipp. I have the pleasure of serving as the Community Development Director for the City of Washougal.

First let me state that Oliver and his group have been a pleasure, as always, to work with. We look forward to the continued collaboration on our planning efforts. We'd also like to thank the Board in regards to the property owner request for the 40 acres that Washougal has asked to expand in our northeast urban growth area. It's probably no surprise, but Washougal is in favor of Alternative 3.

In reviewing Alternatives 2 and 4, Washougal is concerned with the proposed ability for parcelization of larger parcels that could possibly inhibit the city's ability to aggregate property for future employment lands immediately adjacent to our urban growth boundary.

I'm sure that it's no surprise to the Council and the Commission that the only place that Washougal can grow is to the north. With that in mind, having that ability to aggregate those properties together for employment opportunities along our urban growth boundary, our only urban growth boundary, is imperative.

Regardless of what alternative is chosen or what elements are pulled from the different alternatives, we would hope to see that the 40-acre request, the property owner request, be included within that. And we'd also like to see that that parcelization of those properties adjacent to our urban growth boundary, that that does not occur so we can maintain our future for employment. Alternative 3 is the only alternative that ensures both of these and that's why we're in favor of that. Thank you very much.

MADORE: I have a question.

KNEIPP: Sure.

MADORE: You're recommending that the parcels just outside the UGA, UGB be left

large. The question is, the inside, just inside that line, would it be appropriate to match the kind of parcelization just inside the line; in other words, is Washougal leading by example?

KNEIPP: Well, when you look at property we have, we are currently looking at an annexation of 100 acres right now. It's one parcel of 100 acres. The northern portion of it is employment. So, yeah, we would like to make sure that those large acres are kept in, you know, in one parcel ownership.

Any time you look at, in the example that you have of ag land, that we have several parcels that are 50, you know, 100 acre that are ag, and if they go from AG-20 to AG-10, you've basically doubled the amount of work if those parcels split up, double the amount of acquisitions that someone would have to do in order to put that property back together, so, yeah.

MADORE: So the large parcels you're speaking of, they're kept large. You're not dividing them up into smaller?

KNEIPP: Yeah. Right now it's part of the plan that we did last time. They have an urban holding on them that keeps them at a 40-acre minimum right now, so, yes, that's exactly.

MADORE: And the finished product will be at 40 acres, they're not small?

KNEIPP: Well, no. The finished product will be much smaller because it comes into the urban area. It has urban services and we provide those services to them, allow that density to occur so then we can have larger parcels in the rural area.

MADORE: I see. Thank you.

KNEIPP: You bet.

MADORE: George S-u-n --

SUNDEM: Sundem.

MADORE: Sundem. Okay.

SUNDEM: One of these? Yeah. I'm George Sundem, S-u-n-d-e-m.

And I just wanted to comment on, I got five acres of land at 149th Street and 21st Avenue that I've been paying taxes on for 50 years with not any income off of it. And we intended to build on it, and one thing after another and we never build on it from my son being killed in a hit-and-run to -- and then my wife became ill and she passed.

And anyway, her dying wish was to put it -- give it to my other two daughters and she made sure she put it in a trust. And it was zoned two and a half acres then so they could each take two and a half acres when the time came that they wanted.

Well, in the last go-around, it got downsized to five acres, so that was out the window. So then after the last go-around, then I -- what my options were to do with it, and so I was a bachelor so I thought, well, maybe I'll downsize. So I went to try to see if I could build on it and the sewer district told me - the sewer is in the street, a subdivision across the road - that if I'm not in the urban growth boundary, I couldn't get on the sewer.

And so I went to the County Health Department. They told me I couldn't get a septic tank permit if there's sewer in the street. So then I thought sure something will probably happen this time, but it doesn't look like it. And so I was just sitting here thinking -- I mean, my only options, I guess, are probably just to write it off as a bad debt and quit paying taxes on it. But that's all I got to say, but...

MADORE: The property you're speaking of is located inside the urban growth boundary?

SUNDEM: No, it's outside. You went right around it the last time. I thought sure they'd include it and I thought it don't look like it and it's in there again, so it's --

MADORE: Okay. Thank you, sir.  
Steve Horenstein.

HORENSTEIN: Thank you, Councilors and Commissioners. For the record my name is Steve Horenstein, 500 Broadway, Suite 120 here in Vancouver. I submitted a letter earlier today. Did that get distributed?

STEWART: Yes.

HORENSTEIN: It's in the packet?

ORJIAKO: Yes.

HORENSTEIN: Okay. Thank you. I don't want to go through it in great detail.

When the Growth Management Act was adopted in 1991, it had two fundamental goals among the 13 that are listed. One is to densify the urban area and the other is to keep the rural area rural. We've been fighting about that ever since.

The environmental community primarily has appealed just about every growth management plan that Clark County has adopted. There have been on some occasions, some issues the development community has appealed, but largely it's Futurewise and Mr. Karpinski. It's a rare day when Mr. Karpinski and I testify the same

way. Although we get along and are able to work many things out, it's very rare that we're on the same side of the argument and tonight we are.

I'm very sympathetic to the property owners that are here tonight whose hopes have been raised that they may be able to parcelize their rural property. I think it's clear under the law that the County doesn't have authority to adopt the Alternative 4 map. I was just looking at it out in the hall. It's quite a scattershot map.

I think there are some smart ways to create more urban development in rural areas. I've alluded to that in my letter in section -- the numbered Section 3, I believe. There are tools to use. There's the LAMIRD's tool. There is the rural industrial land bank tool which the County is attempting to use now. There are rural commercial centers possible. But to just scattershot and allow the kind of small, smaller than 5-acre land division will not be upheld in the inevitable appeal before the Growth Management Hearing Board. It simply won't.

I've given you three or four cases. There's a plethora of Hearings Board cases on this very issue. It's important to note that they don't draw a bright line as to what's a rural lot and what's an urban lot, and some cases have gone one way and some have gone the other, but no case with a scattershot map like this one will be upheld.

Unfortunately the track we're on to get this plan done does not allow us enough time to do a smarter job of creating more urban areas in the rural area. If we had more time, I think we could step back and take a closer look at that map and, perhaps, provide some relief to rural property owners.

This one isn't going to work and I'm afraid we're going to -- if we choose Alternative 4, we're going to disappoint a lot of folks. Thank's for your time.

MADORE: James Howsley.

HOWSLEY: Good evening, Councilors and Commissioners. I'm here tonight wearing my hat from the Development Engineering Advisory Board.

From our perspective, we think a reset of this process is necessary and prudent at this time. Our County has been dealing with a set of unique circumstances. The first of it, which is when we started this process, we were a commissioner form of government, and since that point, we have changed now and adopted a charter and will be moving to a five-member council in January.

Secondly, as we have kept alluding to for the last several years, we believe that the planning assumptions that this plan is based upon are faulty and incorrect and could lead to a legal challenge that might be upheld by the Hearings Board; namely, the population numbers and the infrastructure deduction.



I've given you a letter that I've already submitted to the Board last week that sort of highlights this continuing testimony on the population side, but primarily it's when OFM did its forecast, they did it during the recessionary period and they allude there within the report that they've made no time prediction as to when population growth would rebound within Clark County.

Since that time, we have now adopted a 1.12 percent growth rate, and yet last year and the year before, we were growing at a much closer rate of 1.7. And what impact does that have? It forces us to undersize capital facilities plans that we require to do any kind of urban or rural development for that matter, and it also ensures that we do not have enough adequate supply of jobs lands which our county sorely needs, and we have a unique ability to grow jobs on this side of the river and remove our dependence from Oregon.

One of the other things I'd like to point out from a process standpoint is I'm a little bit concerned that the Planning Commission is deliberating this matter on the 17th, the last day that comments are due. I believe that the Planning Commission will be receiving comments from various business organizations on that day and potentially elected officials and they should be wise to take that under careful advisement and maybe not deliberate on this matter during that Thursday. With that, I will just wrap up, unless there's any direct questions for me.

MADORE: Thank you.

HOWSLEY: Thank you.

MADORE: Erik K-a-a-r-t-o it looks like.

KAARTO: Good evening. Erik Kaarto, K-a-a-r-t-o. I just found out about this recently reading through it and listening.

I live in La Center, AG-20. I'm from California and just wondering what the environmental impacts are going to be on all of these alternatives. Has that been considered? So that's what I'm wondering. Are we going to have another -- are we going to build, like, La Center's going to turn into Vancouver, you know, if we let all the homeowners decide what to do with their land? These are just thoughts that came to me when I was listening to testimony. And that's all I have to share. Oh, and that was my little boy, except for the love of dirt on his shirt. All right. Thank you.

MADORE: Thank you. Carol Levanen.

COOK: Are we having people testify twice?

MADORE: Say it again, Chris.

COOK: I'm wondering if people are testifying both at the last hearing and this hearing?

MADORE: Is there a legal reason that they cannot testify last week and this week?

COOK: No, there is certainly nothing in the law. I don't recall whether you announced last week that people would be testifying only once, but I think you did.

ORJIAKO: You did.

MADORE: Okay. It is not a hard fast rule, and if the citizens have taken the time to come down here more than once, I will not somehow disallow that.  
Carol.

LEVANEN: This is different testimony. I think you were saying that so that people didn't have to say it twice.

MADORE: Yes.

STEWART: And the other point here is, though, there may have been other people that were here last week who would have wanted to come back again and testify but didn't because the Council said if you testified last week, we didn't expect that you would testify again this week. So if we said that, I don't know now how to resolve this, but it isn't fair to the other people who might have wanted to come and get their last word in tonight too or at least the last word in this forum.

LEVANEN: This is not an individual testimony. This is for Clark County Citizens United. There's a number of people involved in this organization.

COOK: I believe that was also your statement last time that you were testifying on behalf of CCCU.

LEVANEN: Right.

MADORE: So this is not a repeat. This is not an election. It's simply ensuring that we have as much diversity and input as would help us do a better job.

LEVANEN: I don't think legally you can prevent me from giving testimony tonight.

MADORE: You can go ahead, ma'am.

LEVANEN: Thank you. Carol Levanen for Clark County Citizens United.

Alternative 4 is the best choice of the alternatives offered in the Draft SEIS, but more work needs to be done. Authors of the Draft SEIS didn't go far enough in their analysis, nor did they adequately portray 13 equal goals in 36.70A.020 of the GMA, particularly

protection of private property rights. Environmental impacts are biased and skewed against Alternative 4.

GMA comprehensive land use planning is a plan for housing, economic vitality and infrastructure to accommodate growth for 20 years, not plan for no growth or prevent growth. A status quo plan is not realistic and a community will quickly fall behind in meeting GMA goals.

According to CTED, this county grew by 15,000 people from 2013 to 2014 but is only planning for 6,431 now. That's less than half annual growth and is not acceptable. Michael Williams, Southwest Region Planning Manager for Washington State Department of Transportation, Vancouver office, states: WSDOT's vision is to provide a sustainable and integrated multimodal transportation system.

One assumes the major improvements to State Highway 502 was to meet that goal for expected growth -- for expected growth of 20 years and beyond. Clark County will likely continue the statistical trend of 15,000 new people annually and the State needs to plan for realistic growth.

Alternative 4 does not drive increased population, as growth happened between 2013 and '14, the status quo. Transportation has also been frozen with zoning and the State is failing behind -- falling behind. Alternative 4 will simply recognize existing parcels in rural resource areas. Transportation impacts from these lots already happened and have no affect on increased future impacts. As always, new parcels will pay for new impacts via policy and taxes. Dividing potential Alternative 4 lots by 20 years equals only 620 parcels a year. With steep slopes and critical areas removed, the number will be much smaller.

Alternative 1 equals 354 and Alternative 2 equals 411 parcels a year. Alternative 4 calls land what it is using predominant parcel size in an area; Alternative 1 and 2 don't. Soil limitations to Septic Systems map Figure 2-3 says most of the county is very limited to septic sewer systems and yet agriculture and forest maps show most of the county is prime or good soils. Septic systems need well drained soils as do agriculture and forest. If soil is not conducive to septic systems, it's not conducive to resource land. The 1980 comprehensive plan recognized this, but it's missing in the 2015/'16 Draft SEIS. Alternative 4 is a good start. Thank you.

MADORE: Thank you. We're going to take a little recess here if I don't hear any complaints about that. Okay. We'll break for five minutes. According to that clock, we'll come back at 25 till. We're in recess.

(Pause in proceedings.)

MADORE: We are back from our recess and we are continuing public testimony.

The next person in line here is Dennis, can't quite read that last name. He's from Battle Ground, P.O. Box 2551. Is Dennis -- okay.

RITOLA: Good evening. Dennis Ritola, R-i-t-o-l-a.

I don't have anything prepared tonight, but I think that the status quo is actually costing the County economically. The company where I work, we actually hired a person in June, a software engineer, and three months later he still hadn't found a house. He wanted to buy a house that had a shop, and everything that actually was a house and a shop was up between 600 and a million dollars. So after three months this person left.

We have to open up more property, so I'm in support of Alternative Number 4. The status quo is already costing us. Thank you.

MADORE: Okay. Thank you.  
Stephen Boynton, B-o-y-n-t-o-n, it looks like.

BOYNTON: Yeah, it's Steve Boynton. Thank you for having me here.

Yeah, my wife and I, we own La Center Farms. It's a 27 acre. Basically we do not want to see the ag and timber properties cut up, so we are against Option 2 or 4. Because from what I've seen - okay, I grew up in California, I lived in Oregon and worked for the Washington County there for quite a few years and now I'm up here - and what I've seen is the property cut up more and more and more until there's nothing left except city.

So what I believe is if we go this route, 2 and 4, we'll eventually pretty much eliminate the ag and the timber industry in this area and also eliminate the open space that we enjoy. Having the ability to cut up your property raise the price of the land. If you want 20 acres, now you're going to have to buy two tens. Okay. That's if you're going into ag.

If you're going into timber, you need land. You can't do it on 5 acres. You can't do it on 10. If you're going to do timber, it takes 45 years to raise Douglas fir and you need to cut out maybe a 5-acre swath at a time for the loggers to make it feasible. Ag, the same thing, you need land in order to be able to pay for the equipment you need in order to make it feasible. But not only will the price of land go up, the property taxes will go up making it more difficult to run timber or farms.

And then I did work for the Health Department for a number of years and I saw tons of conflict between farmers and the urban people coming in. They don't like that smell of the fertilizer. They don't like that spraying the crops that you need to do to grow the crops and the food for the public. They don't like the logging because, oh, now they can't see the nice trees there. But these are things that are harvestable. It gives the local community food and timber that we need for in order to live here.

So what I've -- if you want to see what this place will look like in 50 years, take a look at Southern California. Take a look at what's going on in Oregon and the Washington County. Everything's being covered over in cement, and we are having it done here too. So we're not going to be here in 50 years, we'll probably be dead, but what are we going to leave to the people who come after us? Is the last cash crop going to be homes? And homes do not provide good economy. Thank you.

MADORE: Thank you. Lissa Boynton.

BOYNTON: It's Lissa. Good evening. My name is Lissa Boynton, L-i-s-s-a, B-o-y-n-t-o-n, and I'm also I'm co-owner of La Center Farms, owner with my husband.

We bought it about 18 years ago and we picked it because it was 20 acres on fertile soil and we wanted to be in the country to raise our kids. When we bought it, we knew the land use laws. We knew it was AG-20 and we respected that. We know land laws are there for a purpose and we plan to keep ours in farming. And even if we keep ours at 27 acres, if everybody else subdivides out, it becomes a different character in rural Clark County. My concerns are many. Will our water supply be adequate? How bad will the congestion be? What about economic viability of our agriculture?

The first one is water. 95 percent of our water comes from aquifers. We have potentially 1,000 new wells to be drilled in ag zoning. Already we have wells that are very poor quality in Clark County, particularly in the foothills in Hockinson, northeast Battle Ground and they have a thousand gallon supplemental holding tanks and drought conditions should get us thinking more about this.

Also the other thing is traffic congestion. A basic goal of the comprehensive plan for Clark County is to slow the trend of increased dependence on the automobile. And when we have to construct new roads and improve the roads that we do have, we are going to have with the cost of this, would fall to the County with partial recovery of cost through transportation impact fees, but that means more taxes for -- because the taxpayers pay for roads and infrastructure.

And also we'll need more infrastructure, power lines, schools and support services such as fire and rescue. All of this would change the character of our rural and beautiful Clark County, the land we love. Let's see.

In closing, Alternates 2 and 4 are in direct conflict with the comprehensive plan goal to slow the trend of dependence on automobiles, and neither Alternative 2 or 4 support State regulations to control sprawl.

We now have the opportunity to keep our county beautiful, attract people to come up, and just like we'd go out to Hood River, and when we're in Hood River, they have this thing called the fruit loop and you go around and you can go to the different farms, and

it's a tourist thing. We saw tons of people when we stayed up there, so all going around. And it attracts people. The wineries attract people, agriculture is viable, but it has to be on bigger acreages.

So I also wanted to say I agree with Chuck Green that we need to wait and make these important decisions when all the Councilors are on board in 2016 and we have full representation. Thank you.

MADORE: John Matson.

MATSON: John Matson, M-a-t-s-o-n. Councilors, people of the public.

Anyway, I'm here not to really say anything. Most of the things have been said which have been in favor of Number 4 which has been common sense and facts. A lot of the things that have been said against 4 haven't been facts. They've been emotions and feelings and don't want us to be able to do anything in the county.

Number 1, 2 and 3 supports the county and urban growth and it seems like most people are pretty well satisfied because that's probably where most of those people live and they have plenty of lots in there. And I just don't like what the person, the manager or one of the managers from Washougal and it was even in The Reflector of the three of the mayors from the City of La Center and the north county, they don't want property to be divided outside of the city limits. They want to keep the big acreages there, so that I can't -- I've got 25 acres and I can't do anything on mine. But then the city comes over there and they put -- annex it in the city and then they put all kinds of houses on it. So that's really not fair to us rural people.

We need to be able to develop our property out there and I'd like to have it so I could put a house on it for one of my children on my 25 acres. So we need a plan for the rural area.

The City, they get by, they annex it like one of the last times they did in Battle Ground, which was pretty dishonest the way they annexed a bunch of land in Battle Ground, and that's generally the way it goes. The property owners don't have much say, but they get forced into it and we don't have a choice.

And when they adopted the growth management, they, Clark County had been growing 2 to 3 percent for many years. Well, they, growth management, cut it down to you could only provide services for one and a half percent. Well, they said, what is Vancouver going to do? What are you going to do to provide? Well, Vancouver, to take care of their population growth, they jumped from 8 units per acre to 12 units per acre so that you could build a 12-plex on 1 acre instead of an 8-plex. Well, is this good living when you're crowded together?

If everybody could live out in the country, we could as far as food and produce would

produce way more than what it's producing now on a lot of that ground. Like one person said about the deciduous trees, they don't grow. It's good fir ground. And if there's small acreages and controlled, it's a lot better place, so...

Carol Levanen has put so much time in over the years, it's a shame she's had to do that, tried to do something fair for us rural people in Clark County. She shouldn't have to do that. Our constitution when it said guarantees the pursuit of life, it was life, property and happiness. So we need some protection and help for the rural areas so that we can provide for our family, and all the lots that are spread out, they say, well, look at all the lots --

MADORE: Your time's up, sir.

MATSON: -- they're spread out for a lot of land out in Clark County.

MADORE: Thank you, Mr. Matson.  
Heather Williams.

WILLIAMS: Hello. I am Heather Williams, W-i-l-l-i-a-m-s, and I represent four family members who all have land in La Center and one in Yacolt, that would be Heidi and Jeff Dietz, Jerry and Peggy Brewer and Jim and Valerie Williams besides my husband and myself.

We are in favor of 1 or 3. We do own a couple of larger lots and we would like to see the larger lots preserved. I think that personally corridor connectivity would be hindered by smaller lots. I know that we do protect wetlands and we do protect waterways by not allowing buildings there, but that doesn't mean a property owner couldn't put up a fence, and a fence is just as much of a barrier as a road or something else that we might put up.

So I appreciate the EIS process because if we were all allowed to do anything we wanted with our property, we wouldn't have good habitats for our wildlife and our trees and everything else we need to preserve for our futures. So that's what I just want to say. Thank you.

MADORE: Okay. Thank you.  
Heidi Owens.

OWENS: Hi. So I'm Heidi, H-e-i-d-i, Owens, O-w-e-n-s. Okay. So, well, I came prepared tonight, but I've changed what I want to talk about a little bit.

You know, it doesn't take much effort to look at that draft environmental report and see that there's a huge impact with Alternatives 4 and 2 in terms of the increased energy needs, the transportation needs, the public service needs, the groundwater needs would be a huge impact on wildlife. And I know this is hard work and I want to

commend all of you. I mean, this is hard, hard work. And I understand that the -- you know, the property owners have their opinions, but this is Washington law and this isn't Clark County law.

And, you know, I was looking at it and the purpose of the 2016 update I understood was to be focused on where the population and the employment growth should be focused, and I'm kind of wondering when we have all of this impact, environmental impact on the schools and the roads, who's going to pay for all of this.

I would like to see a pause, a pause to really back up and look at what you're supposed to do under RCW 36.70A.020 which sets the clear goals for developing comprehensive plans which is to encourage development in urban areas, to reduce sprawl, to encourage efficient multimodal transportation systems, to encourage the availability for affordable housing in all economic systems -- segments, to encourage economic development within the capacities of the state's natural resources, public services and public facilities, protect the environment among other things, but also to 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.

So I understand people say, well, we have our property rights and it is Washington that sets these rules. It is not Clark County that says how the rural areas are supposed to be developed. So if we have to address these economic, these public services, these transportation, these environmental needs, what is it going to cost all of the residents in the county?

I would encourage the Commissioners or the Council to back up and really look at where is it we want to go and what is this going to cost and what is the real plan. It's been said here already tonight. I don't want to see us give us these big blocks of environment -- of agriculture land. And then once we have that clear plan, then you can look at how you want to change the rural lands.

MADORE: Thank you, ma'am.

OWENS: Thank you.

MADORE: Gretchen Starke.

STARKE: Okay. I'm Gretchen Starke, S-t-a-r-k-e, and I am speaking on behalf of the Vancouver Audubon Society.

Vancouver Audubon supports Alternative 1 and opposes Alternative 4. There are many reasons to oppose Alternative 4. It promotes sprawl of a kind that is neither strictly urban nor actually rural but is a kind of bastard combination of the two with the worst qualities of each and with few of the amenities of either. There would be the traffic congestion of urban areas and a distance from public and private services of rural



areas.

Alternative 4 will cause the taxpayer a bundle of money, providing services to the newcomers. Either that or the public services for the rest of us will deteriorate as scarce public dollars stretch in an effort to provide services to people spread out all over the county.

Alternative 4 will put a strain on water resources, will promote more pollution from cars, will hem in the cities hampering their orderly growth, will reduce the ability of the county to attract large employers, those that would need large tracts of land. I could go on.

Alternative 1, on the other hand, does not do these things. Alternative 1 provides for plenty of room to grow, to house the new population, to allow for support facilities such as stores, restaurants, offices and schools all without putting undue pressure on the taxpayer.

Ms. Levanen confused the population growth or the lots available of approximately 6,000 people. This is in the rural area. She confused this with the total population in the total county, most of that would be going to the urban area.

But Vancouver Audubon's main interest is in birds and wildlife. The SDEIS makes it very clear that of all the alternatives, Alternative 4 has the greatest impact on fish and wildlife. Forest and field habitat will be converted to houses and lawns, and neither of which is suitable for most wildlife.

There is a problem of fragmentation, breaking up habitat into pieces makes it less suitable for wildlife. More intensive development adversely affects fish, especially salmon. More intensive development disrupts migration corridors for both aquatic and terrestrial species. An animal moving along a stream corridor through the woods will suddenly confront an expensive lawn, expanse of lawn or a building. Its migration is then disrupted.

But the SDEIS offers a grain of hope. The County could take measures to mitigate for the harm done to wildlife by Alternative 4. The SDEIS specifically mentioned the Conservation Futures Program, a program in which the County, through various grants and funding from a number of sources, buys land for recreation, open spaces and conservation purposes.

If thoughtfully implemented, Conservation Futures could help offset to some extent the harmful effects of Alternative 4 on fish and wildlife. Strategic purchases of land or development rights could help maintain migration corridors. The problem is that mitigation is not required. There is no evidence that the present Board of Councilors --

MADORE: Ma'am, your time is up.

STARKE: Well, you allowed others to slop over.

MADORE: Ma'am.

STARKE: You let others slop over. I detect a bias with the Councilor.

MADORE: Ma'am, thank you very much.  
Susan Rasmussen.

RASMUSSEN: Susan Rasmussen, R-a-s-m-u-s-s-e-n.

Thank you for this opportunity this evening to come before you and speak on behalf of support of Alternative 4. There are many mistruths and absent data in the Draft SEIS. These are tools that were used to facilitate the downfall of Alternative 4. This leads one to believe who is really navigating public policy on land use issues here?

There are rules that apply when writing an EIS, and if these rules aren't respected by the writers and consultants tasked with the job of writing an unbiased draft for proper analysis, how are the Councilors supposed to make important informed decisions? How are competing interests, in this case the private property rights of rural citizens, supposed to intervene and get our voices heard?

CCCU is now tasked with going through the draft with a fine-toothed comb to make corrections. What are the motivations of the writers of the draft? By taking it upon themselves to provide their analysis, one would think that Alternative 4 proponents are vigilantes, invading marauders and only want to carve up the county lands, crowd the highways, deplete water resources all for merely self-serving purposes.

Then you have the cities wanting to lay claim to large lots to prevent fragmentation. Where do private property rights enter into the fray? The purpose of the authors is a big factor for consideration and interpretation.

Motivation becomes really important in part of the decision of making of the County Councilors. The County's comprehensive plans are lawfully supposed to serve the entire breath of all county communities by facilitating positive changes for everybody. That has never happened for the rural communities. When engaged in an activity of the entire public interests, private interests of the writers and consultants need to be set aside. The public's right to honest data outweighs purely private interests.

What the writers failed to realize is that farmers and foresters are operating businesses that are in the public's interest to keep viable. Many counties recognize this, in particular Chelan County. Chelan recognizes the needs of the resource-based industries, the importance of options for private property owners and the importance of property rights.

I was in attendance at the land use forum sponsored by the Clark County Food Systems Council, Mr. Tom Trohimovich from Futurewise spoke. He said, according to the latest USDA Census of Ag for 2012, Clark County has 1929 farms and the main types of ag operations include milk, fryers and berries. He also said that the farm-gate value was 51 million. That's true, but he didn't elaborate. He didn't say that the 2002 Census of Ag was at 54.4 million.

MADORE: Ma'am, your time is up.

RASMUSSEN: Thank you for your time.

MADORE: Thank you.  
Sydney Reisbick.

REISBICK: Good evening. Sydney Reisbick, R-e-i-s-b-i-c-k.

MADORE: Sydney, if you could move that microphone a little closer, please.

EULER: Pull it closer to you.

REISBICK: Do I need to respell?

MADORE: No, she's got it.

REISBICK: Okay. We plan to do input on the EIS rather than the alternatives themselves, so that's what we did. The bottom line points are that the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement, DSEIS, fails totally to discuss the quantitative affects of the alternatives on the environment and on rural life. Because of the above, this DSEIS is not an adequate analysis for creating a preferred alternative.

Finally, the DSEIS -- okay. Finally, the Alternative 4 with its countywide rezoning and changes in minimum lot sizes violates the Growth Management Act and significantly changes the nature of rural character. The DSEIS does not promote -- provide quantitative analysis of any of the alternatives impacts on water, streams, aquifers and wells, wildlife and fish habitat, resource lands, protection and use of -- let's see -- infrastructure, traffic trips, utility service, human health, affordable housing or transit.

The DSEIS does not quantify these affects of the alternatives on cities, rural centers or rural life. It states that mitigation is possible but does not define the necessary mitigations or give the affects or cost of mitigations.

Clearly Alternative 1 will do the least damage to rural character. Current development has already added many wells. Even Alternative 1 will continue to affect rural water systems, ability to use any wells and probably septic tanks as well. Private land rights are only one of the many factors to balance within rural character and are not a Growth

Management Hearing Board's issue; the maintenance of rural character is. Courts having found that Alternative 1 and its zoning consonant with both growth management and State law on land rights. Again, the DSEIS fails quantitative analysis.

MADORE: Thank you, ma'am.

REISBICK: I'm going to read for Val.

MADORE: Okay. Then you have an additional three minutes. Can you spell Val's name, please.

ALEXANDER: Val Alexander, A-l-e-x-a-n-d-e-r. I'm going to give you my written statement because it's too long to read in three minutes. These are regarding the SEIS as was supposed to be the focus of this hearing or so I thought.

What I would like to add is that those who advocate for Alternative 4 are placing their own personal wishes over those of the county citizens who will pay dearly to support their demands if Alternative 4 is adopted. We will pay to build more roads, schools, fire and police protections and for the legal costs that will follow the adoption of Alternative 2 or 4. Many wells will go dry and those property owners will really lose the value of their land. Try to sell a piece of property that has no water or try to live on your rural property without water.

I've lived on my property, 65 acres, northwest of La Center for 50 years and have seen so many attempts to overpopulate the rural areas. It's often been at the behest of a small group of disgruntled landowners who want to make big profits off their properties.

I appreciate those who can see the big picture and want the county to support agriculture and protect open spaces and save taxpayers money and keep our areas safe for the next generation. Please choose Alternative 1 and think of the future.

MADORE: Thank you.  
Fred Pickering.

PICKERING: Good evening. Fred Pickering, P-i-c-k-e-r-i-n-g.

I'm here in support of Alternative 4. And if you take a look at Alternative 1, you'll notice that there's a considerable amount of spot zoning in that Alternative 1 where there's, say, a 40-acre parcel and then there will be a big block around that 40-acre parcel that is zoned 40 or 20s and that includes many, many two and a halves or fives, and that was consistent with the growth management 20 years ago.

They spot zoned any large parcel. They zoned everything around it as that large parcel. And we think that just the fact that somebody's got a large parcel is going to be where, when we go on Alternative 4, then they can subdivide and it's all going to be bad.

But the other thing it does is all these parcels around that 40 acre or larger parcel, they're all nonconforming lots, so their setbacks are impacted by that. It's not only that large lot that's being saved by Alternative 4, it's also all the surrounding ones that are zoned improperly. And, anyway, that's the one point I want to make.

The other point is the forced migration that we're doing in the county by not allowing building in the north county. You take all the kids that come into Battle Ground are bussed into Battle Ground go to school, you know, in two years' time after they're bussed in to go to school, they want to start a family, it's almost impossible to find a place in the north county for them to live. They're forced into Vancouver or Portland or just to leave the area. That's a forced migration of our north county.

Now, you don't normally think about that, but you think of how many hundreds of kids are -- actually it's in the thousands that are graduating every year and they're not going to be able to locate in their -- on their own farm or on their own area. Thank you very much.

MADORE: Thank you.  
Jacqueline Freeman.

FREEMAN: I'm Jacqueline Freeman, F-r-e-e-m-a-n.

We've owned our farm in Battle Ground since 2002. We bought it when an old family farm was broken up into multiple 5-acre lots. Ours is the only land that has continued as a farm. Many people ask us what we grow and they do that with the expectation that we're going to give them one answer, like apples or corn or sheep. But our answer is different: We're a family farm that's formed with the understanding that a farm works best when it has diversity. The entire system supports itself with overlapping resources within the farm.

We own 10 acres and we lease 8 more acres nearby for livestock pasture. On our land, we've got dairy and we've had dairy and beef cows, dairy goats, broiler chickens, laying hens, seasonal turkeys and many, many honeybees. We grow orchard fruit, vegetables, herbs and flowers and we are a mentor farm that teaches young people how to farm.

We make our own compost from animal manures and vegetation we cull from the land. We use this finished product to enrich the gardens and the animal pastures. These days many people don't understand the value of composted manure and instead use chemical fertilizers that can leach into the local water with dire effects. Compost is a more natural way to make the soil stronger and fruits and vegetables more resistant to pests and diseases.

Our system is successful and we have a bounty. We sell our food in Clark County and

we donate the surplus to the Food Bank. Our system works because we have enough land to access each crop or each livestock's unique and overlapping aspects. With a small piece of land, we would not be able to engage each of these farm components to their maximum use.

Animals take up a lot of space, especially when we rotate them through different pastures using principles of sound pasture management. The animals are a very important part of making sure we have nutrient dense soil for the food we grow which makes it healthier than conventional or imported food.

If larger parcels are broken down into smaller pieces, you won't find many people raising animals, yet animals are important to the health of the soil. Without animals on the land, the only choices are to supplement the ever-weakening soils with imported fertilizers, toxic chemicals and to put the water supply at risk.

I want to point out something I hope is at the front of your minds as you choose which plan to follow. As part of the ancient Willamette Valley floodplain, our Clark County land is some of the richest growing soil in the world. Every time some of this land is turned into residential or commercial use, that incredible soil is lost to agriculture forever.

And I know you're not farmers and it's hard for you to understand what the loss of perfect soil means, but it just makes you cry to know this land will never grow food for anyone, man or animal again. In some parts of Clark County we have topsoil that's 12 and even 20 feet deep. This is highly unusual and a tremendous resource for Clark County that should be protected to the hilt.

Alternatives 2 and 4 may look like good ideas, but they'll have devastating effects on local agriculture because they'll break agricultural land into parcels too small to sustain a healthy and productive food system.

MADORE: Ma'am, your time is up. Thank you.

FREEMAN: Thank you.

MADORE: Mary Ann Simonds.

SIMONDS: Mary Ann Simonds, S-i-m-o-n-d-s.

I haven't been here for a while. It feels like an old gathering of old friends, and I say that with quite a lot of love. But old is the key word in this room. Most of us have been involved with the comp plan since 1991. I'm one of those. Moved up from California specifically. I lived here, worked on everything from the stewardship plan, tree ordinances, wildlife habitat, know a lot of you and we've put thousands of hours into things. So a couple of things tonight.

Everything's been looking at the "me." We're good planners. I live part of the time in Florida and I travel all over the world, just got back from Germany doing community planning, equestrian and ecological sustainable development. Do you know I use Clark County all the time as something I'm proud of and say we have good participation? This is how public process should work, because I'll tell you in a lot of the places it doesn't work. So even though I hear a lot of differences of opinion, we have passion, people get out.

But I'm saying, where are the young people? Where are the people we're planning for? Why don't we have high school students on our Planning Commission yet? That was proposed 15, 20 years ago. They're the ones we're planning for.

So with the alternatives before you, I know we can be more creative. I've worked on this with a lot of you. Alternative 1 is not nothing. It has a lot of work in it. It needs some help. Let's use the tools that we have in the state of Washington comprehensive planning, things like equestrian district overlay, sustainable district overlay, small farm, master plan communities.

If you look at the data going on in the United States and you look who sold houses when there was a recession, it was communities that had sustainable interest for the people living there. The equestrian community we've worked on as a task force, that is we are an equestrian county, it's economically viable. It's a planning tool. It protects things.

Case in point where we need to work, Battle Ground School District bought property back in 1994 and clear-cut it. They requested the last comp plan to come into the urban growth boundary, testified under public hearing to the Commissioners and in writing. After three years of a citizens planned group between the County, Battle Ground School District, developers and homeowners on a nice little vision master plan that we did for the community to have a school and they recently now said we're going to sell. They're going to sell because they're in the urban growth boundary. The only reason we came into the urban growth boundary is because they wanted a school.

So my recommendation is stick to what we have that works, but let's listen and get some good development going in the rural areas. We can do master planned communities with small farms. We have a lot innovation and creativity. Thank you.

MADORE: Thank you.

Peter Rasmussen it looks like. I can't quite read that last name. P.O. Box 803 in La Center.

RASMUSSEN: From La Center, yes. Rasmussen, R-a-s-m-u-s-s-e-n. I realize it's late and so I'll make this as short as I possibly can.

I sit here in support of Alternative 4. It boils down to me. I have been a farmer most of

my life. The kind of farming that I did was dairy farming. It does not exist in this county anymore, and as soon as Dennis Lager leaves, it really won't be here anymore, so we're talking about small farms. Now, I have a small farm so I raise the fruit and the vegetables and a couple of beef cows and those kinds of things.

But I'm sitting here for my two daughters, my son, my grandkids. They have 20-acre pieces, but when -- they need options, folks. If they want to continue to keep the place that they have, if they want to live there, they're going to have to be able to seg out some of that land. The days of -- you can say a lot of people have talked here about agriculture and some of the land in Clark County is excellent, but there's a lot of it that couldn't grow anything but trees and berries, maybe.

So I don't want to take up a lot of your time. I support Alternative 4. It's really the only option available to the rural county. It's about property rights. It's about what's really going out there, really going on in the rural lands. Thank you very much.

MADORE: Milada Allen.

ALLEN: I listened -- and I am only testifying today, not last week, Milada Allen, M-i-l-a-d-a, Allen with an e -- I listened through all of the testimonies and I can sympathize with just about everybody because when we purchase our properties, we purchase the rights and liabilities. I would like to maximize my rights and minimize my liabilities; however, I do understand that the Clark County comprehensive plan is a public document that impacts all Clark County residents and taxpayers and it is guided by public policy, laws, regulations and generally accepted planning process as well as the GMA and the State law.

The Alternative Number 1 meets all of these requirements and is de facto an update for you to re-adopt it versus do a major rewrite that would not qualify for the SEIS. The Alternative Number 1, some people keep saying that it's the status quo. Well, it is a plan that is adequate through 2035. It just does not mean that we're doing nothing. It means that we are to stay the course as well as continue to accomplish the goals that were developed and have not been met yet as the population projections were high, in my opinion, then and now and also the recession happened.

The jobs/housing ratio, police officer to population ratio, which is the second lowest in the state of Washington, transportation, infrastructure goals have not been met yet. We do not have the money to meet the existing needs much less to increase the demand, almost double it. So how can we justify the increasing need for services and infrastructure in 2 and 4 when we do not have funding sources to do what we had set out to do and what we had promised the public?

Schools, affordable housing, transportation, safety, public services need to be addressed first before we increase demand on public funds.



There are several components in Alternative 2 and 4 as well as 3 that deserve analysis. In 2016 you will have two more Councilors. Adopt Alternative Number 1 for two or three years and begin a new process of evaluation pursuant to law, pursuant to the GMA orderly development requirement and do not increase a chance for lawsuits as well as penalties that all of us taxpayers will have to pay and then also all of our property taxes will go up.

MADORE: Thank you, ma'am.

ALLEN: So adopt Alternative 1.

MADORE: Thank you. It looks like the last name is Wilder.

WILDER: Wilder.

MADORE: Wilder. Okay.

WILDER: Yeah. My name is James Wilder, W-i-l-d-e-r.

I have a 228-acre tree farm in North Clark County and I'm against Number 4. And the reason I'm against it is because the traffic, the water, property taxes, everything's been talked about tonight. But I'd just like to say with traffic, there's real value in being able to drive from one part of the county to another without getting in a traffic jam. And, you know, over in Portland, we've seen what's happened there and I don't want to see that happen here.

With the water, we had one of the driest summers I can ever remember. I have three creeks running through my property. They all turned into puddles. And we keep sinking wells, you know, the water table's going to drop. Wells are going to start running dry. I don't want to see that.

And the other thing is my property taxes, I've got a 120-year old farmhouse that the property taxes have gone up \$2,000 a year to \$3700 a year in five years. It's like we're going to get taxed off our land. And I think if you pass 4, property taxes are just going to be going up. You got to pay for it.

I think the bottom line is do we want to live in the city or do we want to live in the country? I want to live in the country. There's got to be some kind of divide. And people aren't going to like hearing this, but I think if you bought your land in the last 20 years, you knew what the score was. You knew how many lots you could get out of it. But if you had it more than 20 years, why didn't you subdivide it before this growth management plan? You know, you just can't have it both ways. So that's all I got to say.

MADORE: Thank you.

Fred Pickering you already spoke; right.

PICKERING: Yep.

MADORE: Lee Jensen.

JENSEN: Hello staff, Board. My name is Lee Jensen. I live in Battle Ground, and -- J-e-n-s-e-n. Since some people testified twice and had two three-minute period, time periods to testify, I think it is appropriate for me to finish my friend Gretchen Starke's testimony. She was cut off shortly after three minutes of one testimony and this is Gretchen's.

If the county chooses Alternative 4 as a preferred alternative and if the Board of Councilors continues to attack the Conservative Futures Program, fish and wildlife have an uncertain future in Clark County.

To close, I'd like to point out that there are no mistakes in the current plan concerning lot size. There is a difference between tax lots and legal buildable lots and neither the federal nor the state constitutions guarantee a return on investment or a right to maximize income on property. Gretchen Starke is against Alternative 4, obviously, and she says thank you, Gretchen Starke. And I am against Alternative 4 as well. Thank you Board, staff.

MADORE: Thank you.

That is the last person we have signed up. Is there anyone that signed up and somehow you did not get an opportunity to speak? You can raise your hand if that be the case. Okay. Then I think we are wrapped up.

BARCA: Before we wrap up -- do we have somebody in the back? Yes.

MADORE: Ma'am. Okay.

KENDALL: I wasn't going to say anything, so... My name is Suzanne, S-u-z-a-n-n-e, last name K-e-n-d-a-l-l.

I have lived in Clark County since 1953. I have spent 15 to 20 years managing a farm in Southwest Arizona, a family farm of 1300 acres, and I have -- and my chosen profession now that I'm of a certain age is working in our community to encourage collaboration, being heard as you're doing here, but not one side arguing for this and one side arguing for that. I did that as an attorney for 35 years.

I urge you to look at the very compelling arguments given by both sides. I have a great deal of empathy for the people who purchased property and have families to consider now, and I have great concern about reducing the sizes of the farms in this county.

I know there was one person who testified here tonight with something that I would say was recognizing both sides and proposing alternatives. It was something about carving out, you know, it sounded somewhat like a variance or something, some kind of way for families to pass on to their children their family land that had been owned for a long period of time as opposed to what people on the other side are very rightfully fearful of, that the property would be subdivided and become apartments, or, you know, high density area. We can do that in our cities. That's what they're for.

So all I'm trying to say is that the testimony on the other side is very, very helpful, but now as a Board representing everyone, I urge you to come up with innovative answers to the concerns represented by both sides of the argument. Thank you very much.

MADORE: Thank you.

**End of Public Testimony**

Does anyone on the Board here, any staff want to be able to speak on anything before we wrap up?

BARCA: Yes, Mr. Chair, I'd like to do that.

MADORE: Yes, sir.

BARCA: There was a question from Ms. Owens, I believe, and she was talking about do we know impacts, and I don't know who has read the existing comp plan, 2007 comp plan, but the description about it being the status quo or the no change alternative, I think there's some impacts that we should really discuss and have in the forefront of our thought process.

So here is Capital Facilities Plan For Transportation, Attachment A. It's \$532 million over the 20-year plan. The sheriff's proposal for the 20-year plan, \$108,000. Water system needs, 307,000 -- sorry -- 307 million. Wastewater treatment for Salmon Creek, 106 million. Clark County Regional Wastewater District, 90 million.

And the six-year capital plan from 2007 said that schools already needed to have put in 815 million, which I don't know whether that has actually happened or if we just put in more portables. But the overall impact over the 20-year plan is 22 additional elementary schools, 9 middle schools, 3 new high schools and 4 high school expansions to support Alternative 1. That is significant on its own and I believe the merit of understanding the no change proposal is that we're already down a pretty steep slope.

MADORE: Anyone else? Yes, ma'am.

COOK: I wanted to raise the question of whether the Planning Commission intended to hear more oral testimony next week?

MORASCH: I don't believe we do.

COOK: So oral testimony then is now closed to the public and next week there will be discussion, deliberation, questions of staff, et cetera, et cetera, that's what you're saying?

MORASCH: That's my understanding, yes.

COOK: Okay. But the ability to comment in writing, online, through the means that are up here still exists as far as the Draft SEIS goes through, I guess, close of business on the 17th; right?

EULER: 4:00 p.m.

COOK: 4:00 p.m. on the 17th, so...

MORASCH: And I would encourage everyone to get their written comments in as soon as possible so we have as much time as possible to read them before our deliberation on the 17th.

MADORE: And a question for the Planning Commission. We've heard testimony from several citizens that encouraged a hybrid innovative combination solutions versus an all or nothing, a yes or no, a opposed or reject these alternatives. Do you know if a hybrid or a variation or a mix is on the horizon here at this point or is it just simply foreseeable that it's just on or off?

MORASCH: I think we'll probably have to deliberate on that a little bit.

MADORE: So it's (inaudible.)

MORASCH: I mean, it's something that we will consider, yes.

MADORE: Sorry.

BARCA: Mr. Chair, I believe by asking that question then you're open to sliding the time frame for us to come to a deliberate solution because what Ms. Kendall asked for at the very end and what several other people have asked for is to try and find a solution that genuinely would help the impact from the rural population, at the same time consider the rest of the citizens and the tax base while trying to come up with that solution. I certainly believe that we have the potential of doing that, but that wouldn't be something that would happen in a single evening. So my question to you is, will you support the idea of sliding the schedule to allow us to do that?

MADORE: I can only speak for myself. I cannot speak for my fellow Councilors. We're talking about a 20-year plan and the time it may take to get it right and optimized and to be able to consider how that plan can be improved, in my own opinion, would be well worth it. So if you need more time, I would, my own view would be very supportive of that.

Councilor, do you want to weigh in?

MIELKE: I do. I think we've heard from staff that they have a time schedule that has already been moved out because they pretty much had it put together, and then we had two other alternatives to consider and they started over with the EIS. That's the reason we have a Supplemental EIS already. So I'm amazed if you had something to propose, you didn't have it done.

BARCA: I don't really have access to staff perhaps as you all do.

MADORE: Councilor.

STEWART: So I think we need to consider any reasonable melding of alternatives or adapting them or being creative. I heard some things thrown in about overlay. It might be a little bit late in the process to really look at serious -- of developing a series of overlays, so some of what's being suggested we wouldn't see this thing come back any time soon.

If the Planning Commission does a really thorough effective job, and we want you to do that and we want you to have the time to do that, at least I do, and so the better the product you send to us, you know, the better the product that will come out of the Councilors or Commissioners.

And it isn't likely that we're going to adopt it word-for-word, you know, but we may see it and we may have a policy difference or want to tweak it or whatever. You know that. This is part of the Planning Commission job. You recommend to the governing body and then we see if we think substantially that's correct, and if it needs to be modified in some way which we'll have the ultimate final decision on that, so... It's a good process and it really is good to have this complicated an issue go to this many sets of eyes and brains, so we appreciate that.

And I just want to say, having served on a Planning Commission myself for five years in Vancouver, it's tough work. Comp plans are tough work. They really are and we appreciate your effort and your hard work.

MADORE: One more bit of feedback on - again, this is my own personal opinion - some may believe that this is a predetermined outcome, that this is just a process we go through to be able to just simply count this as an election, how many people for, how

many people against. In reality, these very few small numbers, very important feedback that we got here, but it is not an election. 450,000 people are depending upon these decisions.

All this feedback, the way I see that, is this is to provide us insight. Before we heard all of this feedback from the individuals, we did not know what we did not know. And the three magic words that I believe are at least my responsibility is to make it better, and all this public feedback, all of the every citizen's points and I think we've each written, nailed down a number of them, are ingredients that are in some of these new, some of these we didn't think of, some of these can potentially make it better and that we would only serve the citizens well if we seriously consider those to make it better.

So I certainly encourage us to take all of that input and to see what can we do to make it better, my own personal view.

ORJIAKO: Staff would like to hear from other members of the Planning Commission before we make any additional comment.

BENDER: Chris, Mr. Horenstein presented his input tonight and with a letter backup and on Alternative 4 indicating that basically it wouldn't meet muster for the Washington law. I would like to get Counsel's opinion on that, so if your Counsel determines it will not hold up with Washington law as it currently exist that we don't waste our time on it.

COOK: Duly noted.

QUIRING: And then I had a comment. Mr. Howsley, I think, said that we would be receiving comments from elected officials and some other people on the 17th, and I'm just wondering, I would just encourage those people, if they can get those comments in before the 17th, you know, unless there's some special meeting that they're having on the morning of the 17th, that they need to get them in by end of day on the -- you know, by 4:00 p.m. on the 17th, maybe they could work on those comments and get them to us so that we can read them and study them before we actually deliberate and not have to read them while we're deliberating, so...

WRIGHT: I agree, that would be very helpful. I also had a question about John Karpinski's comments. He mentioned a letter back in April that he submitted, and I'm wondering if that's in any of our packets of comments?

ORJIAKO: Thank you all. We will make sure that we contact Jim Howsley to see if they can submit their comment in a timely fashion. We will search our index record to look for the comment submitted by Mr. Karpinski. If you close public testimony today, as we stated, we are going to be receiving written comment and we want that to come to you in a timely fashion.

I also indicated that staff will do our best, as you can tell. We are not -- we have not

made any recommendation to the Planning Commission coming from staff. That's not our role in this process now. You have to look at the document that is in front of you; that is, the Draft Environmental Impact -- Supplemental Impact Statement.

You have to look at the four alternatives that have been studied. You have taken testimony on what they like and what some folks don't like about them. It is your time to deliberate and then make a recommendation to the Council.

Yes, it's true that the Council may accept your recommendation, modify it, whatever the case may be, but you have to make a recommendation on the preferred alternative to the Council which they themselves will consider, tweak, accept or ask us to do something else. But remember that as you tweak it, if it's outside what have already been studied, you are creating some issues for staff and timing. I just want to put that out there.

JOHNSON: That kind of goes back, we had, I think, nine people tonight testify on time and four people at the last hearing testified on time, and I appreciate the Councilors' position which is -- and, Councilor members, were you talking to us that we should have had a hybrid plan or was that directed at Councilor Madore or we should have that hybrid plan already in our heads? I don't understand. I didn't understand that last exchange.

MADORE: My comment?

JOHNSON: No, Councilor Mielke. Excuse me.

MIELKE: No. I guess what I was trying to say is that we've already had -- this is called a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement because it's the second one that we've done, and you already had the first one and this the second one was to address additional changes. I don't think we have in the time frame to go back and have another supplemental study because I think we spent another 100,000 to get this done, so we're already on overtime. So we need to come to a conclusion and recommendations and adjustments now rather than start a new one.

JOHNSON: And that was my next question because I really think that it's interesting that all the positions, again, they're well thought out, articulate, but it seems to me that everybody was saying hold off. There's a little bit of hold on here, hold on. Let's look at that. Let's look at that.

And for us, the -- and I'm kind of proud of this commission, that we do -- we do our work and we read and we do what we're supposed to do. And so to come up with a hybrid and not go outside of a scope that would cost us something, you know, we're kind of -- we're treading in water that we're not prepared, so that to me takes much more time.

And that's what I'm saying is giving us time and ability if we did not come up with a

conclusion on the 17th that if it took longer, okay, it did, but it would not. It would just be we really need to try to get you the best information we can because there is a diverse amount of information out here; heard that in the last two testimony. That's all I'm saying. That's kind of a question there, Chris.

ORJIAKO: I'll let Chris jump in on that. I can only add that your deliberation on the 17th, and I think I did indicate that it's likely that you may not complete your deliberation on the 17th because you'll be receiving some comment on that day, it's unfortunate, but we will allow you, if you continue your deliberation, to a date certain that will be acceptable.

But I think we have to be able to know that the Board of Councilors, I've already scheduled October 20th. If we have to move that, we may have to move that, but we will give you the time you need to continue your deliberation, but out of that, we will need a recommendation so that we can go forward.

Again, the more we come closer to our timeline, we have 60 days, if I may stress that, to submit our plan to the State. That implies that we have to -- that means that we have to submit our plans to the State by April of next year, not May, not June, to meet that 60-day timeline. So we have to complete this by April of next year, giving Commerce 60-day notice of intent to adopt. So those are the timelines that we have to meet, and outside of that, honestly you'll fall short to the current plan we have.

MADORE: One more point. You mentioned the term hybrid.

JOHNSON: I just took your term.

MADORE: Well, just for the sake even of the citizens to be able to know what we have here, we're not talking about a multiple choice test of 1, 2, 3 or 4, pick one. The outcome, by nature, will be a combination of 0 to 100 percent of 1, 2, 3 and 4, 0 to 100 percent of each one of those. The locally preferred alternative, by nature, will be some kind of a hybrid.

It's not pick one and the process of it optimizing that combinations and also the process of addressing each of the concerns that have been raised by the citizens and by the EIS to understand the impacts, the concerns that could be addressed in ways that up to this point have not been addressed.

As I see this, this is not necessarily to say that the only -- the solutions that are somehow pointed out here are the only ones available to us. What we have pointed out to us are concerns, and there may be ways, better, smarter ways to address those concerns so that that could -- potential combination can be successful because you found a way to be able to break through to and just meet that need, take that concern out. So I hope that the hybridization, optimization, the innovation, all of that comes together to make a -- bake a really good cake with all the right ingredients, taste just



right.

Anyone else?

STEWART: A final question here. If, in fact, the information we got tonight develops, which is jurisdictions, the cities, councils, additional citizens, additional groups maybe wanting to submit written testimony, as you collect that, you will make sure the Council gets copies of all of that. Obviously the Planning Commission will, but it will be important we see those too because we'll also want to read those.

I think Chris has a comment.

COOK: Yes, thank you. Since you're discussing testimony, I'm a little concerned the taking of written testimony was a little not routinized. It didn't all go to one person. So I'm concerned that there may be written testimony that was given to the Councilors that did not get over to Sonja and Kathy over there who need it for the record. And so, Councilors, since you're around, we're going to have to figure out something to get together within the next few days with our people from planning and make sure that there is one copy of everything for the record.

STEWART: And I think you could be accurate, because on a couple of occasions, we ran out here.

COOK: Before you got there?

STEWART: No, I think I got it all. I'm not sure Tom has. She means from tonight, handouts from tonight; correct?

COOK: Yes, that's right. The things that were handed out that came in before tonight, I think everybody has those and those certainly were in the record. I'm just concerned about some of the individual writings that got distributed this evening.

MADORE: Anyone else? Okay. Is there a motion to adjourn?

MIELKE: Make a motion to adjourn, Mr. Chair.

STEWART: Second.

MADORE: All in favor.

EVERYBODY: AYE

MADORE: We are adjourned. Thank you.