

BEFORE THE WESTERN WASHINGTON
GROWTH MANAGEMENT HEARINGS BOARD

CLARK COUNTY CITIZENS UNITED,)
 INC., a Washington nonprofit) NO. 16-2-0005C
 corporation,)
)
 Petitioners,)
)
 vs.)
)
 CLARK COUNTY,)
)
 Respondent.)

VERBATIM REPORT OF:
BOARD OF CLARK COUNTY COMMISSIONERS MEETING
(FROM TAPED PROCEEDINGS)

Meeting date: January 21, 2014 @ 10:00 a.m.

Participants: Chair Tom Mielke, Councilor David Madore,
Councilor Steve Stuart

(Proceedings Transcribed by: Catherine M. Vernon, CSR, RPR)

WHEREUPON, the following proceedings were had and done, to
wit:

1 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: This is the
2 Commissioners' meeting, Tuesday morning hearing.
3 Please join me for the pledge and the invocation.

4 (In unison) I pledge allegiance to the
5 flag, of the United States of America, and to the
6 republic for which it stands, one nation, under God,
7 indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

8 And the invocation today will be given by
9 Pastor Lynn Brock of the Trinity Baptist Church.

10 PASTOR BROCK: Thank you. Join me, if you,
11 please, in the spirit of prayer, as we invoke God's
12 blessings and guidance upon this meeting of the Clark
13 County Board of Commissioners.

14 Almighty God, I pray for these
15 Commissioners as they work through the agenda set
16 before them today. Each of them is an individual
17 uniquely gifted by you with various talents and
18 abilities. Synergize their efforts so that they will
19 be more effective working together than individually.
20 Grant that the actions they take and the decisions
21 they make will benefit all of the citizens of Clark
22 County and make this an even better place to live.

23 No one knows the future but you, Lord, so
24 guide them with wisdom from above, because it's often
25 difficult to see what's coming here below. Thank you

1 for all of the people employed by the county and the
2 dedicated work they do for us each and every day,
3 providing services, planning for the future, keeping
4 the peace, maintaining order and justice. Strengthen
5 each one. Help them realize that their service to the
6 people of this county is an extension of your
7 righteous rule because the government is upon your
8 shoulders and everyone is ultimately accountable to
9 you.

10 I pray for all of us who live in this
11 county. We have the privilege of living in one of the
12 best places in the entire world. Every day we gaze
13 upon scenic beauty that has been here for thousands of
14 years. And day after day people of every nationality
15 are moving here, becoming our neighbors and fellow
16 citizens. Truly Clark County is a microcosm of the
17 melting pot aspect of the United States. With all of
18 our diversity help us to have harmony. Let us be the
19 starting point for the symphony of brotherhood
20 envisioned by Dr. King.

21 Gracious Lord, thank you for keeping your
22 eyes upon us and your ears open to our prayers. Amen.

23 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Amen. Thank you,
24 Pastor Brock.

25 All right. We're going to have an

1 interesting day today. We have about 13 items on our
2 consent agenda.

3 Running down that list, the first one is
4 out of the General Services. It's a reciprocal
5 agreement so that we could purchase things as a larger
6 group.

7 Any comments or questions from the Board?

8 COMMISSIONER MADORE: It's good saving
9 taxpayers monies.

10 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: It sure does.

11 Second, out of Public Health, and it's a
12 process that allows the food handlers, after their
13 training, to apply for their food handlers permits
14 on-line.

15 Any other questions from the Board?

16 COMMISSIONER MADORE: I'm really pleased to
17 see that -- that we are not alone, but we're joining
18 in other counties that are doing things smarter.
19 We're taking advantage of the Internet, making it
20 convenience so people don't have to drive down like we
21 did in the 1970's, but get training and up train their
22 food handling safety permit on-line.

23 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Nothing wrong with
24 the seventies. I have to say that.

25 COMMISSIONER MADORE: We stand on your

1 shoulders.

2 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: The third item is
3 also out of Public Health. It has to do with
4 receiving a grant, along with Cowlitz County, to
5 reduce and give knowledge of those issues that can
6 treat health problems by using tobacco.

7 Any comments from the Board?

8 COMMISSIONER MADORE: And this is a grant
9 in order to accomplish that, which is --

10 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Yes. Yes.

11 COMMISSIONER MADORE: Which is no cost to
12 local funds; is that right, Mark?

13 MARK COLLIER: Yes, sir.

14 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: I double-checked that
15 one.

16 Okay. Number four is out of Public Works.
17 It's an agreement signed with our Public Works and CPU
18 guy. Any questions on that?

19 COMMISSIONER MADORE: I'm happy to see that
20 -- that Clark County is active out there, dynamic in
21 building new roads, widening the ones that we have,
22 improving them, and this is part of that project at
23 119th Street out there, improving that corridor.

24 Keith, I see you out there. And thank you
25 so much for making that happen.

1 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Items five, six, and
2 seven are our warrants. These are the bills that we
3 paid. These are up on-line also for the transparency
4 of the county. You can see what is being paid.

5 Any question for the Board on any of them?

6 COMMISSIONER MADORE: Yep, checkbooks
7 on-line, if anyone wants to check it out.

8 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Number eight is a
9 notice of public hearing.

10 COMMISSIONER MADORE: Oh, it's today?

11 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Today on the hearing
12 on those advisory votes.

13 COMMISSIONER MADORE: Um hum.

14 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: And number nine is
15 today's adopting those code amendments that we worked
16 on last week. Would that be the final presentation to
17 the public, general public?

18 COMMISSIONER MADORE: Well, actually,
19 that's a -- number nine is the notice for January 28
20 for public hearing, right?

21 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: I think today we
22 adopt those that we did last week.

23 MARK: Actually, Commissioner Mielke, this
24 is an action to combine park impact fees, the
25 acquisition and development component, and this is a

1 public notice for the 8th.

2 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Oh, okay. Um hum.

3 COMMISSIONER MADORE: And so that people
4 understand what that is, when -- when residential
5 developments happen, there's a fee that's collected
6 for parks. And right now the fee goes into two
7 different categories, acquisition, which right now
8 that fund is -- is very -- it's got a high balance so
9 we can afford to buy -- keep buying more properties.
10 The problem is that the other part of that goes into
11 development and so we really don't have sufficient
12 funds to really do the degree -- to develop all of
13 those properties we've already bought to the degree
14 that we want to. So this combines those two funds
15 together so that we can both -- well, we can use it
16 most wisely, both build the parks as necessary, which
17 is the -- I guess our plan this year is to build three
18 new parks within our county. Two?

19 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Two or three anyway.

20 COMMISSIONER MADORE: No, it's three.

21 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: All right.

22 COMMISSIONER MADORE: So love the
23 flexibility.

24 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Item number ten.

25 This is a considered action on the possibility of a

1 moratorium or further discussion on marijuana issue.

2 COMMISSIONER MADORE: Um hum.

3 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: That's February the
4 11th.

5 And then number 11 is that we've collected
6 -- I believe we received the taxes for East County
7 Fire and Rescue.

8 COMMISSIONER MADORE: Um hum.

9 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Number 12 is a letter
10 of acceptance for William Skidmore, appointed to the
11 Workforce Development Council. Thank you, Mr.
12 Skidmore. We appreciate that.

13 Number 13 is having to do with the Minutes.
14 Any changes or --

15 COMMISSIONER MADORE: No, hum um.

16 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: -- adjustments on the
17 Minutes? Seeing none.

18 So that's the 13 items that we have on our
19 consent agenda. Do I have anybody in the audience
20 wishing to speak on any one of those 13 items on our
21 consent agenda. Mr. Ed, come up.

22 ED BARNES: Ed Barnes. I live at 4009
23 Northeast 50th Avenue.

24 Basically there's two of them. Number
25 eight, I think you're throwing good money after bad

1 money. The voters have already spoken. The courts
2 have already spoken. The Attorney General has given
3 everybody an opinion that the votes aren't worth the
4 paper that they were written on, on all of those items
5 that have to do with the three bridges and so you guys
6 are just throwing more money away that could be spent
7 on Sheriff -- people working in the Sheriff's
8 Department that could catch those folks that killed
9 those two ladies out there on 72nd and Vancouver Mall
10 Drive. It's ridiculous that you guys continue to talk
11 about this bridge, this bridge, this bridge, and this
12 bridge and that and waste public money holding your
13 time and that when you could be out looking for jobs.

14 The other one is on the parks, you wouldn't
15 have to be taking the park fees and the -- and the
16 other fees and combining them if you hadn't have
17 screwed up and taken the park fees off to start with
18 in the first place. The parks were doing fine. They
19 were being taken care of. They were being maintained.
20 So now you're trying to cover-up the loss of money in
21 the parks by -- by combining two -- two funds to -- to
22 the park impact fees and the -- and the development
23 fund into one fund.

24 Guys, you're doing everything the wrong
25 way. That sign up there, you need that promising

1 future off until you guys get -- David, you guys get
2 yourselves squared around. It's not right what you
3 guys are doing, trying to cover up this after you have
4 made this mistake and that mistake, but these items on
5 those bridges out there, the Attorney General has
6 given you an opinion --

7 COMMISSIONER STUART: Should we have a
8 hearing on those?

9 ED BARNES: The court's given you an
10 opinion.

11 COMMISSIONER STUART: Have a hearing on
12 those?

13 ED BARNES: Why don't you forget it.
14 Forget it and let's -- let's get on with it. Let's
15 get some jobs in this community so we don't have to go
16 to Oregon to work, so Intel is not the fifth largest
17 employer in Clark County. When those two projects are
18 done over there, they're going to be number one and
19 number two. Where in the hell are jobs? Guys, why
20 don't you spend time creating jobs on this side of the
21 river?

22 Thank you.

23 COMMISSIONER MADORE: Before you go, Ed, on
24 the parks, we used a budget of \$880,000 to take care
25 of the parks and now this -- this plan brings that

1 down to \$440,000 to continue to take excellent care of
2 our parks. Isn't that an improvement rather than
3 going backwards?

4 ED BARNES: But the users should pay.
5 David, you know, if you use something, you should pay
6 for it and that and you guys took the fees off when
7 the parks were doing fine. They were put on there for
8 a reason, to keep the vandalism and everything else
9 down. And you can mix it up all of the way you want
10 to. You can mix it up. You can put it in the general
11 fund, which you've been doing. You've been taking the
12 money out of the general fund for -- to maintain the
13 parks and that when you can't afford to hire more
14 sheriffs in this community and the jail house and have
15 them out here patrolling so people don't keep -- quit
16 killing people in Clark County. You've got five --
17 five -- five kids are without two moms because of
18 that.

19 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: This one, I think the
20 park fees had to do with entrance to the parks. It
21 didn't have to do with road development or funding
22 sheriffs.

23 ED BARNES: I understand that, but it's all
24 in the same vein, Tom, what you guys are doing, mixing
25 and matching.

1 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: But we saved the
2 three hundred and twenty-five. Our taxes pay for our
3 parks also.

4 COMMISSIONER MADORE: And, Ed, I respect
5 your freedom of speech, being able to say whatever you
6 want, really we do, but I also want to make sure that
7 if there's anything that's how not as accurate as it
8 could be, that we simply have an opportunity to
9 correct that.

10 Recently we've, each of the Commissioners,
11 we approved hiring four new people for the sheriff's
12 office and our budget office or Bob Stevens is working
13 very closely with our sheriff's office to do what he
14 can to find the savings so that we can afford to add
15 eight more sheriffs or deputies. We -- we hope to be
16 able to do that. There's no guarantee yet, but we're
17 on track to do what we can to better equip and support
18 our sheriff's office.

19 ED BARNES: But that should come first,
20 David. Before any of these public hearings on this
21 money that's being wasted on this, you should be
22 holding, giving that money to them so you don't have
23 to worry about where you're going to get money to hire
24 eight future sheriffs for that or where the funds are
25 going to come from for public security.

1 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: COMMISSIONER STUART?

2 COMMISSIONER STUART: I appreciate IT. AND
3 AS FAR AS making sure we are on the same page with
4 facts, you're speaking to the roughly \$300,000 per
5 year that is not being taken from the general fund
6 that was being paid for by users fees on our park
7 system. That was an action that was taken in 2013
8 that does cost the general fund taxpayers \$300,000 a
9 year. At the time we had elected officials, including
10 the sheriff's office, and the Assessor and Auditor,
11 all of whom are Republicans, speaking out against
12 that, saying that there needed to be higher priorities
13 for general fund than taking the parking fees off of
14 our parks. So if you were speaking directly to that,
15 you are absolutely correct in your factual
16 interpretation.

17 ED BARNES: Thank you very much.

18 COMMISSIONER STUART: You're welcome, Ed.

19 COMMISSIONER MADORE: And I'd like to add
20 one more fact. Since that time we have found a way to
21 save much more, which was \$440,000 per year, to care
22 for our parks.

23 COMMISSIONER STUART: So just so that we're
24 all on the same page, factually speaking, the
25 Commissioner likes bringing up the \$880,000 that was

1 budgeted for our park system when we had a joint park
2 system. That budget, first of all, was never spent.

3 Second of all, the proposal that was
4 brought forward for a joint park system between
5 Vancouver and Clark County was approximately \$500,000.
6 That was the proposal that was turned down by this
7 Board so that we could have a \$440,000 proposal that
8 was county go-it-alone. Now, whether that will be the
9 right call or not is something that we'll have to see
10 over time, but when we're talking numbers, the numbers
11 are incredibly clear, and it was a \$500,000 proposal
12 that we turned down for a \$440,000 proposal. So the
13 savings, if -- and just to be honest, the savings is
14 \$60,000 a year, based on what we were going to have
15 and what we have now. Now, hopefully we can do a
16 better job and save a little money. That would be
17 great.

18 ED BARNES: That would be great.

19 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: COMMISSIONER STUART,
20 you have to realize the devil is in the details.

21 COMMISSIONER STUART: That's why I keep
22 bringing them up.

23 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: And so when they
24 reduced it from \$880,000 down to the \$500,000 or
25 \$600,000, it still --

1 ED BARNES: Mr. Chairman, you also have to
2 pay your bills that you owe to the Economic
3 Development Council which you still owe for a contract
4 that you signed that you haven't paid.

5 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: We're doing great
6 there. Boy, that covered everything from parks to
7 roads to jails to everything.

8 Anybody else wishing to make a comment on
9 anything that was on our consent agenda, items one
10 through 13? I don't see any, so -- oh, I'm sorry.
11 Come on up.

12 BILL: Thank you.

13 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: You're speaking on
14 one of those items there?

15 BILL: Item number ten, actually. I'd like
16 -- I've read it. My name is Bill.

17 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Sit down here.

18 BILL: My name is Bill. This is my first
19 time here. I've been hiding under a rock because I'm
20 an outlaw. You made me an outlaw. You need some
21 information? I've got information. I'll be as honest
22 as I can. If I don't know the answer, I'll -- give me
23 a week. I'll come back with the answer.

24 The answers you people are wanting is how
25 to create more money. How about if I told you in one

1 year's time, if you try my idea, you'll have a half a
2 billion dollars more than you do now? Want to crunch
3 some numbers?

4 From the article in the paper that I saw,
5 Colorado is already doing this. This is a one-time
6 really good offer and all they want to do is for you
7 to try it. I'm talking about the federales. They
8 want you to do this. You are an experiment. And it's
9 true, in an experiment you need some control subjects.
10 So if you do nothing, you're the control. They want
11 you to do this. They want to give you money. They
12 want to figure out how to do it because they made this
13 illegal in the first place, not because it was hurting
14 anybody, because it's a victimless crime. I'm not
15 hurting anybody if I smoke pot. If I'm sitting in my
16 house and I don't hurt anybody, what's the problem? I
17 don't understand. They want you to put up stores
18 where people can go out and buy this if they want to.
19 Right now I could leave this place, make a phone call
20 on the way out, and within an hour I can get you an
21 ounce of pot for \$125. Colorado is selling it for
22 \$400. They're charging 25%. That's \$100 for every
23 ounce of pot that you sell, free, just for allowing it
24 to happen. That's all you've got to do. It's an
25 experiment.

1 The federales have told you it's okay.
2 They're not going to do it. They're not going to send
3 anybody in here and stop you from doing it. They're
4 not going to tell you to do it, because if you tell
5 somebody to do it, I guarantee you they're not going
6 to do it. They're not going to want to do it.

7 Now, you can tell, well, this is what we're
8 going to do to you if you do it. They have free
9 choice. You have free choice. You can sit here and
10 do nothing. That's the old way. The new way is get
11 something done, whatever it takes. Sit down and
12 honestly talk with somebody about the problems. Don't
13 have any hidden agenda. Don't let your personal bias
14 into it. You've already stopped any progress right
15 there if you allow those things in there. If you sit
16 down honestly, and I've heard the beginning of this
17 and all of those words sound really good, but if you
18 don't believe in them and you don't do them, it ain't
19 going to do you any good. You have to believe in what
20 you're saying.

21 What that other thing is, is called lip
22 service. You tell somebody what they want to hear,
23 but you have no intent of doing what you told them you
24 were going to do. It doesn't do anybody any good,
25 except you get your way and their life is miserable

1 and your life is good.

2 I'll tell you right now. I'm 62 years old.
3 I need a job. I don't have enough because I really
4 haven't done legal stuff and some of that stuff that
5 I've done has been taken away from me because I didn't
6 follow their rules. Well, I didn't know what the rule
7 was, so you really can't blame me for that.

8 I don't know why you'd have to punish me
9 because I don't know, but for some reason that's the
10 old way.

11 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Thank you.

12 BILL: Is it done? Am I done? Is my time
13 up?

14 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Yeah, you're way
15 over.

16 BILL: So half a billion bucks, you don't
17 want to know how to do it?

18 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: There's more to it,
19 first of all.

20 BILL: Sure it is. You sit there and you
21 can say whatever you want. You can stop me from
22 talking and say what you want.

23 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: We gave you your
24 three minutes.

25 BILL: It's not doing anybody -- I know

1 already when I came in here you weren't going to
2 change your mind. I knew that.

3 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: We're not discussing
4 this today.

5 BILL: Even for half a million bucks,
6 you're not going to allow me? I can tell you right
7 now how to do it. Any problem you come up with, if I
8 don't know, I'll find out. I'll research it.

9 COMMISSIONER STUART: Sir, just so you
10 know, we will have an opportunity to get the idea from
11 you, because all that happened today was the notice of
12 the public hearing.

13 BILL: But you want six months. It's too
14 late.

15 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Hold on. Hold on.
16 Hold on. This isn't the public hearing. We have a
17 public hearing coming up on February 11th. 10:00
18 a.m., February 11th.

19 BILL: And that's when you're going to make
20 a decision, to ask for six more months to make a
21 decision?

22 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: We haven't made a
23 decision yet, but on February --

24 BILL: You need facts.

25 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: But on February 11th

1 we will be making a decision and we'll be taking
2 public testimony, so you'll get a shot to talk about
3 it.

4 BILL: I've put out enough information that
5 you have what you say you need to make a decision for
6 everybody.

7 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Yes.

8 BILL: Not just the 51%.

9 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: And you're also aware
10 of the Attorney General's decision?

11 BILL: What I said will be helpful, helped
12 by this. Do you have a job for me?

13 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Do you understand the
14 Attorney General just made another decision; are you
15 aware of that?

16 BILL: Is there any job? Pardon? I'm not
17 aware. I just told you when I walked in here --

18 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: You're not listening
19 to anything else. So --

20 BILL: This isn't my deal. I've been under
21 a rock, staying out of the public eye. I don't want
22 to be on TV. I can -- I'm looking at myself to see if
23 there's any red dots on me. By doing this I know that
24 I've put a target on my back. If you want to.

25 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: All it was was public

1 notice that we're going to have a hearing next week.

2 BILL: Thank you.

3 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: On the 11th.

4 All right. Anybody else wishing to address
5 anything on the consent agenda? I don't see any.

6 So may I have some action from the Board?

7 COMMISSIONER MADORE: Sure, Mr. Chairman.

8 I move to approve agenda items 1 through 13, as
9 presented.

10 COMMISSIONER STUART: Second.

11 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: It's been moved and
12 seconded to accept those items 1 through 13 on the
13 consent agenda.

14 Any further discussion from the Board?

15 Seeing none, all those in favor? Aye.

16 COMMISSIONER STUART: Aye.

17 COMMISSIONER MADORE: Aye.

18 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Opposed? None.

19 All right. I see Dr. Melnick is going to
20 leave now after we have the hard subject.

21 All right. So who do we have up for the
22 comprehensive? Oh, Oliver. Morning, Oliver.

23 OLIVER ORJIAKO: Good morning,

24 Commissioners. I'll wait until Rebecca pulls up the

25 Power Point presentation.

1 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Oh, okay. We have to
2 wait for that thing to warm up. Always a good feister
3 -- good feisty discussion when you come up with things
4 where people are really bent in their heart a certain
5 way.

6 COMMISSIONER STUART: Oh, you've got
7 general public comments. Are you going to do general
8 public comments before you go to public hearings?

9 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Oliver, please excuse
10 me. We have general public comment before and we have
11 just a few people signed up.

12 OLIVER ORJIAKO: Oh, okay.

13 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Signed up to testify
14 on general comment, those items related to Clark
15 County, is Ed Barnes.

16 COMMISSIONER STUART: ED.

17 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Ed, you're up.

18 ED BARNES: Mr. Chairman, Ed Barnes, 4009
19 Northeast 50th Avenue.

20 Last week I asked the Commissioners a
21 couple of questions about the whatever you -- what you
22 were going to do while Senator Benton was gone or our
23 environmental director, whatever you want to call him
24 here in the county, and who was going to take his
25 place. And you explained to me that you've given him

1 a laptop, you've given him a cell phone. You've given
2 him all of these various different instruments to take
3 up to the Legislature so he could cover the county
4 commission at the same time he's covering the
5 Legislature. And one of the interesting things that
6 concerned me was the fact that you folks all jumped in
7 and told me, well, we have three very qualified people
8 in the environmental department that will handle
9 anything that has to do with the environmental issues
10 in the county. All three of you said that. And so my
11 concern is if you have all of these people that are so
12 educated and so smart about environmental stuff, why
13 did you hire somebody that is not qualified as the
14 environmental director for \$100,000 a year when you
15 have three people on staff that are already qualified?
16 So it really concerns me that -- that the person that
17 you hired violated the county rules when he filed to
18 have an attorney file a lawsuit against me for freedom
19 of speech, which you folks didn't even know about,
20 which is a violation of your -- your county policies
21 that he did that. And now we have the Chairman up
22 here, according to the paper and what I -- what I'm
23 hearing, what I'm reading, is that Thomas now decided
24 that there is no freedom of the press here in the
25 county building either. You're not going to allow the

1 Oregonian or the Colombian newspaper in there where
2 the people come in to talk. And as a 1st Amendment
3 person, David, I don't see how you could -- how you
4 could do that. No free speech here now? We can't
5 have that? No newspaper here if the people understand
6 because you don't want them to know the truth of
7 what's being published in the paper. David thinks the
8 Colombian lies about everything that they publish in
9 there. He told me that two weeks ago at the regional
10 transportation council meeting, that everything in the
11 Benton and Rivers was a lie. It wasn't -- none of it
12 was the truth. He didn't even bother to look to see
13 what the facts were.

14 Did Senator Benton go from here or
15 Environmental Benton go from here at the taxpayers'
16 money, go up there to make his appeal at the
17 Legislature? Was you guys paying him for that? Did
18 it come out of his own pocket or did the state
19 legislature pay for it as a state senator? I'm really
20 concerned what's going on, that you have a person
21 that's not qualified when you have three people in
22 that department that you could have hired, any one of
23 those three, for less than the \$100,000 that you're
24 paying for somebody that's unqualified. So I just
25 -- you guys again proud past, promising future, it

1 ain't here yet, guys. Thank you.

2 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Thank you, Ed.

3 Let's see the next signed up is George
4 Espinosa. Good morning, sir.

5 GEORGE ESPINOSA: Good morning. George
6 Espinosa from Ridgefield, Washington.

7 The issue that -- you know, I'm glad to
8 hear that we're working hard to get more public input
9 on the general plan. I think that's a good idea,
10 because it -- I know all of our -- my neighbors are
11 very interested in being involved.

12 Another thing that I've mentioned here
13 before and I want to bring up, because it has come up
14 in my business again, this is the matter of the
15 confiscatory fees on legal lot determination. And I
16 sent to Mr. Madore, because I have a situation right
17 now where a property owner in Cowlitz County, also in
18 Clark County, and they're selling some lots here, and
19 we're confronted with this legal lot determination.
20 Well, the fees in Clark County are three times higher
21 than they are in Cowlitz County for the same purpose.
22 And in Cowlitz County the county does all of the work.
23 Here you demand the property owner go to the expense
24 and the difficulty of producing all of the
25 documentation and still charge them three times the

1 fee. And I just -- I'm trying to figure out, is it
2 just an inequity or are our employees that much slower
3 or what? I can't understand it. And I wondered if
4 you would help me out or if we could look into that
5 and maybe find some equity in that situation. It
6 certainly -- I mean, you talk about jobs, jobs, jobs,
7 and these kind of fees certainly stop it, because when
8 I first brought this issue to you, I've since then had
9 three clients that have backed out of selling their
10 property because they didn't want to risk \$1,000 to
11 \$2,000 to find out whether you called their lot legal
12 or not.

13 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: I guess, I'm not
14 quite sure what you're talking about, but I know a lot
15 of the problem stems from changes that were made way
16 back when. They may have changed it one place, but
17 didn't realize that they were zoned something else.
18 So I take faith that Commissioner Madore is working on
19 answering -- answering the question that you're
20 specific to.

21 GEORGE ESPINOSA: Well, it's been about a
22 year.

23 COMMISSIONER MADORE: So, George, before
24 you leave today, if you could go back and meet with
25 Anna and make sure she has everything so that we can

1 really address your concern.

2 GEORGE ESPINOSA: Certainly. Thank you for
3 your time, gentlemen. I hope it is worthwhile this
4 time.

5 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Thank you. Thanks,
6 George. I'm having trouble reading this next one.
7 Steve Yoacham. Yorcken. There we go. You'll set me
8 straight when you get here, right?

9 STEVE YOACHAM: You got it. I'm Steve
10 Yoacham, 20716 NE 10th Avenue, Ridgefield.

11 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: I was close.

12 STEVE YOACHAM: Pardon me?

13 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: I was close.

14 STEVE YOACHAM: You're not bad. It's been
15 an ongoing issue. I just want to go on record that
16 for five years we've been in kind of a quagmire with
17 our zoning issues on North 199th. Mr. Madore
18 graciously came up and suggested that we have a
19 meeting about that, but I have a question that is
20 puzzling. I'm not a lawyer, so I don't know what
21 entails being in urban hold, but I was under the
22 impression that there was nothing could be done with
23 zoning while you're on urban hold. And there was two
24 pieces of property that were put MX on the county
25 docket without any public hearings or any meetings and

1 I'd like to know how that happened. And it was over a
2 piece of land that was in contention about being sold
3 and it was on 209th there and it was two parcels. And
4 I never got any public notice about any meeting of
5 having that zoning changed and it basically shows on
6 the map, the county map. So I'd like to know how that
7 happens. I mean --

8 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: I think --

9 GEORGE ESPINOSA: And this is -- this is
10 -- this is -- these are property owners that have all
11 been within our consortium of people and that have
12 been contesting our zoning. And then all of a sudden,
13 you know, I'm talking to George and all of a sudden
14 here's this zoning changed. And, I mean, how does
15 that happen?

16 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Well, one of the
17 things I believe you're talking about is a draft
18 proposal that's going to be for 2016.

19 GEORGE ESPINOSA: Um hum.

20 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: It's a starting point
21 with putting different things out there.

22 GEORGE ESPINOSA: Um hum.

23 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: To get started.

24 COMMISSIONER STUART?

25 COMMISSIONER STUART: Just -- and I'm

1 looking at Oliver to smack me around if I get it
2 wrong, but one of the keys for urban holding, you
3 know, the quagmire of being stuck in urban holding, is
4 we have to figure out a plan to get it out of urban
5 holding, you know, be able to build the infrastructure
6 to support the growth. So we had already told them
7 hey, look at a sub area plan that helps us get to
8 that. There's a work group and staff that started
9 going that work. They came up with a work group and
10 working with some of the property owners out there,
11 came up with an idea of how they might change it.
12 They brought that to us. We said okay, this is a
13 bigger issue that we should deal with in the 2016 plan
14 because we don't want to only have some land. We want
15 to make sure everybody is a part to this. So -- so we
16 backed it off and said let's do this right. Let's
17 make sure we talk to every one of the property owners
18 in the area, including all of you folks on 10th and do
19 this right so that we can get the zoning correct as we
20 get into the 2016 plan. So when Commissioner Mielke
21 says this is something we'll decide in 2016, it is.
22 This will be part of the 2016 Comprehensive Growth
23 Plan and there will be a discussion of what we do with
24 the zoning, not just for the MX parcels that were
25 being discussed, but also along your area as well.

1 GEORGE ESPINOSA: So how -- I just -- one
2 other quick question. How can you legally sell a
3 piece of property with the zoning addressed as -- as
4 MX to -- to the property that hasn't been officially
5 zoned MX then?

6 COMMISSIONER STUART: So the underlying
7 zone is the zone. So whatever the underlying zone is,
8 that is what you can sell it for. The urban holding
9 overlay means that you cannot change uses. You could
10 sell your parcel tomorrow. You could sell it with no
11 encumbrances using the exact, same zoning that you
12 have today. That's -- that is legal. So the only
13 thing you cannot do is the new zoning has not been
14 applied yet until the overlay is lifted. So any new
15 zoning requires the overlay to be lifted, but whatever
16 your zoning is today, that is what your zoning is that
17 you could sell it for tomorrow.

18 GEORGE ESPINOSA: Okay.

19 COMMISSIONER MADORE: And I assume that you
20 and George Espinosa are here.

21 GEORGE ESPINOSA: This is -- this is --
22 this is the frustrating thing is like, you know, five
23 years ago we presented a document to the Commissioners
24 with -- with 80% of the people in our area that either
25 wanted to get pulled out of the urban growth boundary

1 or have some zoning applied that was better than
2 Office Campus Park. And, you know, we've been
3 working. We've been to meetings. We've been to a lot
4 of meetings. And then all of a sudden one of the
5 -- one of our members in our -- not a member, but one
6 of the people in our group decides that he wants to go
7 mixed use and over -- oversaw what everybody else's
8 opinion was and he, you know, sucked his neighbor into
9 going mixed use too and all of a sudden he sells his
10 property for MX. And it's just really confusing. We
11 weren't notified at all about any of this. I mean --

12 AXEL SWANSON: Nothing has been changed
13 there.

14 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Nothing has been
15 changed. I think you've got neighborhood -- neighbor
16 rumors, I guess.

17 GEORGE ESPINOSA: No, it shows on your
18 -- on your -- your -- on the county.

19 COMMISSIONER STUART: Then that was the
20 comp. plan zone that was adopted. Whatever the comp.
21 Plan zone that was adopted is in holding right now and
22 doesn't apply to the land, but it will be once holding
23 is lifted, unless the zone changes again. So if it
24 was zoned for MX, that piece was zoned for MX in the
25 2007 comp plan, then that's why they would sell it for

1 that. The existing zoning may not be that, but the
2 zoning that's anticipated in the comp. Plan is that.
3 But as far as any changes since 2009, the zoning in
4 that area, nothing -- nothing has taken place.

5 GEORGE ESPINOSA: Those two parcels of land
6 don't supersede any plans that we have in the future
7 of what the zoning we want?

8 COMMISSIONER STUART: No. No.

9 GEORGE ESPINOSA: Okay. All right.

10 COMMISSIONER MADORE: So that if there
11 needs to be -- any communication gap that needs to be
12 closed, I encourage you and Mr. Espinosa to meet with
13 Anna.

14 GEORGE ESPINOSA: And I'm concerned about
15 that because I hear come back over and over and over
16 again, "George, you know real estate. You're not
17 getting something that we're telling you."

18 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: And to cut out the
19 middleman, Oliver Orjiako, our planning director, our
20 long range planning director is here and he would be
21 happy to explain the nuances to --

22 GEORGE ESPINOSA: We've talked to Oliver.

23 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Next up is Allen
24 Aldridge. Oh, not speaking. Okay.

25 Royce Pollard. Good morning, Mayor. How

1 are you doing?

2 ROYCE POLLARD: Happy New Year to you all.

3 COMMISSIONER STUART: Good morning. You as
4 well, sir.

5 ROYCE POLLARD: I just have a -- Royce
6 Pollard, citizen of Vancouver. I have a few comments.

7 First, you know, I believe in prayer, but I
8 want you to know that I -- I don't think it has a
9 place in these kind of meetings.

10 A comment on advisory votes. Just as an
11 aside. Advisory votes are like kissing your sister;
12 nobody gets much out of that. It's a waste of money.

13 So, but to change the tone, I want to
14 congratulate you all on the transparency, the cleaning
15 up of government, and a number of other things but,
16 you know, you -- you all managed to get rid of dead
17 wood in the county. I'll just name a few: Baron,
18 Kapel, Potter, Gray, Rickastrong. Congratulations on
19 your -- on your transparency and your openness.

20 I under -- while I was gone I understand
21 you limited somewhat free speech by banning
22 newspapers.

23 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: No, we just --

24 ROYCE POLLARD: Let me -- let me talk, will
25 you please? And then you can talk.

1 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Yeah.

2 ROYCE POLLARD: Thank you. And, of course,
3 you have employees who are threatening your citizens
4 with lawsuits. I still find amazing. I wonder what
5 the status of that is? You're probably worried about
6 your own lawsuit.

7 I want to congratulate you on your
8 outstanding hiring of the over-qualified Mr. Beantown
9 -- I'm sorry, Benton, as the environmental are -- I
10 have to tell you, my Chinese Shar Pei dog Ralph
11 probably knows as much about environmental issues than
12 Mr. Benton, and he died ten years ago.

13 You've done nothing about these and other
14 serious violations of etiquette, according to you
15 both. I mean, you allowed people to swear. Damn! I
16 just want you to know that I think you are doing a
17 super job and keep up the good work. Thank you very
18 much.

19 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Thank you, Mayor.

20 ROYCE POLLARD: Oh, I'm sorry, you wanted
21 to -- you want to say something, Mr. Mielke?

22 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: No.

23 BRYCE POLLARD: Oh, good. Thank you.

24 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Um, Carol Levanen.

25 COMMISSIONER STUART: Good morning, ma'am.

1 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Good morning.

2 COMMISSIONER STUART: Happy New Year,
3 Carol.

4 CAROL LEVANEN: Thank you. Same to you.
5 How did it go in Olympia?

6 COMMISSIONER STUART: It went all right.
7 It went all right. It's early.

8 CAROL LEVANEN: Yeah. I guess there's a
9 number of things and I just kind of signed the general
10 one.

11 The population projection, that's a key to
12 what you do in the two thousand and -- or excuse me,
13 not 2016 Comprehensive Plan. Hopefully I can go away
14 after the 2016 plan. It's been a long road.

15 But, anyway, so I really encourage you to
16 really look at what happened before and really
17 outreach to the community. And I want to say to the
18 community this is one of the most important things for
19 them to be involved in. There's been a lot of
20 injustices done to landowners over time and so
21 hopefully -- and it's a huge project for this
22 Commissioner Board, but hopefully those corrections
23 can be made in this 2016, and then from there we can
24 go on with something that makes good sense.

25 That being said, I support on your consent

1 agenda to continue considering that moratorium. I
2 think there's so much information out there on the
3 marijuana issue that before you can really make any
4 decision, there's going to be a lot of education that
5 you're going to have to be getting regarding this
6 topic. And I just want to let you know that Clark
7 County Citizens United is here. We are very happy to
8 help you with anything that you need help with. We've
9 got a lot of talented people on our Board of Directors
10 and they're the same people, 15 of them, all in their
11 own expertise.

12 I know I've gotten some calls from some of
13 them wanting to know what they're going to do with
14 forest land, a lot what they're going to do with
15 agriculture land. You know, they're out there.
16 They're educated. They're very helpful folks and want
17 to help you to do the right thing.

18 So, anyway, good luck.

19 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Thank you. We
20 appreciate the e-mails too, very educational,
21 informational, and we appreciate it.

22 That's all I have signed up for public
23 testimony.

24 Now we can probably move on to what I tried
25 to do before. Huh? Oliver, thank you for sitting

1 through that.

2 OLIVER ORJIAKO: Thank you, Commissioners,
3 and good morning. Oliver Orjiako, Community Planning
4 Director.

5 Let me quickly go over the presentation.
6 You've seen this before, so I'll be very brief and get
7 to what we're recommending that the Board do.

8 On December nine -- 18th we had a work
9 session with the Commissioners in which our city
10 partners attended and there was consensus on the
11 information we presented to the Commissioners that you
12 adopt the OFM medium population projection. So what I
13 will do today is review the public -- the population
14 projection numbers. I will quickly ask the Board to
15 select a population number for the Comprehensive Plan
16 update. I will also review with the Commissioners the
17 progress we have made since the work session relating
18 to the public participation plan. I will then ask the
19 Board to approve the public participation plan and
20 take questions, if you have any, and briefly mention
21 what the next steps will be as we move forward.

22 As I reviewed with the Commissioners on
23 December 18th, R.C.W. 43.62.035 requires the state
24 Office of Financial Management, known as OFM, to
25 prepare 20-year population projections for each growth

1 management county and then provide that population in
2 high, medium, and low range.

3 For Clark County, 2035 population
4 projections -- I think I went further than I should.
5 The Clark County population for 2035 from OFM, the low
6 is 459,617 population, a growth rate of 0.31. A
7 medium scenario is 562,207, a population growth rate
8 of 1.12. And the high range is 681,135, a population
9 growth rate of 1.8.

10 The two R.C.W.s that I cited are 36.70.110
11 and 36.70.115, directs that county officials, in this
12 case the Commissioners, select a county-wide plan, a
13 population plan target, and then we, the county and
14 the cities, are supposed to work collaboratively to
15 allocate that population among the cities and the
16 unincorporated portion of the county.

17 This next slide is a different way of
18 graphically showing the same numbers from OFM. The
19 light -- I'm not sure how to do this. The -- you can
20 see the mid points are the 2035 projections, again
21 showing you the low, medium, and high, with the
22 associated growth rates.

23 This next slide just shows you what growth
24 estimates have been in the last seven years. These
25 are growth rate estimates from the April 1 of each

1 year. So if you look at estimated population growth
2 rate from 2007 when the plan was adopted, we, the
3 county, barely were not even at 2%. Since then it has
4 been going down. Some of it is due to the recession.
5 If you look at 2010 we were growing at -- or we grew
6 at 0.3%. You can see us gradually moving up. In 2013
7 we're at .98%. And the dotted red line is the OFM
8 projection -- projected number showing us what the
9 growth rate will be going forward at 1.12%.

10 This chart -- I think I'm ahead of myself.
11 I think at the last work session the Board asked for
12 historical data. This chart represents what our
13 historical growth rate has been. These are real, what
14 is called realtime data. These are based on the
15 actual count. These are census numbers, and they're
16 at ten-year intervals. So we looked at -- we went
17 back as far as 1960. So you can see from 1960, this
18 will be in the third column, 1960 to 1970 we grew by
19 34,645, with a population growth rate of 3.1. And we
20 grew significantly in the seventies and eighties, as
21 you can see, 4.03%. And we've remained a little bit
22 over 2% until we started at a much slower growth based
23 from 2000 to 2010.

24 So this is the historical information, I
25 hope this is helpful, that the Board asked for at the

1 work session on December 18.

2 Going back to the changes in population
3 projection from 2007. When OFM prepared the latest
4 information that was released in May of 2012 it shows
5 that -- that almost all of the GMA counties,
6 population projections, are lower than were predicted
7 in 2007. No one predicted the deep recession that we
8 are in now. And some of the reasons for the lower
9 projections again was based on the actual count from
10 the 2010 census and the adjustments that we made to
11 the input for the future projections. They also
12 looked at the economic downturn and then also factored
13 in lower than anticipated growth rates.

14 Looking back at why is the medium OFM
15 series recommended, in the past OFM have really been
16 very, very close to predicting what the county
17 population will be. There's mixed. I would say in
18 the seventies and eighties they were off because we
19 were growing relatively higher than what was
20 reasonably anticipated or forecasted. Since then
21 they've been very, very close to predicting county
22 population going forward. And the medium series
23 projection is considered the most likely to occur,
24 based on current information and trends. And the
25 medium series also or their latest forecast is

1 developed by, you know, looking at available data
2 based on census, historical growth patterns, and then
3 looking at growth stability or decline.

4 They've also looked at the fact that when
5 you're looking at what number do you pick, the low and
6 the high gives you some bookends. And that represents
7 the measure of uncertainty as the future does not
8 always allow or follow past trends. So if you look at
9 the low and the high, we landed on the medium series
10 and that's the most likely to occur going forward.

11 This next slide -- and I may stop here.
12 This next slide just focuses on the progress that
13 we've made since the work session, this time focusing
14 on the public participation plan. I will quickly add
15 that we --

16 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: COMMISSIONER STUART?

17 OLIVER ORJIAKO: Yes.

18 COMMISSIONER STUART: Whenever he's done
19 with this portion of it is fine. Thank you.

20 OLIVER ORJIAKO: We met with the public
21 information office to update our comprehensive plan
22 web page and we are working on a new page that will
23 probably mirror the Board grid and we are looking at
24 having other links, in other words, some materials
25 that will become available as we move forward. And we

1 should be able to complete that work in the next
2 couple of weeks.

3 We also added a Comprehensive Plan web page
4 to items that the public can sign up on and receive
5 updates via e-mail. I will say that currently the
6 public receives news releases, web update open houses,
7 work sessions, and hearings. We have a current comp
8 plan web page and people can sign up to get e-mails or
9 to get updates and we have about 600 folks currently
10 signed up on our comprehensive web page.

11 Other projects that we have, there are
12 about eight projects that we currently are working on.
13 This, our current subscribers, the current comp page
14 web page we have, like I say, about 600 folks signed
15 up. The Commission on Aging has about 870, and
16 surface mining to Pleasant Highland ranges from 24 to
17 184 folks that signed up.

18 On this other page you can see, when folks
19 open that up, we ask them for their name, occupation
20 or business, e-mail, and the city or zip code. That's
21 how they will get on any of these projects. So we're
22 going to use a similar project update as we move
23 forward with the comp plan.

24 We also have -- I don't know what's
25 happening with this. Okay. We also are very

1 committed in working with our local partners and other
2 stakeholders to increase public information access.
3 These represent what we have now in terms of the
4 planning commission web page. Here we post their
5 meeting Minute notes, agendas, and then any materials
6 that goes with them. People can go on the planning
7 commission web page and get every information, every
8 document. We are going to do a very similar thing for
9 the comp plan web page. And I've reached out to the
10 cities. I've allocated individual staff in my
11 department to liaison with each of the cities as we
12 move forward so that when the cities are having an
13 open house or we're doing something, we'll have
14 someone there representing the county and partnered
15 and are working with them.

16 Commissioners, the next slide is really
17 what I'm asking the Board to do. And that is to
18 approve or select a population projection number for
19 the plan update. We are asking the Board to adopt or
20 select the medium series.

21 I'm also asking the Board to approve the
22 proposed public participation plan. There are two
23 resolutions that are associated with the two items.
24 Our legal counsel have reviewed that and signed it, so
25 I will stop there and take any questions or comments

1 that you may have.

2 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: COMMISSIONER STUART?

3 COMMISSIONER STUART: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

4 Oliver, on the adoption of the population projection
5 number, you had said a staff recommendation, but we've
6 had a lot of work in the interim in this and I think
7 it would be really valuable for people to hear that,
8 you know, what -- what -- who, other than staff, might
9 be suggesting this population projection number?

10 Because we had a great work session with our
11 jurisdictional partners where you had mentioned it in
12 a single word early in the presentation that there was
13 consensus. Explain that consensus, please.

14 OLIVER ORJIAKO: The consensus is that the
15 cities --

16 COMMISSIONER STUART: Just the end.

17 OLIVER ORJIAKO: Okay. I'm sure you're
18 going to be hearing from some of them today. I think
19 there is tremendous consensus that the economic
20 downturn I've indicated that we're growing slowly and
21 that the OFM medium series is the most likely and
22 they're onboard with looking at us adopting the medium
23 OFM.

24 COMMISSIONER STUART: Who is "they"?

25 OLIVER ORJIAKO: The cities and the school

1 districts.

2 COMMISSIONER STUART: All of the cities?

3 OLIVER ORJIAKO: All of the cities, yes.

4 COMMISSIONER STUART: And school districts?

5 OLIVER ORJIAKO: And some of the school

6 districts that were here at your work session. I'm

7 anticipating that you'll hear from them and they've

8 signed up, that you will directly hear from them.

9 That's why we're having the public hearing, so that

10 they can put their comments into the record and for

11 you to officially adopt a number.

12 COMMISSIONER STUART: Thank you.

13 OLIVER ORJIAKO: You're welcome.

14 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Commissioner Madore,
15 you had something?

16 COMMISSIONER MADORE: Yes. I assume there

17 are two separate actions here. One is to adopt the

18 population medium projection number. The second one

19 is to adopt the proposed public participation plan.

20 We haven't really talked much about the population or

21 the projection -- the public participation plan. Are

22 you going to say anything more about that part?

23 OLIVER ORJIAKO: I think we did at the work

24 session on December 18th. The Board asked that we

25 look at new ways or innovative ways to engage the

1 public. And what we are proposing is to look at other
2 new ways that we can increase public participation.
3 And I think I've highlighted the ones that we are
4 doing and what we're currently doing. That is not for
5 me to sell that we're doing a good job, but at least
6 to present to the Commissioners what is it that we're
7 currently doing and what we are trying to enhance
8 going forward.

9 We've used Phase I of this process to do
10 more of informational items, background information.
11 I think as we move forward our next goal is to engage
12 the public directly and identify how they can
13 participate.

14 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: All right.

15 COMMISSIONER MADORE: Okay. I do have
16 something more than that. As part of -- well,
17 actually, what defines the public participation
18 process, we have a document that's included here
19 titled "Clark County Comprehensive Plan Update". And
20 it gets right into, on page five of eight in the
21 middle of the page, it highlights those innovative
22 public involvement technologies, which is very good.

23 I notice that on line number 22 this is the
24 community plans website and it lists an e-mail
25 address. So we have to probably make sure that we

1 actually accomplish the actual website and also refer
2 to make people a little bit aware that this is an
3 e-mail address that they can send to us whatever.

4 The first bullet indicates that there will,
5 in addition to the master grid that keeps track of all
6 of the documents of the public meetings of the
7 Commissioners, there will be a project grid
8 established and that will live at a certain home at an
9 address that we want to make sure that we make obvious
10 to people up front, if that has -- has that already
11 been established?

12 OLIVER ORJIAKO: That's what we're working
13 on with the public -- the public information office to
14 develop. And I said it will be completed in the next
15 couple of weeks.

16 COMMISSIONER MADORE: Okay. So when that
17 becomes available, we'll publish that and make it an
18 easy way for the citizens to it. Great. That method
19 of making sure that everybody has the same tool to be
20 able to communicate and see what is in the works, what
21 drafts there are, what's been established, what the
22 schedules are, what the meetings are, and how to
23 participate, that will be the place to -- the master
24 place where we will keep track of it all.

25 OLIVER ORJIAKO: That's correct. And

1 that's our goal.

2 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: COMMISSIONER STUART?

3 COMMISSIONER STUART: Just one addition to
4 that. I agree, the innovative public involvement
5 technology piece that you've added into this I think
6 is great and I think it's a great upgrade from what
7 we've done in the past.

8 The one piece that I don't see in here, and
9 I may have just missed it, was utilizing GIS, because
10 that's one of the great things that we've had is being
11 able to light up a map, you know, with things
12 happening. Is that in here and I just missed it?

13 AXEL SWANSON: Yeah. It's on line 19,
14 Commissioner.

15 COMMISSIONER STUART: I don't have that. I
16 don't have line numbers.

17 AXEL SWANSON: I'm sorry, line 19 says
18 mapping on mine.

19 COMMISSIONER STUART: Oh, I just focused on
20 that. Got it. Thank you. That's great.

21 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: All right. No other
22 questions from the Board? We have a few people signed
23 up.

24 COMMISSIONER STUART: Sure.

25 COMMISSIONER MADORE: And, COMMISSIONER

1 STUART, thank you for bringing that GIS technology to
2 our attention. My -- they've already hit a home run.
3 They've already been way ahead and created automation
4 tools to engage every citizen that's affected and that
5 has been -- the terminology that we coin for that
6 process is preference census. It's more than a
7 survey, which basically just keeps track of
8 information out there and we don't line up the owner
9 of that particular parcel that's affected with the
10 information on the survey, but the preference census
11 keeps alignment so that you can actually go to the
12 map, update your information, and see everyone else's
13 information on that same -- in that same context,
14 which is a break-through for us. It's just very, very
15 informative to us as decision-makers for the county,
16 but also of the citizens, so they know in situation
17 awareness where they stand compared to everyone else.

18 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: We have several of
19 our partners signed up to testify. I'd like to start
20 off with Brian Snodgrass, the City of Vancouver.
21 Thank you for coming today.

22 BRIAN SNODGRASS: Good morning,
23 Commissioners.

24 COMMISSIONER STUART: Good morning.

25 BRIAN SNODGRASS: You should have -- for

1 the record, Brian Snodgrass, City of Vancouver.

2 You should have a letter from us, admitted
3 last week, in support of the recommendations before
4 you, the two recommendations. If you don't --

5 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Speak into the mike.
6 It's kind of noisy for us right now.

7 BRIAN SNODGRASS: What you're receiving now
8 is just a copy of that same letter, in case you didn't
9 get it.

10 I just wanted to briefly speak in support
11 of the two recommendations before you, with the caveat
12 that we only just learned of this hearing date last
13 week, so we've not yet had a chance to engage our
14 Council, but anticipate doing so soon. And the
15 recommendations before you are very much in keeping
16 with the past position of the council regarding
17 emphasizing job growth to a greater extent than
18 housing growth.

19 The -- in terms of the public, we support
20 we support the public participation plan, support the
21 population forecast recommendation, as for the reasons
22 given.

23 I'll just add a couple of points on the
24 population. I think if you look at some of the past
25 growth rates, certainly what's proposed here is less,

1 but I would note and just in looking at some of the
2 recent growth rates of other areas, the growth rate
3 proposed in the medium forecast is faster than the
4 county has grown in any of the past three years, as
5 you saw from one of the slides. It's also faster than
6 the State of Washington has grown in any of those past
7 periods, faster than the United States has grown in
8 any of the years, I think in about 15 years, so it
9 -- it may look modest, but in terms of its compounding
10 over the years, it yields some substantial growth.
11 You'd have about 130,000 new people in the next
12 20 years. That's almost another Vancouver, not quite.
13 We're about 160,000 people. So I think also it -- the
14 process under growth management affords chances for
15 adjustment, as you know. You're required to update
16 the forecast at least every ten years so the 20-year
17 land supply is going to be very, very difficult, if
18 not impossible, to run out. And should you choose,
19 you have the option, as a county, of updating sooner
20 than that. That's an option obviously that Clark
21 County has obviously used in the past. So I just
22 wanted to put that in context.

23 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Great. I appreciate
24 that.

25 Jim Irish, La Center? Mayor Jim Irish?

1 Thank you for coming today. Good to have you here.

2 COMMISSIONER STUART: Good morning, Mayor.

3 JIM IRISH: Thank you. Good morning. I'm
4 Jim Irish, Mayor of the city of La Center, and I
5 wanted to offer my comments on these comprehensive
6 planning county-wide population forecasts.

7 First of all, I want to mention that we are
8 in agreement with the public participation plan. I
9 think it's a good option and needs to be something
10 that we had before to cut down a lot of the arguments
11 that went on before.

12 I have entered a letter of which speaks
13 basically to our position. And what it says in effect
14 is on behalf of the City of La Center, I understand
15 that the 2014 Clark County and the local jurisdictions
16 within the county will begin working in earnest on the
17 update of their respective comprehensive plans.

18 As you know, the city of La Center has a
19 long-term vision of creating a path for sustainable
20 economic development by encouraging the development
21 not only of the housing growth potential, but also the
22 employment opportunities of the I-5/La Center Road
23 junction. The city of La Center will work in concert
24 with the county as the process is -- as the process
25 unfolds. We understand that the first step of the

1 process is the adoption of the county-wide population
2 projection.

3 Like other jurisdictions in Clark County,
4 we are beginning to climb slowly, but steadily, out of
5 the recent housing recession. That's -- a little bit
6 of history behind that is the city of La Center waived
7 builder's fees that would normally be charged up front
8 for sewer and etcetera and added them to where they
9 could defer those until closing. We still got our
10 money back, but the builder didn't have to charge
11 those fees as part of the loan that he's getting in
12 order to start building. That has kept our growth
13 rate steady, not steady, but it's still climbing with
14 five to seven building starts per year when the
15 recession was at the bottom. We're now up to
16 approximately ten last year and looking forward to
17 another ten this year. So we are steadily climbing
18 instead of coming down into the dip and then starting
19 to build back up again by working with the builders
20 and working with the public that are looking to come
21 to La Center, we are working with them.

22 Given the recent experience of growth
23 recession and the initial rebound, it is the consensus
24 within our community that the county should adopt a
25 medium range of OFM population forecast. The medium

1 range forecast is consistent with our own 20-year
2 planning goals and policies and we look forward to
3 working with the county during the update process that
4 we all address issues -- as we all address issues such
5 as land and opportunities for employment growth that
6 are important to our individual and collective future.

7 And I thank you for this opportunity to
8 comment.

9 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Thank you, Mayor, for
10 coming.

11 Next up is the city of Ridgefield, Steve
12 Wall. Is Steve still here? Oh, here we go. Had his
13 back to me walking away and walking around there.
14 Thank you for being here today.

15 STEVE WALL: Thank you, Commissioners.

16 Again, Steve Wall, city of Ridgefield.
17 Thank you for the opportunity to comment. I'll keep
18 it very brief, very similar comments to both La Center
19 and Vancouver so far and I appreciate the opportunity
20 again.

21 Similar to other jurisdictions, as you're
22 aware, Ridgefield saw that sharp decline during the
23 recession. Thankfully things are picking up again,
24 both residentially and on the commercial side of
25 things, so we're climbing back out. What I would add

1 for Ridgefield is that the city council has not had
2 any official public hearings or conducted any official
3 work sessions, but what we can do is certainly support
4 the medium growth projection through OFM.

5 And, with that, we're looking forward to
6 having -- or looking forward to working with the
7 county and I'm certainly happy to answer any
8 questions. And there is a letter as well that has
9 been submitted.

10 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Just got it.

11 STEVE WALL: Great. Thank you.

12 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Thank you very much.
13 I appreciate it.

14 COMMISSIONER MADORE: And, Steve, your
15 position with the city of Ridgefield?

16 STEVE WALL: Public Works Director.

17 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Thank you.

18 Next signed up is Jamie Howsley. Good
19 morning.

20 JAMIE HOWSLEY: Good morning, Chairman
21 Mielke. This is the first time I've been in front of
22 you as a Chair this go-round.

23 For the record, Jamie Howsley, the
24 Government Affairs Director for the Building Industry
25 Association, and I'm here in that capacity today.

1 I'm here to discuss specifically the
2 population projection and the specific concern that
3 the BIA has is that the forecasted medium range misses
4 the mark for a growth forecast over the next 20 years.
5 I provided you two graphs. The first graph here is a
6 historical growth experienced by the county. I didn't
7 go back to 1960, but went back to '63 and forecasted
8 it out, what it would look like, out to 2035.

9 As you can see, we've sort of had eras of
10 dips and then eras of growth, but the average out
11 would accommodate about 595,000 people by the end of
12 that time.

13 The second issue is that the OFM
14 projections are -- seem to be predicated a large part
15 on the unique slowdown we've had in housing and
16 interstate migration in the United States. That would
17 go to the second graph here. This -- this goes back
18 to 1959 and shows the US housing starts. And as you
19 can see, the United States experiences about
20 1.5 million houses on average for annual production
21 since that time.

22 This is a really unique period in United
23 States history back to the great depression, where
24 housing had slumped down to about a half a million a
25 year. Why is this important? Well, we're going to

1 have a very large ramp up back with a catch-up factor
2 and then we should get back to that average trajectory
3 of about a million-and-a-half a year. And I would
4 encourage the Board to read two papers by the fed.
5 One was the Kansas City Fed called the Demographic
6 Shift that was published this last quarter. The
7 second one is the Washington DC Federal Reserve paper
8 from April 1st, 2013, called the Long and Short of
9 Household Formation. And both of these papers suggest
10 that we are going to experience a rapid growth,
11 especially up through the early 2020s, as a way of
12 catching up.

13 And so with that, I think that OFM's
14 numbers are a little bit off. It's also critical from
15 not only the -- the amount of land we need from a
16 housing standpoint, but also from job production.

17 I'm currently writing an article about the
18 recent court case from the Court of Appeals down in
19 Woodburn, Oregon. And we seem to have a unique
20 advantage here in Washington that we have a little bit
21 more tools to try to maintain adequate land supply of
22 land for jobs, but if we keep that -- that number down
23 as a population and yet we experience the growth, we
24 might not have enough land for job growth, and that
25 would be a real shame.

1 Moreover, the BIA is really concerned about
2 the other planning assumptions going into the plan and
3 we look forward to working with the Board on that
4 going forward. I appreciate it. Thank you.

5 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Thank you.

6 COMMISSIONER MADORE: Jamie, if I think I
7 understand what you're presenting here, what it
8 concludes is basically we're taking too short of a
9 time sample and the long-term trend, which goes all of
10 the way back to the early nineties or sixties would
11 indicate a higher growth rate, right?

12 JAMIE HOWSLEY: That would be my take on
13 it. I think Oliver's graph up there showed the bar
14 graph that had 2007 and it had this way dipped down to
15 2010 and now it shows that we're slowly getting back
16 up to 1%. This takes a longer view. And the reason
17 why I suggested that the Board taking a longer view is
18 that the -- the experience that we're having here in
19 Clark County is something that's experienced
20 nationwide and it's a unique -- well, it's unique in
21 the history of the United States that has only
22 happened really since the great depression now, but if
23 we take a ramp back up factor, as well as the historic
24 growth we've experienced, we should be back on track.
25 And that would suggest that by 2035 we should be about

1 595,000 people.

2 COMMISSIONER MADORE: Okay. So we're --
3 we've adopted the middle of the range number, which
4 came from the Office of Financial Management.

5 JAMIE HOWSLEY: Correct.

6 COMMISSIONER MADORE: Which is 1.2%. What
7 is the slope of that line that you're suggesting.

8 JAMIE HOWSLEY: The slope would be steeper,
9 a little bit steeper.

10 COMMISSIONER MADORE: Do you have a number?

11 JAMIE HOWSLEY: Well, it would be between
12 the high and median range. I don't have a specific
13 number.

14 COMMISSIONER MADORE: So basically those --
15 those three slopes, those three curved lines that we
16 showed earlier, what you're suggesting is that it's --

17 JAMIE HOWSLEY: It's in-between there.

18 COMMISSIONER MADORE: It's in-between the
19 medium and the high?

20 JAMIE HOWSLEY: That's correct.

21 COMMISSIONER MADORE: Okay.

22 JAMIE HOWSLEY: I don't have a specific
23 percentage. I didn't do the math.

24 COMMISSIONER MADORE: Okay. Thank you.

25 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Thank you, Jamie.

1 Carol Levanen?

2 CAROL LEVANEN: Carol Levanen, Clark County
3 Citizens United.

4 I agree with Jamie. The reason is
5 particularly when you do the tool -- the 502, when
6 that interchange gets completed, and that's going to
7 be beginning in 2014, that's going to open up a very
8 large part of Clark County that probably these
9 population projections aren't looking at. I notice
10 the date was 2012 on the population projection from
11 the state and, of course, it was during the down time,
12 but that's not usual for Clark County. It is a very
13 nice place to live and especially when you open up
14 some of your industrial lands and so forth. When you
15 work with the -- the improvement on 502, State Route,
16 you're going to see a huge influx of folks who want to
17 be in that area and I don't know that this population
18 projection has looked at that.

19 Also you're considering additional bridge
20 capacity. And when that happens, you're also going to
21 see another location or possibly other locations in
22 Clark County that are also going to be something
23 that's going to be desirable for folks. And when they
24 see that potential coming in, you're going to have a
25 lot of folks who are going to say hey, this is going

1 to be a great place to be.

2 So I agree with Jamie, maybe not the high
3 one, but the medium one maybe not quite on the mark.
4 So just some little comments. Thanks.

5 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: It's a kind of a
6 safety thing that we do.

7 Commissioner Madore?

8 COMMISSIONER MADORE: I think one of the
9 main concerns is to make sure that we have enough land
10 so the employers can develop parcels and employ people
11 here in Clark County. And, if I understand correctly,
12 you can correct me if I'm wrong, the last time we did
13 this, we looked at a flat map and we lined out, which
14 was typically a blue color on the map, that would
15 indicate that's business, those are business parcels,
16 but that didn't pay any attention to critical lands,
17 if there was wetlands there or some other physical
18 feature that didn't allow that 100% of that area to be
19 used for -- to be developable. We counted it anyway.
20 And we're in the process -- this update includes
21 making sure that whatever is set aside for business
22 land, that we're not just simply saying well, that
23 wetlands, we fixed that. Right? Do we fine-tune
24 that? Do we fix that?

25 COMMISSIONER STUART: So we're fine-tuning

1 it, but just to be clear, 100% of the acreage was not
2 included in the vacant and buildable lands analysis
3 for jobs or for housing. We actually radically
4 improved our analysis for what is actually available
5 to be developed for the 2017 plan using GIS. GIS was
6 the key to it in looking at what is actually on the
7 ground. We changed our building assumptions of what
8 can be built and what can't from what used to be
9 before 2007 a flat percentage.

10 COMMISSIONER MADORE: Okay.

11 COMMISSIONER STUART: That was this is the
12 percentage that it's going to be and it was based on
13 historic detail. We used GIS and said okay, based on
14 GIS information, this is the percentage that can be
15 used of parcels for -- for development versus what
16 will be constrained environmentally and set our vacant
17 buildable lands analysis that way, but we continue to
18 tweak it. Now we can almost do a parcel-by-parcel
19 analysis of it. So we continue to refine using the
20 best available technology.

21 COMMISSIONER MADORE: Great.

22 COMMISSIONER STUART: So it does get -- it
23 will get refined based on this. But the point I would
24 say as far as the jobs number is that nothing that we
25 do on the population growth projection here affects

1 our job projections. Our jobs projections work
2 separately. OFM does not set a range for jobs
3 projections. So if we need more land for jobs, we can
4 get it, and it won't be affected by this.

5 COMMISSIONER MADORE: Terrific. Thank you.

6 CAROL LEVANEN: But the thing that drives
7 -- drives the population projection are jobs.

8 COMMISSIONER STUART: No. The population
9 growth projection that we're doing today is purely
10 residential. So then you set a ratio that we would
11 like to achieve of people per job. We set that ratio.
12 OFM has no say in it. So we set an incredibly
13 aggressive target in '07, trying to make sure there
14 was one job per household, which does not exist and
15 has never existed in Clark County, but it was an
16 aggressive target, that that is what -- that ratio is
17 what set the needed acreage for job development. It
18 was not the population growth projection.

19 CAROL LEVANEN: But I know that OFM uses
20 jobs as a basis for their OFM projections.

21 COMMISSIONER STUART: What I'm saying is
22 nothing in the population growth projection affects
23 jobs land allocation, at all, period, end of sentence.
24 There's nothing that affects it. We do. OFM does
25 not. They have no say in it.

1 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: If we had no jobs, we
2 wouldn't need -- we wouldn't have population growth.

3 COMMISSIONER STUART: I don't know. We
4 don't have enough jobs now and we've got lots of
5 population.

6 CAROL LEVANEN: Right. Well, your
7 infrastructure needs to be in place first.

8 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: That's right.

9 CAROL LEVANEN: And I think that's a real
10 key.

11 COMMISSIONER STUART: I totally agree.

12 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Thank you, Carol. I
13 appreciate it.

14 Eric Golemo? And thank you.

15 COMMISSIONER STUART: Good morning, Eric.
16 Thanks for serving on DEAB again, by the way.

17 ERIC GOLEMO: Yeah, no problem. Good
18 morning, Commissioners. My name is Eric Golemo, SGA
19 Engineering, 2005 Broadway, Vancouver, Washington.

20 First, I want to echo Mr. Howsley's
21 comments on the rate possibly being too low. This is
22 a big decision, long-reaching consequences. Land
23 supply is a substinance of growth. It affects land
24 for jobs. It affects land for our community and land
25 for essential public services. Low supply drives up

1 costs, it makes us less competitive, and it affects
2 affordable housing. Personally, I'm optimistic that
3 this community will continue to thrive and I believe
4 all of you are up there not to make a mediocre
5 community. I think you are -- I'm positive all of you
6 are out there to make this community thrive and I
7 think you share my optimism.

8 When you're making a decision like that, I
9 encourage you to look at the potential risks of both
10 directions. And one thing I'm seeing is it's a fairly
11 low risk decision. What's the risk of going a little
12 bit too high? What's the risk of going a little bit
13 too low? To me, when you look at going a little bit
14 higher, it's a pretty low risk decision. If you're
15 low and you underestimate it, you constrain economic
16 development in our community. So the risk of going
17 higher, I was kind of running through, you know, maybe
18 you'd have to plan a little bit more, you'd have to
19 plan for more growth, you have to look at your
20 infrastructure. And I don't know if that's such a bad
21 thing. So even the negative actually seems like a
22 positive. You get caught off guard when you don't
23 plan for the future and your growth comes and you
24 didn't plan for it. So I guess what I -- what I would
25 look -- look for is going -- maintaining as much

1 flexibility as you -- as you can and urge you to go at
2 the higher rate.

3 Another factor is there's a lot of
4 variables that are outside of your control. It seems
5 like every year there's a new rule from Olympia or
6 Washington that affect what land is really available
7 to build on and how it affects our community. So this
8 is one of the few variables that you actually have a
9 decision to make. So, again, I urge you to go with
10 the higher one based -- based on, you know, the
11 potential consequences of going both directions.

12 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: So, Eric, even though
13 we come back and readdress it between seven and
14 ten years, that's the flexibility that we have. We
15 could come back and address it sooner. In my opinion
16 I don't think we got there the last time in creating
17 jobs and I think that this Board recognizes that we're
18 probably focused that direction. More so.

19 So, Commissioner Madore, you have a
20 question?

21 COMMISSIONER MADORE: Sure. I'm curious.
22 You sit on the DEAB, the Development Engineering
23 Advisory Board. Have you already -- has that Board
24 already looked at these numbers and chewed on it and
25 then worked with our long-term planning to be able to

1 provide that feedback?

2 ERIC GOLEMO: We -- we have not discussed
3 that, so I'm not speaking on behalf of DEAB today.
4 I'm speaking on behalf of myself. And it isn't
5 -- it's something we maybe should look at going
6 forward, but we -- we haven't at this point.

7 COMMISSIONER MADORE: Um hum. Because
8 there's -- the history that brought us up to this
9 point included a previous work session and a lot of
10 work by staff and there's been basically unanimous
11 consensus that -- of everyone involved so far that's
12 been involved so far that says that middle number,
13 that's a -- the good number. And at this point we're
14 at the point where we're expected to make a decision
15 today. Right? And adopt these numbers the way they
16 are. So I would just say what do we learn from this?
17 In the future it would be really good to engage the --
18 that advisory board early on so that you're involved
19 in that process so we -- I know you, as a citizen, I
20 know you are speaking as a citizen.

21 ERIC GOLEMO: Yeah, um hum.

22 COMMISSIONER MADORE: But still you have
23 that insight of the development community and what
24 that means. So hopefully next time we'll -- we will
25 have more engagement to help get this feedback early

1 on so we have more opportunity to tweak it, fine-tune
2 it.

3 ERIC GOLEMO: Can I address, Mr. Mielke had
4 a question about --

5 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Absolutely.

6 ERIC GOLEMO: Yeah, you talked about the,
7 you know, our chance to update it in ten years. I
8 think it becomes more and more difficult to do that.
9 This is the easiest time to address that. This is our
10 base point. It becomes more and more difficult in my
11 experience to change those as the plan goes on. We
12 forget we have that flexibility.

13 Again, all of the projected -- this whole
14 entire range seems to be significantly lower than the
15 historical data. So, again, we're basing it on
16 information like we've had an economic downturn.
17 Well, economic downturns come and go. That's a cycle.
18 In this 20-year forecast we're probably going to see
19 at least one more full cycle. We're going to see a
20 boom. We're going to see -- we're going to see that
21 cycle repeat time and time again. So history does
22 repeat and the historical data we have is extremely
23 useful in predicting. And, again, I urge, again, I
24 know my time is up, what are the consequences of going
25 to the high to the low to the medium? I don't see a

1 lot of risk going with the high. Worst case, the
2 market decides and we have extra land out there. It
3 makes us more competitive. I don't see any down side
4 to going the other direction. And, actually, I'd be
5 welcome to hear it if someone has a reason.

6 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: COMMISSIONER STUART
7 might have.

8 COMMISSIONER STUART: I have several
9 reasons, but not to get into that. You mentioned the
10 boom/bust cycle and that history repeats itself. Part
11 of what we're doing here is so that it doesn't. The
12 boom/bust cycle has been incredibly destructive for
13 you, for your industry, for our citizenry. We have
14 too many people per job. We have too many people
15 commuting across the river. We don't have enough jobs
16 on this side of -- on this side of the pond. So
17 ultimately our job is to make sure that we don't
18 repeat history, that we don't have the same boom/bust
19 cycle that we've had in the past, and to learn from
20 that, which is why you've heard us focusing a lot on
21 availability of the jobs land to really hone in on
22 making sure that there are jobs for the people who
23 live here as opposed to just places for them to live
24 as a weigh station on their way to a job in Oregon.

25 ERIC GOLEMO: Oh, I agree with that, and

1 focusing on jobs land is great.

2 COMMISSIONER STUART: Well, and not
3 focusing on a single industry, which has destroyed us
4 as well.

5 ERIC GOLEMO: Um hum.

6 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: I'm not seeing a boom
7 coming out of this. Maybe that's good. Maybe it's
8 going to be a solid growth.

9 ERIC GOLEMO: That would be great.

10 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Thank you, Eric.

11 ERIC GOLEMO: Thank you very much.

12 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: And the last sign-up
13 is Val Alexander. Val Alexander? All right. That's
14 all I have signed up to testify on this.

15 COMMISSIONER MADORE: Just for a quick math
16 check here, what is being -- what the slope of this
17 line ends up being is 1.18% and we are adopting
18 -- about to adopt a 1.12% compared to 1.88%, so that
19 slope is really only 6% -- 6% or 7% higher than what
20 we are already -- I mean, percentage change between
21 those two. So we're pretty close, even -- even with
22 this.

23 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: That's good.

24 Anything else?

25 COMMISSIONER MADORE: No.

1 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: COMMISSIONER STUART?

2 COMMISSIONER STUART: No, I appreciate all
3 of the testimony and the work on this. This is just
4 the first step. And we talk about this. It is a big
5 issue. You know, picking a population growth
6 projection sets a lot of other wheels to turning, but
7 there's a ton of work that will come forward as far as
8 the vacant and buildable lands analysis, making sure
9 that we're getting it right on the ground so that the
10 pieces of land that are dedicated for jobs can be used
11 for jobs. That we'll be dealing with, you know, our
12 rural lands and how are we dealing with parcel sizes
13 and how will that affect population outside and inside
14 of the bound -- of the growth boundaries themselves.
15 So there are so -- there are so many more steps along
16 the way. This is a first one. And I think that for
17 me, I really appreciate all of the work that's been
18 done with our jurisdictional partners because the risk
19 on the -- the risk is if you go high, from a
20 jurisdictional standpoint, you're taking more density,
21 period. If you look at the ground, the lay of the
22 land on the ground, we have agricultural lands and
23 environmentally sensitive lands that constrain us in a
24 lot of different directions of where we can grow. So
25 if you're a small city and you're looking at this and

1 how can this help implement our vision, you go high,
2 that means you're taking more density. That may not
3 be what you want as a small city. So there is a
4 danger for them on that side of it. There's also the
5 danger of if you pick the wrong land, we're back in
6 court again on appeals. So there are -- there are
7 definitely dangers on both sides of it. I mean, there
8 always are. It's growth planning, you know. This is
9 why lawyers have jobs. So I think this is a good
10 start, though. I appreciate all of the work. Thank
11 you.

12 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Anything,
13 Commissioner Madore?

14 COMMISSIONER MADORE: I agree. The high
15 density, pushing high density, trying to pack more and
16 more within a space, presumes that we would not be
17 changing the growth -- the urban growth boundary. And
18 so, anyway, what you just said there, I -- I agree.
19 The quality of life has a whole lot to do with being
20 able to have a garden in your backyard.

21 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: No, I recognize it's
22 a real challenge for Clark County. We are limited in
23 what we can do and what we can plan for. We are
24 bordered on the south by the river, on the west by the
25 river and the Columbia River Gorge and the mountain

1 range on the east. And I think that we have been
2 looking at planning on the discovery corridor on 503.
3 We have talked with a lot of the neighborhoods
4 involved that could be involved with job creation.
5 And everybody worked a lot and worked a lot with them.

6 The other thing that we've seen is with the
7 skills and the equipment that we have on the GIS, it's
8 kind of shocking sometimes when you actually open land
9 up to be built on, how much of it is not buildable.
10 It has to be used for something else. And -- and that
11 gets concerning because if you have to move farther
12 out, if you have to have that sprawl thing, you have
13 to put infrastructure over a larger ground, distance
14 on the ground. So I think that we're going to be
15 awhile coming out of the recession that we're in. I
16 don't know if it's going to be two years or
17 four years. So I -- I like the idea of baby steps.
18 I'm not afraid of coming back and addressing this down
19 the road before seven or -- seven or ten years. And I
20 really appreciate the work that Oliver has done and
21 the recommendation of the Office of Financial
22 Management from the state.

23 So, with that being said, do you want to
24 --

25 COMMISSIONER MADORE: Make a motion?

1 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Are you prepared to
2 make a motion?

3 COMMISSIONER MADORE: Sure. I move that we
4 adopt the medium population projection number of 1.2%.

5 COMMISSIONER STUART: And the resolution
6 number, did you want to add that too?

7 COMMISSIONER MADORE: Is -- yes.

8 COMMISSIONER STUART: Sorry, it's to your
9 left hand, by your left hand.

10 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: 09?

11 COMMISSIONER MADORE: Okay, yes. And that
12 would be adopting Resolution No. 2014-01-09.

13 COMMISSIONER STUART: Second.

14 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: It's been moved and
15 seconded that we adopt the medium growth level,
16 2014-01-09.

17 Any further discussion?

18 COMMISSIONER STUART: No, sir.

19 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: All in favor, say
20 aye.

21 COMMISSIONER STUART: Aye.

22 COMMISSIONER MADORE: Aye.

23 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Opposed? Obviously
24 not.

25 COMMISSIONER STUART: Call for public

1 participation plan now?

2 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Sure. We have a
3 second part.

4 COMMISSIONER MADORE: Um hum. Sure. I
5 move that we adopt the public participation plan,
6 Resolution No. 2014-01-10.

7 COMMISSIONER STUART: Second.

8 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: It's been moved and
9 seconded that we adopt the participation -- public
10 participation plan 2014-01-10.

11 I think this is really a step in the right
12 direction. I think last time was the first
13 Comprehensive Plan that the Board has really done and
14 they've learned a lot from that. We still have
15 COMMISSIONER STUART on the Board who went through that
16 and it was quite a challenge and it was hard work.
17 And so I think as we move forward, I think there's a
18 lot more people in the public are going to become
19 aware of what we're doing. I don't think they were
20 before, not until after the fact, and then some people
21 were happy and some were very disappointed. So with
22 that being said, all of those in favor?

23 COMMISSIONER MADORE: Aye.

24 COMMISSIONER STUART: Aye.

25 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Aye. Opposed? None.

1 AXEL SWANSON: We need to propose a slight
2 amendment. Oliver noticed that the date range in
3 Exhibit 1 needs to be amended.

4 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Oh.

5 OLIVER ORJIAKO: Commissioners, with your
6 indulgence, on line three.

7 COMMISSIONER STUART: Which resolution?

8 OLIVER ORJIAKO: The one dealing with the
9 population.

10 Line three, I would like the planning for
11 growth to change from 2106 to -- 2015 to 2035.

12 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: What page is that?

13 OLIVER ORJIAKO: That would be on page four
14 of eight, line three, 2015 to 2035.

15 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Oh.

16 OLIVER ORJIAKO: And also --

17 COMMISSIONER STUART: This is just within
18 the exhibit, right?

19 OLIVER ORJIAKO: Yes.

20 COMMISSIONER STUART: So we didn't adopt
21 the exhibit, except for by reference, we just adopted
22 the resolution, so it seems like you could change that
23 without us having to take action. I don't know. I'm
24 looking at the Chair.

25 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: I think you're right.

1 OLIVER ORJIAKO: I'm just looking at -- I'm
2 looking at our legal counsel.

3 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE LEGAL COUNSEL: I think
4 the Amendment is correct.

5 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: And it was excessive,
6 but necessary?

7 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE LEGAL COUNSEL: Yes.

8 COMMISSIONER STUART: Yes.

9 OLIVER ORJIAKO: And also, Commissioners,
10 on line 19, it should also say 2015 to 2035.

11 Thank you, Commissioners.

12 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Okay.

13 COMMISSIONER MADORE: So I can make a
14 motion to amend. Is that okay?

15 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: We'll just some
16 do-overs.

17 COMMISSIONER MADORE: Or do we have to put
18 the main motion back on the docket?

19 COMMISSIONER STUART: Yeah, make a motion
20 for reconsideration.

21 COMMISSIONER MADORE: All right. I move
22 that we reconsider the medium population projection.
23 Well, let me see, no, this is --

24 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Change the dates.

25 COMMISSIONER MADORE: COMMISSIONER STUART,

1 have at it.

2 COMMISSIONER STUART: Resolution
3 2014-01-09, I would second that.

4 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: It's been moved and
5 seconded that we --

6 COMMISSIONER MADORE: Okay. So it's back
7 on the table. Oh, wait, are we all in favor?

8 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: All in favor?

9 COMMISSIONER MADORE: Aye.

10 COMMISSIONER STUART: Aye.

11 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Aye.

12 COMMISSIONER MADORE: Okay.

13 COMMISSIONER STUART: Now we can.

14 COMMISSIONER MADORE: Now I'll make a
15 motion that we change the year 2016 to 2015 on
16 Exhibit 1, page four, line three, 2015 on line 19.

17 COMMISSIONER STUART: Second.

18 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: It's been moved and
19 seconded to amend the Comprehensive Plan to read 2015
20 to 2035.

21 Further discussion?

22 COMMISSIONER MADORE: Right. We're
23 changing it from 2016, 2016 to 2035, to read -- or to
24 read 2015 to 2035, correct, in both of those
25 locations?

1 COMMISSIONER STUART: Yes.

2 OLIVER ORJIAKO: That's correct.

3 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: All those in favor?

4 COMMISSIONER MADORE: Aye.

5 COMMISSIONER STUART: Aye.

6 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Opposed? None.

7 COMMISSIONER MADORE: And now we can

8 re-adopt it. So I move that we --

9 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: You're already --

10 COMMISSIONER MADORE: Oh, that's right.

11 COMMISSIONER STUART: It's already on the
12 table, but we have to take a final passage vote on it.

13 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Okay. It's been
14 amended back to the Board for final action. All those
15 in favor?

16 COMMISSIONER MADORE: Aye.

17 COMMISSIONER STUART: Aye.

18 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Aye. Opposed? None.

19 I think we got it. It got --

20 COMMISSIONER STUART: Got 'er done.

21 OLIVER ORJIAKO: Thank you, Commissioners.

22 COMMISSIONER MADORE: Are you good, Mike?

23 MIKE: Yeah.

24 COMMISSIONER STUART: Now we're on to the
25 advisory votes.

1 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: All right. Now we're
2 going to move on to the advisory votes, which I've
3 got. Okay.

4 The first one up on the advisory votes is
5 the light rail.

6 AXEL SWANSON: That's right, Mr. Chair.

7 Axel --

8 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: You're taking this.

9 AXEL SWANSON: I guess I'm going to walk us
10 through.

11 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Okay. Let's do them
12 one at a time. Maybe I should ask the Board that
13 question.

14 COMMISSIONER MADORE: What's that?

15 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Is there any
16 objection to doing these all at one time?

17 COMMISSIONER MADORE: I think it would be
18 good for us to do them each individually, but if --

19 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Okay. I say that
20 because --

21 COMMISSIONER MADORE: Well, we can't do
22 them all at one time, really, because they have
23 different results.

24 COMMISSIONER STUART: Okay. So but for the
25 purposes of public -- for the purposes of public

1 testimony, maybe I would -- if we can do a staff
2 report on each of them individually, but then, if
3 somebody wanted to come up and testify, instead of
4 them having to come up five different times, just have
5 one big round of public testimony and then do each
6 individually. Is that okay?

7 COMMISSIONER MADORE: Right.

8 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: We need everybody to
9 testify on any of the five, if they'd come forward,
10 and we'll take individual action --

11 COMMISSIONER MADORE: Perfect.

12 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: -- when we accept or
13 take action.

14 ED BARNES: Can you rephrase what you just
15 said?

16 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: We're going to take
17 public comment on one through five. So when you come
18 up here, you can talk about more than one or you can
19 talk about item number five or item number three. And
20 then after we have all of the public comment on all
21 five items, all five resolutions, then the Board will
22 take action.

23 ED BARNES: Chair. Mielke, I had planned on
24 talking three minutes on two of the different
25 advisories. May I do that all at once? Will I be

1 able to speak six minutes?

2 COMMISSIONER STUART: Unforeseen.

3 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Unforeseen, yeah.

4 COMMISSIONER STUART: You want to go to
5 five and -- go to five for small group?

6 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: We can do that. As a
7 compromise we could go to -- I don't think we have
8 that many people here to testify, so we could go to
9 five minutes.

10 COMMISSIONER STUART: That works great, Mr.
11 Chair.

12 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: I can't hear the
13 buzzer hardly at all. I don't know if you can fix
14 that or not.

15 So, Mr. Axel?

16 AXEL SWANSON: Yes, Mr. Chair. Axel
17 Swanson, policy staff for the Board.

18 I'll just give a brief recap of why we're
19 here and then I think we can -- we can get underway.

20 We -- we are here today to kind of close
21 the loop on the work that the Board did last year with
22 regard to our advisory votes. If you'll remember, we
23 put together 12 resolutions that we wanted folks to
24 have a chance to take a look at and vote on and give
25 us their opinion on. That happened this past fall.

1 So now what we're doing is we're back to potentially
2 today to hear testimony to adopt policy positions
3 related to those resolutions.

4 So you'll recall five of those were
5 transportation related. So starting with light rail,
6 bus rapid transit, and then we had the east county
7 toll free bridge, west county toll free bridge, and
8 I-5 replacement toll free bridge.

9 The sixth one I'll just briefly explain is,
10 we're not going to get into and talk about, because we
11 need more time to deal with that one. It's more
12 specifically related to I think just flat out county
13 ordinance and us looking at potentially changing it
14 and that is fireworks. So we'll come back at a later
15 time with a hearing and some recommendations on that,
16 but today we're going to focus on the five
17 transportation-related questions.

18 I can go into the specifics of the numbers
19 if you want or do you want me to just touch on kind of
20 how each one fared of the five?

21 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: No. If it passed or
22 fail. I think those all passed. I don't think we
23 need to go back.

24 AXEL SWANSON: One was just shy.

25 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Oh, you're right.

1 AXEL SWANSON: One was just shy,
2 Commissioner, four, 49 votes, but you're correct.

3 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Not any different.

4 AXEL SWANSON: They all passed except for
5 the one, which was a very close vote.

6 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: I know. I think the
7 intent of the advisory vote was to give this Board a
8 more clear direction on where the majority of the
9 people would like for us to -- to support the
10 direction that we probably should be targeting and the
11 way we should be supporting it on other boards that we
12 sit on. And I think that was the intent of the
13 advisory vote.

14 So -- so you speak of the west side toll
15 free bridge that failed by 49 votes. So --

16 COMMISSIONER MADORE: Was -- was it 49
17 votes?

18 AXEL SWANSON: That's the count I got.

19 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: The man tells me.
20 And I'm not always the best numbers guy, but that
21 was --

22 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Did we do a recount
23 on that, because that was my project.

24 AXEL SWANSON: We probably should have
25 asked for a revote or a recount on that one. And

1 just, I guess maybe for the audience or people that
2 want to speak today, they may not have seen this and
3 this is some great work obviously by our GIS
4 department. And it -- and they can look at it either
5 before they comment or as they comment, but it really
6 does a great job of breaking down by precinct how the
7 vote came out on these. And so you get kind of an
8 interesting and unique perspective on how different
9 geographic areas and the county voted on each one of
10 those.

11 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: And the one you have
12 displayed is number one, the first resolution?

13 AXEL SWANSON: That's the first one.

14 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Related to light
15 rail?

16 AXEL SWANSON: So you can see the red is
17 who would have voted, which precincts would have voted
18 against that particular measure, and the blue is the
19 precincts who voted for it.

20 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Okay. So we'll start
21 with public comment and the first I have signed up is
22 Ed Barnes. And I think he has left.

23 Next signed up, wishing not to testify, is
24 Val Alexander. Blank page. That's east county, west
25 county.

1 That's all I have signed up to testify on
2 the light rail portion.

3 Any comment from the Board?

4 COMMISSIONER STUART: Well, did you want to
5 go through all five presentations and then -- so that
6 people can see all of the presentations of it, and
7 then go to testimony or --

8 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: That would be good.
9 I'd like to show the people.

10 So the next one will be number 2, bus rapid
11 transit. And I have nobody signed up to testify on
12 behalf of that.

13 AXEL SWANSON: We'll give Rebecca a chance.
14 There you go. So there's the -- there's the bus
15 route, very similar, just a little bit different in
16 terms of the red and blue.

17 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: So since it's there
18 and I can't read it, what -- what is the vote?

19 AXEL SWANSON: The bus rapid transit vote
20 or was -- it passed by 62.79%. And so folks gave a
21 very clear indication in Clark County that they --
22 they would like the Board to oppose bus rapid transit
23 projects, unless there is a vote of the people which
24 would support a particular project.

25 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Right. So that would

1 take it to a vote of the people to support that.
2 That's what the Board, this Board, was directed to do
3 by the voters.

4 Any comment from the Board? Seeing none,
5 the next item up there is east county toll free
6 bridge.

7 AXEL SWANSON: The east county toll free
8 bridge, that resolution passed 57.73%. Folks said
9 that they would support an east county toll free
10 bridge and would like the Board to take a favorable
11 position on that.

12 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: And I have a few
13 people signed up to testify on that. Ed Barnes signed
14 up and he's not here.

15 Lee Jensen signed up, wishing to testify on
16 this.

17 COMMISSIONER STUART: Do you want to go
18 one-by-one then?

19 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: No, we'll give him
20 five minutes and he can testify on more than one.
21 That was your suggestion.

22 COMMISSIONER STUART: Yeah.

23 LEE JENSEN: Thank you. My name is Lee
24 Jensen. I live in Battle Ground. And I'd like to
25 talk about first of the east county bridge.

1 The east county bridge, I'm against that.
2 The promoters of the east county bridge at 192nd
3 Avenue have not consulted with the Chambers of
4 Commerce or business groups on either side of the
5 Columbia River concerning the feasibility of their
6 proposal.

7 Bridges are built to enhance shipping and
8 promote commerce. In order for a bridge to be built,
9 both sides of the river have to want it and it has to
10 be justifiable to the state's taxpayers. Portland has
11 no need for a bridge at our 192nd Avenue and will not
12 help pay for it. Only a small percentage of their
13 manufacturers are across the Columbia from 192nd
14 Avenue and Portland already has I-84 for shipping. A
15 new bridge at 192nd Avenue would promote and require
16 development of all boulevards and avenues between
17 Interstate 205 and 192nd Avenue. I doubt the citizens
18 living in those areas would like to have the
19 additional traffic. 192nd Avenue would have to have
20 more lanes for a lot more traffic day and night. A
21 bridge at a new location would be subject to the same
22 studies the current I-5 bridge was. These studies
23 take a lot of time and money. No studies have been
24 done. The people promoting a new bridge at 192nd
25 Avenue don't even know if the federal government would

1 assist financially in its construction. The easy
2 county bridge is a bad idea.

3 Now, I looked up on the Columbia River
4 crossing alternatives considered. This is from the
5 CRC people. Third bridge river crossing. CRC studied
6 new river crossings at locations east and west of the
7 I-5 corridor. Between 68% and 75% of trips crossing
8 the interstate bridge in peak travel hours use an
9 interchange in the project area to enter or exit I-5.
10 As a result, a new bridge constructed east or west of
11 I-5 would not divert a large volume of traffic to that
12 new bridge and I-5 congestion would remain the same.

13 In addition, a third river crossing would
14 not address the safety deficiencies of the interstate
15 bridge or a highway leading to it. The Southwest
16 Washington Regional Transportation Council, RTC, has
17 studied the future need of a third crossing outside of
18 the I-5 corridor. And I have the RTC stuff here. You
19 guys are familiar with that. You're all on the Board.
20 The transportation corridor vision -- visioning study,
21 Appendix E, analysis of new crossings of the Columbia
22 River. Let's see. I'm going to go to the -- to the
23 summarization, the summary page, the very last page.

24 The west corridor would be, as far as its
25 impact to I-5, would be minor relief, 8% fewer trips.

1 Impact to I-205, minor relief due to trip shifting.
2 Increase in -- increase in cross river travel, 3% to
3 4%. That would be for a west corridor.

4 An east corridor impact to I-5? None.
5 Impact to 205? Some relief, 15% to 20%. 7% to 10%
6 increase in total cross river traffic.

7 Mr. Madore and Mr. Mielke, don't you think
8 that persons in your position, elected officials, have
9 an obligation to make sure that something like an
10 advisory vote is on a credible issue? That you don't
11 -- that you haven't just pulled an idea out of thin
12 air and proposed it as credible? People voted on the
13 bridge locations, trusting all of you, thinking these
14 different locations were all reasonable and feasible.
15 The east and west bridge resolutions should go no
16 further. Mr. Mielke, you and Mr. Madore should
17 apologize to the voters of Clark County for not
18 knowing what you are talking about and giving them
19 false hope.

20 The majority of businesses on both sides of
21 the I-5 bridge want it replaced at its current
22 location. This bridge has infrastructure of feeding
23 ports and businesses on both sides of the Columbia.
24 The other bridge proposals do not have infrastructure
25 or ports. The failed CRC project does provide

1 completed studies necessary to build a bridge at the
2 current I-5 location. There are no other locations
3 between Vancouver and Portland where these current
4 necessary studies have been completed or even started.
5 These studies take a lot of time and money. Based on
6 the fact that the necessary studies have been
7 completed, the permitting process has been started,
8 and if Portland needs this bridge, meaning they're
9 willing to help pay for it, the current I-5 location
10 is the best choice.

11 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: All right.

12 LEE JENSEN: Thank you.

13 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: I appreciate that. I
14 think that, looking at the map down here, that most of
15 the people agree with us, that the advisory vote
16 wouldn't hurt anything on that east side, and that's
17 what the advisory vote was for.

18 Next signed up to testify is Carol Levanen.

19 CAROL LEVANEN: Carol Levanen, Clark County
20 Citizens United.

21 I think the landowners can support the east
22 side bridge. The reason is that as you're going
23 through the Comprehensive Plan and you're doing
24 population projections and you're looking for
25 locations for industrial land and commercial land and

1 jobs, you're going to be looking in locations that
2 they haven't been looking before. And I remember when
3 205 was put in and considered, the state of Oregon
4 balked for quite awhile, actually. They just felt
5 that it wasn't something that they needed and it
6 wasn't something that was necessary. And, as you can
7 see now, it has enhanced the state of Oregon to a
8 great deal.

9 So I think it's a decent location.
10 Actually, this community needs many more bridges.
11 Portland right now is building one over the Willamette
12 River because they have a need there. And, you know,
13 it's unfortunate that it's bi-state, so you have this
14 bi-state issue. It's also a federal highway, so that
15 you have this federal issue. But the federal
16 government says that you definitely need your
17 infrastructure, you need increased infrastructure for
18 that interstate commerce and interstate traffic. They
19 didn't say how they thought you should do it. They
20 just say yes, you do it, that we need it, and that we
21 want to support whatever you folks come up with that's
22 a good and feasible location. I still, in my own
23 personal mind, feel that this, the east side, should
24 make a connection somehow to the interstate beyond.
25 And -- and my suggestion was going from, you know,

1 increasing the capacity of 192nd, going on to Patent
2 Expressway, and then accessing I-5 from -- or 205 from
3 there.

4 The west bridge, I'm also supportive of a
5 west location, but I was thinking more further down
6 the highway as a truck bypass area off of Highway 30.
7 Actually, the state of Oregon had a location already
8 decided upon and had bought the easements and so forth
9 and then something happened with the funding and so
10 they sold it back or got rid of it. So they were
11 supportive at one time. I know Jerry Olson from Olson
12 Engineering was telling me that information.

13 So, you know, I mean, we're growing here.
14 We want to be self-sufficient. We want to be going
15 for everything that we can possibly do to enhance this
16 community. And I think third and fourth bridges are a
17 big part of that. So good luck.

18 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Thank you. I have to
19 share with you, Carol, that the 11th -- the west side
20 bridge was my idea to see, to get the vote of the
21 people. That didn't promote it. We just put it out
22 there. We left it pretty open, whether it be served
23 from the Mill Plain or from the Ridgefield area, it
24 was pretty open. But, like you, I recall when I was
25 in the Legislature, when both the Port of Vancouver

1 and the Port of Portland came and asked us to build a
2 port-to-port bridge. And at that time it didn't
3 happen because one was a bulk port and one was a
4 container port. Today they're both. And it would be
5 feasible to double use that as a port-to-port bridge
6 and a connection over to Highway 30 I think is where
7 they're building that new bridge in Oregon that's been
8 on the docket for about 40 years to get the traffic
9 out of St. Johns. So that was the reason for that
10 proposal.

11 CAROL LEVANEN: You know, thinking about
12 regional, regional growth, you know, not just us but,
13 you know, we've got so many people down the line on
14 I-5 within our region that have so much potential, you
15 know, for growth increases and -- and job
16 opportunities that, you know, I think tapping into
17 everything we possibly can will really make us much
18 more self-sufficient here in Clark County.

19 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Thank you very much.

20 COMMISSIONER STUART: Thanks, Carol.

21 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Good to see you.

22 Lee Jensen? He already left.

23 Bridget Mc -- help me out here -- McLeeman.

24 BRIDGET MCLEEMAN: Yes.

25 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Oh, man, I did it.

1 Thank you for being here today.

2 BRIDGET MCLEEMAN: Bridget McLeeman. Do
3 you need my address? Vancouver anyway, Clark County.

4 I was more concerned with the process
5 around this. When I listened to both gentlemen over
6 here and you guys talk, it's as if the advisory votes
7 were votes against the process, the issue. I don't
8 believe that's the case. I believe it's the people
9 wanted to vote on any proposal. And I'm not certain
10 that these large blue areas are people who oppose an
11 east side, a west side, or a main bridge. I think
12 it's that they want more detail. And yet, when you
13 translate that and the way you talk here, it's a vote
14 against the I-5 bridge or a vote for the east county
15 bridge. I do not believe that's the case. And when I
16 look at the proposals that are there, the only one
17 with any substance attached to it is the I-5 bridge.
18 And that has enough detail in it, the people could
19 make some -- have some valid opinions.

20 What concerns me about the way this is
21 going is that adopting these advisory votes precludes
22 you negotiating on a good deal in any one of these
23 locations. It's like, okay, you're going to go to the
24 -- the Regional Transport Commission and you're
25 mandated to vote against anything. I don't think that

1 was the intention. The intention is that you
2 negotiate and the best deal you come up with is
3 approved or disapproved by -- by the average
4 population.

5 Having said all of that, I have to say that
6 it really disappoints me that this is almost vicious
7 antipathy to the idea of light rail. I was sitting in
8 a traffic jam on Highway 26 yesterday and I have to
9 say, the best move you could do is get Powells to
10 build a bookstore over here, but sitting there for an
11 hour-and-a-half, and during that time at least six
12 light rail max trains went by. And I thought if we
13 had that sort of an opportunity, it would be great.
14 However, those sort of things don't seem to be being
15 negotiated and put on the table. Rather there's a
16 sort of a universal dislike of anything except east or
17 west. And, yes, I agree, we need three or four
18 bridges. But I just wanted to say I think you're
19 locking yourselves in and doing a disservice to the
20 people of Clark County when you take these as being
21 against the proposal or for the proposal. I want you
22 people to be on committees negotiating good deals, the
23 best deals we can get, to improve the situation with
24 traffic and the infrastructure of the bridge itself
25 which, regardless of the engineering, I don't believe

1 is safe for many years to come. Thank you.

2 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Thank you. Thank you
3 for coming.

4 That's all I have signed up to make
5 comments on all five. So --

6 AXEL SWANSON: Okay. Mr. Chair, why don't
7 we take a quick look at the other two maps and then --

8 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: You know, I think one
9 of the things that those advisory votes did is that it
10 gave the people a chance to say, you know, I want a
11 bridge, but I want something financially affordable.
12 It did say in so many words that it wasn't about light
13 rail, it was about road construction. And light rail,
14 as we just heard, does not remove congestion when you
15 can sit out there on 217 and watch all of the trains
16 go by. So the construction of that didn't help.

17 COMMISSIONER MADORE: I just want to make a
18 comment. Notice in the middle of this one, there's a
19 couple of yellow precincts. That's a hiccup in the
20 software and GIS couldn't take care of that.

21 COMMISSIONER STUART: It wasn't that they
22 weren't completely even? It's just they were out?

23 COMMISSIONER MADORE: No. Actually, if
24 you hover -- these live maps are available on-line if
25 you go to the grid. And I'm trying to figure out what

1 date that was. Why don't we add the website to these
2 maps to today's grid so that people can access them.
3 And you can zoom and pan and you can hover your mouse
4 over every precincts -- precinct and then you can look
5 at how each one, how many people voted for and against
6 in every precinct. There's actually 228 precincts in
7 our county. And on the first one, for instance, 223
8 of those precincts all voted one way versus the
9 balance on the other. So it's interesting to see the
10 -- the dramatic results that these maps portray.

11 AXEL SWANSON: Yeah. So this is the --
12 this is west county result. You can see the red
13 pretty blocked up there on the east side and more blue
14 to the north and to the west and then --

15 COMMISSIONER STUART: Before you leave that
16 map, because the question was asked earlier and we
17 asked this question before, was there a recount? It
18 was so close. It was within the margin of error. So
19 if this was a legislative race or one of the other
20 races that was on the ballot, we had a couple of
21 recounts and I did ballot certification as our -- as
22 the chair last year and that's one of the jobs the
23 chair does is goes and helps to certify elections,
24 along with the auditor and the prosecuting attorney's
25 office. What I was told by the elections office and

1 the auditor was that because these advisory votes were
2 non-binding advisory votes that are not covered under
3 the requirements of state law, that's why they didn't
4 end up going to the expense of going back and doing a
5 ballot recount on this. So that was the answer I got
6 on that.

7 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Thanks for that
8 explanation. I wondered that myself.

9 COMMISSIONER STUART: Yeah, I did too.

10 AXEL SWANSON: And one other, because this
11 was so close, it was about 49 votes, I believe, and,
12 you know, and if you go back and look at the under
13 voting or folks who decided not to vote, for whatever
14 reason, I think east county bridge had about 800 more
15 people turn out and vote than west county. And so
16 just a civics lesson there, you know. They need to
17 get out and fill out your ballot, you know.

18 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: I do believe it gives
19 us some direction and gives us a feel that the people
20 in the east county are -- are more involved and
21 felt -- wanted to be heard that they're congested when
22 they go across the bridge. So that -- that's fair,
23 and we should learn something from it.

24 AXEL SWANSON: And then -- and then we just
25 have the one last map which was the toll free I-5

1 bridge replacement. And you can see it's a little
2 more just sort of evenly distributed. We've got some
3 patches there of --

4 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: And, there again,
5 it's important to say that it was a toll free bridge
6 and did not include light rail.

7 COMMISSIONER STUART: Portland said almost
8 the entire county voted for it, but we all interpret
9 it differently.

10 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: And it's toll free
11 and it did not include light rail.

12 AXEL SWANSON: Yeah, you know, I'm just
13 going off the top of my head, more evenly spread blue
14 there, but it must have been closer, because, you
15 know, it was 55.71% and you did have about 600 less
16 people vote in this one than did the east county side,
17 about 200 more.

18 COMMISSIONER STUART: Something like
19 40,000.

20 AXEL SWANSON: Yeah. So, you know, not a
21 -- not a significant drop-off, but more evenly
22 disputed -- distributed, but probably closer precinct
23 by precinct. So --

24 COMMISSIONER MADORE: I would suggest that
25 when we do look at these two things, consider adopting

1 them, that we read the action part of it, the
2 "therefore" part of it, because that's the direction
3 that each one of these areas are to set.

4 COMMISSIONER STUART: Agreed.

5 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: So what we have up on
6 the screen right now is the first one.

7 COMMISSIONER STUART: Yeah.

8 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Light rail.

9 COMMISSIONER STUART: Go up just a little
10 bit. You've got to get the last -- it starts "be it
11 ordered," so we don't need to see the rest. Go up.

12 AXEL SWANSON: And since we each kind of
13 authored some of these, why don't we each, whoever
14 authored it, just read that part of it. Is that okay?

15 Okay. So, light rail resolution. Should I
16 go ahead, Mr. Chairman?

17 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Go ahead.

18 COMMISSIONER MADORE: This one passed by a
19 significant majority and the -- starting with line 28
20 on that resolution it says be it order and resolved,
21 by the Board of Commissioners of Clark County, State
22 of Washington, as follows: It shall be the policy of
23 the Clark County Board of Commissioners to clearly
24 oppose every light rail project in Clark County,
25 unless it is first supported by a majority of the

1 voters in a county-wide advisory vote of the people,
2 and to uphold this policy as Board members of CTRAN,
3 the Southwest Washington Regional Transportation,
4 that's RTC, the Metropolitan Policy Advisory
5 Committee, that's MPAC, and the joint policy advisory
6 committee on transportation, JPAC, adopted this date,
7 I guess that would be today, by the Board of County
8 Commissioners.

9 So the idea there is that the people, if
10 we're going to reflect how they have voted, they're
11 asking us to take these positions and to give us
12 direction how they want us to vote on any of these
13 issues on any of those boards.

14 So I will make a motion to adopt resolution
15 -- light rail Resolution No. 2013-07-17.

16 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: I'll second that.

17 It's been moved and seconded that we adopt
18 number one, light rail Resolution 2013-07-17.

19 Any further discussion, Mr. Madore, or Mr.
20 Stuart?

21 COMMISSIONER STUART: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

22 On all of these there will be a consistent
23 thread for me and there are two different pieces to
24 it. We have a couple of them. The first ones we'll
25 discuss are that we should oppose something, unless an

1 advisory vote county-wide occurs, and the other ones
2 are to support. For me, I am solution-oriented, I
3 always have been, I always will be. So when I come to
4 the table and start with no, then that is -- I'm not
5 best serving people. In looking for the best solution
6 to get the answers that people need in our community,
7 that's where my time is best spent.

8 What I would say is on these first two,
9 what it says in that last piece, to uphold this policy
10 as Board members of CTRAN, Southwest RTC, MPAC, and
11 JPAC, there are several -- there are two of those
12 bodies where we have one seat as a Board. And I think
13 it is wholly appropriate that the majority view of
14 this Board is represented in those bodies, where we
15 have one voice and one vote.

16 For CTRAN and Southwest Washington RTC we
17 all sit as independent, individual members and we have
18 many years touted the fact that we have a diversity of
19 opinions and that we share those. We have expressed
20 anger, upset when the city of Vancouver has taken
21 their multiple positions on those bodies and used them
22 to force a singularity, to force a single position
23 coming from them. So I can't say with certainty I
24 appreciate the advice on this, and it certainly goes
25 into any thought process that any of us will have, but

1 when I know that what we would be signing off on would
2 be approving a singularity, where all three of us
3 would be signing off on saying the same thing, no
4 matter what, unless a future vote occurred, I just
5 can't do that in good conscience. Otherwise, we
6 should just have one vote on CTRAN or RTC. We should
7 just take away the other two votes and we should just
8 give one.

9 It was awesome the -- I was thinking a lot
10 about this and the invocation actually served a great
11 purpose for me this morning. And that was that the
12 pastor said with all our diversity, let us have
13 harmony. I can't have harmony with only one note.
14 You have to have multiple notes to have harmony.
15 That's the -- I mean, that's just -- that's just the
16 truth of it all. So to have that harmony, we have to
17 have multiple notes.

18 I absolutely am committed to trying to seek
19 a better solution than what was come up with before on
20 this, but as far as this advisory vote goes, great
21 instructive information, but I can't sign off on this
22 one. There are others that I am absolutely supportive
23 of. This one, this one because of the nature of what
24 we're signing off on, I just can't.

25 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Commissioner Madore?

1 COMMISSIONER MADORE: I think the measure
2 speaks for itself and I certainly support and want to
3 faithfully represent the way that the people in our
4 community have voted. I serve as a re-presenter of
5 their wills. The people have spoken and to me that
6 -- I'm -- I don't find any reason to take it other
7 than face value.

8 COMMISSIONER STUART: Oh, and one other
9 quick thing that I thought was interesting, if I
10 might, Mr. Chair. I thought that was really
11 interesting, one of the things that was great about
12 all of these are the maps that we've created. And
13 we've shown them for just a second, but I do hope that
14 the people take a look at them because there's really
15 interesting results. On one side of it you look at
16 this example particularly and you say that the vast
17 majority of the County spoke up and of the 39% that
18 showed up, but you don't have a voice, unless you show
19 up, so I'm not going to talk about turnout being low
20 or anything, but the people who spoke are the people
21 who spoke. The vast majority of the county,
22 two-thirds, said we want a county-wide advisory vote
23 before you support anything. The only area that
24 supports -- that did not support that is the area that
25 is directly physically impacted by the light rail

1 proposal for CRC. And that area includes my
2 neighborhood. The only area that would actually see
3 physical impacts of light rail is that.

4 Now, if you asked me, you know, if you
5 asked me if there was a tax increase needed, would you
6 oppose it no matter what? Yes, I would oppose it if
7 there was a tax increase needed. If Clark County
8 citizens were all affected by the proposal physically
9 by the alignment, would I oppose anything unless there
10 was a vote? Yes, I would. But if there's no increase
11 in tax necessary, and if all of the impacted citizens,
12 if it's not all of Clark County that would be
13 affected, I can't go there. But it was just an
14 interesting map to see the differences, the really
15 stark differences, between those who would be
16 physically impacted by saying no, we don't necessarily
17 need an advisory vote for you guys to support it and
18 the rest of the county. It was interesting on this.
19 And all of the maps are interesting for different
20 reasons.

21 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Um hum. They are.
22 Do you want a do-over also?

23 COMMISSIONER MADORE: Just a supplement. I
24 thought it was really interesting to see that the
25 people got it, because in order for us to be able to

1 take action, we can either adopt something or not
2 adopt something. And because basically this is an
3 extension of how we vote and represent the people on
4 these other boards. So if we don't adopt it, in other
5 words, a no vote says well, just don't do anything.
6 So we had to reverse the polarity on these things.
7 You have to, in order to put it on the ballot, it was
8 shall we vote yes to oppose something? So I was
9 afraid that that was going to be a little confusing.

10 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Agreed.

11 COMMISSIONER MADORE: But when you look at
12 the map, it was just amazing how people understood
13 that. They read their ballot, they made a decision,
14 and it's not kind of contemplated by misunderstanding.
15 Very clear. So I'm just so proud of our citizens for
16 speaking up. And also I looked at the voter
17 participation out of all of the different ballot
18 measures that were there and very consistently people
19 were interested in this and they voted. There's a
20 very small under-vote compared to the other issues on
21 -- and individuals on the ballot. Yeah, so people
22 care about this. They voiced that loud and clear.
23 And I'm just so proud of our community. And that
24 direction is informative. No, it's not binding. It
25 doesn't tie our hands and say you absolutely must do

1 that, but hopefully, as representatives, we don't have
2 to be bound by some legal thing. We want to listen
3 and we want to represent and not think that we know
4 better than the people that we serve. So I'm very
5 thankful that the system worked. People had a voice.

6 COMMISSIONER STUART: Um hum.

7 COMMISSIONER MADORE: And it's informative
8 that we as a large united community can set a
9 preference direction.

10 COMMISSIONER STUART: I agree with all of
11 your interpretation on the voter stuff.

12 COMMISSIONER MADORE: Thank you.

13 COMMISSIONER STUART: It's spot on.

14 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: I go back and look at
15 how we got here because the vote has been put off and
16 put off and put off, never really had a say in the
17 selection of the 14 different locations, of which two
18 of them drove right straight into the Portland
19 airport. The agenda -- it was agenda-driven from the
20 beginning and the people said you're going to tax me;
21 How does that affect me physically, my pocketbook? So
22 while you go back and you look at that, it's because
23 of the lack of transparency in all of the years that
24 they've done that and all of the things that they've
25 done to not answer the question or let the people

1 really have a participating thing into it. It's an
2 advisory vote and you saw what they -- what they said.
3 You know, they want to have a vote on something this
4 big that's going to affect them that big. And if it's
5 one of those that go back and forth across the river,
6 we're looking at possibly around the value of \$2,000 a
7 year to commute back and forth if you had to work over
8 there. So while --

9 COMMISSIONER STUART: Mr. Chair? I'm
10 sorry. Go ahead.

11 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: While -- that's what
12 it was, it just says it comes back. It doesn't say
13 I'm for it or against it, but it says you, as a
14 representative, if you're going to increase my taxes
15 or costs, take more money out of my pocket, please let
16 me vote on it so I can weigh the need. And that's
17 what we saw in this case here. So --

18 COMMISSIONER STUART: Yeah.

19 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: So we could talk
20 about this all day. I'd like to move on.

21 COMMISSIONER STUART: Well, I just have one
22 quick thing. I'm sorry, Mr. Chair. Just if it would
23 have said --

24 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: That's three times
25 now.

1 COMMISSIONER STUART: I know. Supposedly
2 these are important.

3 So if it had just said on this one, if
4 you're going to reach into my pocket and ask for more
5 taxes, will you oppose anything until you ask me about
6 reaching in there, then I could support. It doesn't
7 say that. And it doesn't specifically talk about CRC,
8 other than in one of the becauses. It says it shall
9 be the policy -- shall be the policy of the Clark
10 County Board of Commissioners to clearly oppose every
11 light rail project in Clark County, unless it is first
12 supported by a majority of the voters in a county-wide
13 advisory bill. While it doesn't say anything about
14 taxes or CRC on that. If it was more specific to
15 that, when we get into the interpretation of it, I'm
16 looking at the words, clearly the words that we're
17 adopting, not interpreting them the way you just did.

18 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Okay.

19 COMMISSIONER STUART: If it was the way you
20 did, I'm with you.

21 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Hey, it didn't just
22 happen overnight.

23 COMMISSIONER MADORE: Mr. Chair, I have one
24 thing to say.

25 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: This is a do-over for

1 you too?

2 COMMISSIONER STUART: It will shorten it
3 up.

4 COMMISSIONER MADORE: Notice that we don't
5 have among these advisory votes is a vote on the CRC
6 project as proposed.

7 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Right.

8 COMMISSIONER MADORE: I think it's
9 important for the people to know why didn't they get a
10 chance to vote on the CRC project as proposed. The
11 answer is that it was dead. It was dead. The stop
12 work order had been issued. The governor said no,
13 it's dead. At that time we had put this on the ballot
14 at the last available meeting before the deadline for
15 us to put something on the ballot, which I believe was
16 August 6th. And during that time, well, there was no
17 CRC to vote on. That's why. So the closest that we
18 have are these advisory votes that talk about the
19 components, the I-5 bridge toll free replacement,
20 light rail. Those are components that are related to
21 it, but that's --

22 COMMISSIONER STUART: CRC wasn't toll free.

23 COMMISSIONER MADORE: Right. Right.

24 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Gentlemen, we have
25 four more of these.

1 COMMISSIONER MADORE: CRC was with light
2 rail and tolls and so that's --

3 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Good point. I have
4 -- it's been moved and seconded for the approval of
5 light rail Resolution 2013-17-17. All of those in
6 favor?

7 COMMISSIONER MADORE: Aye.

8 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Aye. Opposed?

9 COMMISSIONER STUART: Nay.

10 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: All right. Bus rapid
11 transit.

12 COMMISSIONER MADORE: Okay. Very similar.
13 These are almost cousins here, so the -- I'll go ahead
14 and -- do you want me to make a motion first and then
15 read it?

16 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Yes.

17 COMMISSIONER MADORE: Okay. All right. I
18 move to adopt the east county toll free bridge. I'm
19 sorry, that's -- yes.

20 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: That's rapid transit.

21 COMMISSIONER MADORE: That's rapid transit.
22 Wrong one.

23 I move to adopt the bus rapid transit,
24 Resolution No. 2013-07-19.

25 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: I'll second. It's

1 been moved and seconded for Resolution 2013-07-19.

2 Further comment?

3 COMMISSIONER MADORE: Yes. I'll go ahead
4 and read the conclusion.

5 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Okay.

6 COMMISSIONER MADORE: It shall be -- this
7 is -- I'm starting on line 47. It shall -- should be
8 the policy of the Clark County Board of Commissioners
9 to clearly oppose every bus rapid transit project in
10 Clark County, unless it is first supported by a
11 majority vote -- by a majority of the voters in a
12 county-wide advisory vote of the people. And to
13 uphold this policy, as Board members of CTRAN, the
14 Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council,
15 MPAC, and JPAC, adopted this day, January 21st.

16 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Etcetera, etcetera.
17 Okay.

18 COMMISSIONER MADORE: 2014.

19 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: COMMISSIONER STUART?

20 COMMISSIONER STUART: Just speaking in
21 opposition to this, because it is in opposition, it
22 starts with no -- all of the same reasons. Number
23 one, I'm solution-oriented, not no-oriented.

24 Number two, I want to honor and represent
25 the diversity in Clark County while working to find

1 harmony, which is the difficult part in all of this is
2 the good luck part of it, to see if we can find
3 solutions.

4 So, for those two reasons, I will be voting
5 no. And, again, if you look at the map, I think it is
6 interesting to note that the physically affected areas
7 were the areas that voted no on this proposal, which
8 is something that I did think was interesting on this.

9 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: It would be good if
10 you can bring those. Can you bring those up and show
11 them on the screen since we have them?

12 COMMISSIONER MADORE: The maps?

13 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: The map. This one is
14 bus rapid transit.

15 COMMISSIONER STUART: So now every time you
16 say "the map" -- this is totally a side bar. Every
17 time you say "the map," I watch a lot of Dora the
18 Explorer right now and the map is a significant
19 character in Dora the Explorer, so that song is now
20 beating into my brain of the little "I'm the map"
21 piece of Dora. So I love you son. Thanks.

22 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: So, okay, anything
23 else?

24 COMMISSIONER STUART: No.

25 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Commissioner Madore?

1 COMMISSIONER MADORE: Nope.

2 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: I think I look back
3 at this as saying the people are saying we're all
4 going to pay for this. If we're all going to pay for
5 this, then we'd like to have a vote on it, and that's
6 what I think the people are saying.

7 COMMISSIONER MADORE: Actually, I do have
8 one comment and that is that the --

9 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: That's the last
10 do-over.

11 COMMISSIONER MADORE: The CTRAN Board, the
12 method of paying for the operation and maintenance of
13 bus rapid transit was depending upon the savings that
14 would be realized if the buses, the No. 4 and the 44,
15 no longer had to cross the bridge. That would be
16 covered instead by a different funding mechanism
17 through light rail. If the CRC project is no longer
18 on the table and Oregon would be de -- will be
19 deciding that very soon, then that savings is no
20 longer being realized. CTRAN will still have to run
21 those buses across the bridge, which means that the
22 finance plan, as proposed by CTRAN, no longer works.
23 So certainly the cost -- how are you going to pay for
24 bus rapid transit needs to be redone if we are to
25 include the mechanism there.

1 The other part of that, there's a
2 significant amount of savings that was to be realized
3 by the CTRAN's adoption of the VRT plan and it was
4 really presented, what I thought was to be a lower
5 cost dollars per hour kind of a service. In reality
6 it's significantly more per hour, dollars per hour.
7 The -- the, quote, "savings" is actually -- it comes
8 from a 25% service hours cut along the 4th Plain
9 corridor.

10 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: You need to bring it
11 back to the resolution.

12 COMMISSIONER MADORE: Yes. So that I just
13 brought that out as the specific implementation of
14 that VRT project. So I'll get back to it.

15 COMMISSIONER STUART: That will be a great
16 discussion.

17 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Excuse me. I'd kind
18 of like to avoid is going back and rehashing what
19 we've rehashed over the last ten years or so.

20 COMMISSIONER MADORE: Okay.

21 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: So while we all have
22 a reason to support something or not support
23 something, the devil is in the details. We've been
24 part of it and it's hard not to go back and reference
25 those and I guess if you could do that in a short

1 manner, I'd appreciate that.

2 All those in favor? Aye.

3 COMMISSIONER MADORE: Aye.

4 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Opposed?

5 COMMISSIONER STUART: Nay.

6 COMMISSIONER MADORE: Okay. Moving on to
7 the next one.

8 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: East county.

9 COMMISSIONER MADORE: I move to adopt the
10 east county toll free bridge, Resolution No.
11 2013-07-21.

12 COMMISSIONER STUART: Second.

13 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: It's been moved and
14 seconded that we pass Resolution No. 2013-07-21.

15 Any comments from the Board?

16 COMMISSIONER MADORE: Yes. This resolution
17 is unique in that it provides 15 specifications. And
18 as a specification, it includes not only the
19 parameters of the proposed bridge, but also
20 significant steps that are to be followed as the
21 process in pursuing that potential crossing. And so
22 what I would like -- what I would encourage people to
23 do is read that specification because it -- it's very
24 specific. And also, if people want to be able to look
25 at the -- at the actual proposed design, they can go

1 to a website, eastcountybridge.com.

2 And I'm going to read the action item.
3 Actually, there's -- all of these are -- some of these
4 are action items, and so I'll start with line number
5 72: "It shall be the policy of the Clark County Board
6 of Commissioners to clearly support, provide
7 leadership, and champion the proposed bridge project,
8 and to uphold this policy as Board members of CTRAN,
9 RTC, MPAC, and JPAC, adopted this 21st day of
10 January."

11 So while I'd like to point out that the
12 citizens, if we follow what this resolution is asking
13 us to do, the citizens are asking us to -- to exercise
14 some leadership here. Even though we are not WSDOT or
15 ODOT or RTC or CTRAN, still we have a role in
16 providing leadership and vision and I'm excited to be
17 able to do that.

18 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: All right.

19 COMMISSIONER STUART?

20 COMMISSIONER STUART: Leadership and vision
21 is what we get paid for. I think it is a great thing
22 that we reach out, we seek out solutions, that we
23 -- that we work on the art of the possible, you know.
24 And it would be easy and it is easy enough to punch
25 holes in any bridge alternative, whether it be

1 replacing, and having sat through a lot of it,
2 replacing the existing or building new ones, there are
3 easy ways to punch holes in it, but what's harder is
4 figuring out a vision of how we might accomplish
5 something, you know. And it's the hardest thing in
6 the world to do, to actually make big things happen.
7 But, you know, it's the line that was from Crestline
8 Elementary that got kind of co-opted by Governor
9 Inslee, which was "we can do hard things." After
10 their school burned down, you know, they had a sign
11 that a kid made that said, "We can do hard things."
12 And we can, you know. And whether that's -- you know,
13 whether that is specifically within every one of the
14 lines, it's like one of the lines says it will be
15 about four miles east of the I-205 bridge. Well, what
16 if it's six? I mean, are we within the framework of
17 this? Are we not? What if -- you know, ultimately
18 again the devil is in the details, but I'm not going
19 to get hung up in the detail of, you know, well, I'm
20 all locked into it only being four miles. You know,
21 this sets a path to say let's look at what's possible.
22 Let's see what we can do to get something done on the
23 east side, the west side, replacing. And those -- I
24 enjoy those conversations with the public and -- and I
25 love and we co-opted language from you, a few of the

1 process keys, making sure that it's open and
2 transparent, that we have a two-way dialogue, that we
3 actually do seek input. I think those are all so
4 important and they were lacking in some of the
5 processes we've seen. So I look forward to the
6 process of exploration in this.

7 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Thank you. I think
8 what this --

9 COMMISSIONER MADORE: I just want to -- oh,
10 go ahead, Mr. Chair.

11 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: No do-overs.

12 COMMISSIONER MADORE: I just wanted to add
13 one thing here and that --

14 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: You've got two or
15 three more that you can add onto.

16 COMMISSIONER MADORE: Thank you, Your
17 Grace.

18 This is a starting point and this is a
19 process and we invite the community to make it better.
20 Go ahead and propose refinements because we've got to
21 start somewhere.

22 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Um hum.

23 COMMISSIONER MADORE: And this is -- we
24 need to be flexible and make sure we really listen to
25 the community, both sides of the brick, to make sure

1 it really does -- they can make it better.

2 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: I'm not sure on how
3 Commissioner Madore feels about this east side bridge,
4 but I'll tell you, one of the things that you see from
5 the Board is that we do support another crossing. And
6 one of these things that comes up is it shows that we
7 don't need three billion dollars to do a project and
8 we don't need six billion or Christmas-treed projects
9 over in the state of Oregon to be funded for by the
10 -- by the citizens of Clark County. And it can be
11 done for less than \$900 million dollars. We all agree
12 on that. And that's what -- and that's what the
13 people indicate. Look at the math there. And what it
14 does, it shows that everybody is supporting a crossing
15 and then you'll see that on the other ones too.

16 Having said that, all those in favor?

17 COMMISSIONER MADORE: Aye.

18 COMMISSIONER STUART: Aye.

19 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Aye. Opposed? None.
20 Item number four, west side bridge.

21 COMMISSIONER STUART: Do you want to make
22 the motion?

23 COMMISSIONER MADORE: Oh, I -- for the sake
24 of being able to put it on the table and discuss it, I
25 will make the motion to adopt the west county toll

1 free bridge, Resolution No. 2013-07-27.

2 COMMISSIONER STUART: Second.

3 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: It's been moved and
4 seconded that we adopt Resolution No. 2013-07-27. And
5 I think that shows one more time where this Board is,
6 that we are there, we're opening up for that dialogue.

7 So, COMMISSIONER STUART, any comments?

8 COMMISSIONER STUART: Just the format of
9 this one is a little different and I think in both of
10 the last ones the format is a little bit different
11 where the policy that we would be adopting, it's
12 -- it's long. I mean, if we were to read it, it's all
13 of the items, it's the 11 items that were indicated
14 within that. But for me I'm supportive of this as a
15 fifty -- it was a 50/50 proposition. And, again, just
16 having the joys of experience in this, of nine years
17 of this, is there are a lot of 50/50 propositions that
18 we deal with, especially when you get started,
19 especially at the beginning of the conversation, until
20 something really gets more -- gets clearer as to what
21 it might be. And I've had this conversation with you
22 and with the Chair Anniston and others.

23 I think a west side piece could be a great
24 addition and ultimately, at some point, will be
25 necessary in replacing the connections for the Port of

1 Vancouver going southbound, for truck traffic going
2 southbound. As the starting point for a conversation,
3 I think it's a great one. And, you know, for me, if
4 it was clearly 60/40 against, then okay. But, again,
5 the maps are really illustrative -- illustrative that,
6 if you see the "no" side is like the east side, and
7 the "yes" side is the west side, with some
8 interspersed in the middle that probably didn't like
9 anything of what we were doing. And then -- but when
10 you look at it, it was the exact, you flip it for the
11 east side. And so we have two different segments of
12 our community who are both looking for an answer. And
13 we represent the entire community, so I think it's
14 great.

15 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: So now is a good time
16 to talk about two new bridges.

17 COMMISSIONER STUART: You know, ultimately,
18 again, it's the art of possible. I mean, I hate when
19 people say there's no way we can ever do something
20 because I just don't believe that anybody can see that
21 far out into the future.

22 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Very good.
23 Commissioner Madore?

24 COMMISSIONER MADORE: When we're talking
25 about spending close to a billion dollars, and in this

1 case that was just simply a guesstimate. That is all
2 out of resolutions out there, oh, put something on
3 there for west county, to me I want something more
4 than maybe so, maybe not. I want to be able to have a
5 clear indication that this community is willing to pay
6 for the something like that and that's a pretty high
7 bar, that our budget is small compared to any one of
8 these projects, our annual budget. And I -- to me, I
9 also look at the outcome. If -- if this was a race to
10 elect an individual, he wouldn't have gotten elected.
11 So I'm going to go with not adopting this, because
12 basically even though it was close, the majority wins,
13 and they said don't adopt this one.

14 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: So one of the things
15 that I like about this is that it leaves the door
16 open. I don't think we should shut the door on any
17 possibility of going forward. This one here was
18 proposed way back when I was a Legislator. I guess it
19 wasn't way back, but it was -- and --

20 COMMISSIONER STUART: Just to use yourself
21 as an example.

22 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: And things have been
23 proposed over the last 30 years, everywhere from
24 Ridgefield, along that corridor, to cross over. But
25 one of the things I saw as a Legislator was a

1 port-to-port bridge, a bridge that would tie up with
2 the industrial area and match up with the new bridge
3 that's being built in Oregon across the Willamette
4 that would move truck traffic over to Highway 30. One
5 of the reasons I proposed that -- and for moving car
6 traffic I don't think it would move it that much, but
7 it would move the big trucks off of the impact of the
8 I-5.

9 COMMISSIONER STUART: Um hum.

10 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: That being said, all
11 those in favor?

12 COMMISSIONER STUART: Aye.

13 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Aye. Opposed?

14 COMMISSIONER MADORE: Nay. Nay.

15 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: All right. Number
16 five.

17 COMMISSIONER MADORE: Okay. For the sake
18 of putting this on the table as well, I move to adopt
19 toll free I-5 bridge replacement, Resolution No.
20 2013-07-25.

21 COMMISSIONER STUART: Second.

22 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: It's been moved and
23 seconded to support Resolution No. 2013-07-25.

24 COMMISSIONER STUART?

25 COMMISSIONER STUART: Just speaking in

1 favor of the motion, again, this is one that was
2 supported by the majority of the voters by a clear
3 majority of the voters, with 55.7%. The format of
4 this is also does not lend it itself to reading all of
5 the individual pieces, but they mirror very closely
6 what was done in both the west side and the east side
7 proposals with regards to the process and the product.
8 The -- let me see if I've got -- so it does add a
9 couple of details in there that are location specific.
10 For example, looking at where the enhanced connections
11 would be, but the bottom line is that there are about
12 50, 50 lines of about 13 or 14 specifications where
13 this really is something that there has been a lot of
14 study on and there are specifics about it and the
15 bridge component itself that had been even studied
16 could have been done for the \$900 million dollars. So
17 it is feasible. Again, this is all of the art of the
18 possible and what's possible requires a lot more
19 leadership and vision, looking beyond -- looking
20 beyond the lines here and working with the people out
21 there in our community and beyond it to figure out how
22 we can make this happen. It's the same thing with the
23 west side. I think that to have a good discussion, we
24 need to have a full range of alternatives to have the
25 discussion with.

1 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Commissioner Madore?

2 COMMISSIONER MADORE: Yes. I look at this
3 and see this as a proxy of the CRC project and I'll
4 tell you why, because it's actually written into the
5 resolution. For instance, on line 17, it says over
6 11 years, 7,521 public comments, and it goes on.
7 Basically it's quoting directly from the CRC
8 documents. It talks about \$170 million dollars being
9 spent. Well, that was spent on, and, in fact, it says
10 right there, invested in the Columbia River crossing
11 project.

12 So the -- one of the guiding principles
13 that I think is important that we provide when it
14 comes to leadership is we should ensure that we never
15 mislead individuals, never mislead the people that are
16 looking to us to be able to assume we've done our
17 homework. And in this case what we have, if there
18 -- if there be anything, that 11 years, going on
19 12 years now, and \$180 million dollars now, if it
20 taught us anything, it taught us that this project is
21 multi-billion dollars. Any time you get up in that
22 kind of a price range, it must be funded by tolls,
23 because there's no other way you can fund it.

24 The quotes throughout here of this being
25 the CRC project to me says that I would be

1 disingenuous if I was to vote to support this.
2 However, I don't plan to vote against it either,
3 because in this case I'm going to take a neutral
4 stance. I'm going to abstain from this vote, because
5 there's arguments both ways on this, because a lot of
6 the people say I really want a -- a better version of
7 the CRC project. I really would like to be able to
8 have it toll free. I want it to be a lower cost. And
9 the measures in here are good. In fact, if you give
10 me some good, you know, dialogue here, I just might
11 support this project, because I always want to support
12 the people, but I also want to make sure it's a real
13 choice.

14 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Um hum.

15 COMMISSIONER MADORE: It's not just
16 something that's kind of false hope. So I'm
17 listening.

18 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Okay.

19 COMMISSIONER STUART: So, just briefly, the
20 \$170 million dollars, the mention of the \$170 million
21 dollars is to help show that you can do it within the
22 \$900 million dollars, because no matter what process
23 you choose to start the analysis, it is an expensive
24 proposition to do the design and engineering
25 associated with a bi-state river crossing. The

1 percentage that you use on any average project, you're
2 looking at between 20% and 30% of overall project
3 costs that it can take for that design and engineering
4 and initial NEPA work.

5 So the purpose of showing the \$170 million
6 -- and it's -- you stopped reading before the sentence
7 finished, is it said that has already been invested.
8 That is money that could be used to minimize more
9 time, money, and process by focusing on fixing
10 problems at the existing I-5 Columbia River bridge
11 crossing. So the purpose of that is to show that
12 there's already been an investment made that can be
13 leveraged to lower the overall costs for the solution.

14 With regards to the overall solution,
15 again, this is the art of possible. All three of
16 these have items that any one of us could punch holes
17 in and say I don't think that can happen.

18 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Um hum.

19 COMMISSIONER STUART: But at the beginning
20 of the process, in the time when we say to our
21 citizens no, we're not going to -- we're not going to
22 look at a west side, because we don't think that you
23 can do it within these parameters. We don't know,
24 because it's never been adequately studied.

25 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Sure.

1 COMMISSIONER STUART: But I'm -- I'm one
2 that says okay, let's believe in that art of the
3 possible for the east side as well because I've had
4 lots of people punch holes in that. But I say look,
5 let's look at what might be possible with that. And
6 it means diverging from this, then we have that
7 discussion and say have we diverged so much that we
8 can just not support that.

9 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Um hum. Excuse me.

10 COMMISSIONER MADORE: That's a compelling
11 argument.

12 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Excuse me, we're not
13 doing do-overs.

14 COMMISSIONER MADORE: Please let me speak.
15 This is important, please. The --

16 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: I'll come back. I'll
17 come back when you two get done.

18 COMMISSIONER MADORE: Yes, that's fine.
19 You get the last word, Mr. Chairman.

20 The -- I'm going to go ahead and support
21 this and I'm going to support it and I communicate
22 what I'm not supporting, because I remember when we
23 were debating what to -- what language to use, what
24 title to put, I remember the toll free was something
25 that you really were pushing for in contrast to that I

1 made a motion to not include toll free.

2 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Right.

3 COMMISSIONER MADORE: So we are talking
4 about a toll free bridge, a brand new bridge. I'm all
5 for infrastructure. If we can provide a brand new
6 bridge out there that's toll free that improves our
7 I-5 corridor, absolutely, I would support that, and
8 the people would support that too, but I also want to
9 make sure that people understand that this is not the
10 CRC project. The CRC project is tolls. It's light
11 rail. It's all of the other stuff that comes with it
12 and the expense and the long-term debt, all of those
13 things. So this is my vote, it not to be counted as a
14 proxy for the CRC, but it is to be counted for a toll
15 free new bridge that's better than the one we've got
16 out there.

17 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Are you guys done?

18 COMMISSIONER STUART: I'm done?

19 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Okay. I am. I think
20 that I've gotten history on the I-5 and I go back to
21 1998 as a Legislator, when we met with the Oregon
22 delegation, that said the corridor is full and we were
23 tasked with finding a new corridor. Now, I don't care
24 how big of a bridge you build across there, the
25 corridor door is at capacity. But back in 1998 the

1 mindset was already to position themselves to put
2 light rail on it. And we saw that when it was in the
3 court, the Supreme Court, over in Oregon that said the
4 bridge was thrown in as a caveat. They wanted light
5 rail. They wouldn't pass the bridge and wouldn't pass
6 light rail without a bridge, so they would dangle the
7 carrot out there to build a new bridge. They have
8 done everything in their power to tell me how bad this
9 bridge is, and yet our own DOT through inspections
10 said this bridge is good for at least another
11 60 years, 60 years. In 60 years I would like to see a
12 third and a fourth bridge, but to tear down a
13 perfectly good bridge where the corridor is already at
14 capacity does not make sense. And I really believe
15 that it has been held back because of the repetitive
16 degradation of this bridge that has -- that we've
17 invested in. We spent \$22 million dollars painting it
18 and not counting the trunnions and whatnot. I would
19 support this after we built the other two, wherever
20 they might be built.

21 COMMISSIONER STUART: There is no priority
22 order in these three bridges, Commissioner.

23 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: And other than we
24 have only have two crossings across the Columbia
25 River. There's 13 across the Willamette. Why would

1 we not add more crossings across the Columbia River?

2 COMMISSIONER STUART: Um hum.

3 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: That being said, all
4 those in favor?

5 COMMISSIONER STUART: Aye.

6 COMMISSIONER MADORE: Aye.

7 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Opposed? Nay.

8 All right. We have gotten through there.

9 COMMISSIONER STUART: Can I say something
10 just super quick? I appreciate the conversation. I
11 think that we show the diversity of our community and
12 the -- and we have all done a ton of research on all
13 of these and I appreciate the conversation because I
14 think it is -- it helps people understand that there
15 are a lot of different opinions and not just opinions,
16 a lot of different facts are out there, that we will
17 definitely keep working on.

18 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Yes. This is
19 commissioner communications.

20 COMMISSIONER STUART: I'm done. The last
21 thing I say is go Hawks! I've got go Hawks! That's
22 all I've got.

23 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Commissioner Madore,
24 do you have anything in Commissioner communications?

25 COMMISSIONER MADORE: Even today and

1 multiple times in the past we've heard citizens come
2 forward and say, oh, you're wasting your time. You're
3 asking the -- you're putting elections out there,
4 asking the people what they want. It's a waste of
5 time. It's not a waste of time in my book. When we
6 -- when we -- when we're talking about hundreds of
7 millions of dollars or billions of dollars and
8 potentially tolls that would -- that would impact the
9 citizens in our community, every day they drive to
10 work, it's -- we really want to get it right. And the
11 only way I know to do that is ask the people. And so
12 I'm just very thankful that we have the freedom, we as
13 a board found a way, and working with our prosecuting
14 attorney's office to have them instruct us so that we
15 found a way to give the people a voice to vote on
16 these important issues. They've spoken. We followed
17 their advice as best we can and we will do their
18 -- their will as best we can. So -- and I respect the
19 differences that we share here, the diversity that we
20 share here. So, with that, well done.

21 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: And one more time,
22 you saw the diversity, the reasoning that we have, and
23 the way we process that three different ways.

24 COMMISSIONER STUART: Yeah.

25 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Nothing else? No.

1 Mr.?

2 AXEL SWANSON: No. Well done.

3 COMMISSIONER MIELKE: Thank you. We are
4 adjourned.

5 (End of proceedings)

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

C E R T I F I C A T E

1
2 STATE OF WASHINGTON)
3 County of Pierce) ss.
4)

5 I, the undersigned Washington Certified Court Reporter,
6 pursuant to RCW 5.28.010 authorized to administer oaths and
7 affirmations in and for the State of Washington, do hereby
8 certify:

9 That the foregoing transcript of taped proceedings was
10 transcribed under my direction; that the transcript is a full,
11 true and complete transcript of the testimony of said witness,
12 including all questions, answers, objections, motions and
13 exceptions, except as noted as "inaudible" herein, to the best
14 of my ability;

15 That I am not a relative, employee, attorney or counsel of
16 any party to this action or relative or employee of any such
17 attorney or counsel, and that I am not financially interested
18 in the said action or the outcome thereof;

19 That I am herewith securely sealing this transcript and
20 delivering the same to Phillips Burgess for filing with the
21 Clerk of the Court.

22 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed
23 my official seal this 6th day of November, 2016.

24 /s/ Catherine M. Vernon
25 Notary Public in and for the State
of Washington, residing at
Tacoma.