JOINT HEARING OF THE BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS & PLANNING COMMISSION 2016 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE THURSDAY, MAY 19, 2016

Public Services Center
Councilors Conf. Rooms 679 & 680
1300 Franklin Street
Vancouver, WA

6:30 p.m.

WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS & PURPOSE OF THE HEARING

MORASCH: All right. Good evening and welcome to the May 19th, 2016, joint Planning Commission and Board of County Councilors hearing. At this point I'd like to turn it over to Chair Boldt for a few introductory comments.

BOLDT: Okay. Well, thank you, Chairman, and thank you to the Planning Commission to invite us along. We are your guests, so we will defer to you, Mr. Chairman, and I think that we will go along with the three-minute rule and look forward for people giving us their side of the story either tonight or, I believe, next week. So just thank you again for your input, and this should be a good process. I'll turn it back.

MORASCH: All right. Thank you. Does any member of the Planning Commission or the Board of County Councilors have any comments they'd like to make before we get started?

All right. With that then, we will move right to the business of the agenda, which I'm sure is why everyone has shown up tonight. Pardon?

MCCAULEY: No. Continue.

MORASCH: Okay.

MCCAULEY: Sorry. Thank you.

BARCA: You look very anxious, Mark.

MORASCH: Okay. All right. Thank you. Going back to the agenda, we have public sign-in sheets. I think they're outside, so anyone that wants to testify, please sign in. The testimony is going to be limited to three minutes each and you can testify either tonight or on May 24, and the Planning Commission or the Board of County Councilors may have questions that they may ask you, and if that's the case, the questions won't count against your three minutes.

So with that, I will turn it over to Oliver for the staff report.

MCCAULEY: Yeah. Before Oliver speaks, I'd like to say a few words. Good evening, Commissioners and Councilors. I'm pleased to present to you this evening the draft 2016 growth management 20-year periodic update for 2015 through 2035. This update process began in July of 2013 and will conclude on time with the adoption of the plan before the 30th June 2016 deadline.

So with that, I'll turn it over to Oliver Orjiako, our Community Planning Director, who will provide a summary of the materials for your review.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN PROCESS & REQUIREMENTS

ORJIAKO: Okay. Thank you, Mark, and good evening members of the Planning Commission and the Councilors. As Mark indicated for the record, Oliver Orjiako, Clark County Community Planning Director.

The purpose of tonight's hearing is to take testimony from the public on the comprehensive plan and the zone changes. You also are going to be taking testimony on the comprehensive plan text which includes the community framework plan, the countywide planning policies, county 20-year policies, when I say county 20-year policies, I mean county, unincorporated portion of the county, which the county has land use jurisdiction.

You are also going to be taking testimony on the capital facilities plan, the capital facilities financial plan and all the associated appendices. You also are going to be taking testimony on the update to the section of Clark County Code Title 40. We've provided you also amendment to the arterial atlas.

You will also be taking testimony either tonight or next week on impact fees. As a reminder, the PC already has already heard testimony on all the school districts, if you'll recall, except Woodland School Districts. Also, since your review and public hearing on the school capital facilities plan and the associated impact fees that they submitted, the Ridgefield School District amended their impact fees last January, so you're going to be seeing the new numbers from what they approved last January.

On traffic impact fees, however, the traffic impact fees have been updated to reflect the modified county impact fee districts. I know you saw that last time. I made a recommendation, but you're going to see it again, the Planning Commission. The park impact fee which you also are going to be taking testimony on is new. You have not acted or made any recommendation or had any public hearing on that, so the park impact fee in your packet is new.

So before you this evening you should have also the results of the Engage Clark County online survey that concluded May 11th. You also have received all public comment received on the periodic update through 5:00 p.m. today. I know we have been sending you e-mails on all the comments that we've received. We will also continue -- for the public, we will continue to accept public comment until the Chairs closes public testimony on this phase of the process.

To make this very, very easy to follow, I know many of you Planning Commission members and the members of the Council, you have received voluminous binders from staff, I apologize for that but I don't have to. Given the time period we had, we really -- I should commend my staff for trying to do their best to present the material that is before you.

If you recall, we have been coming to you, Planning Commission members, having work sessions with you, presenting the materials before you incrementally and giving you the opportunity to review them. We've also extended invitation if any of you have questions, issues, please make appointment with myself or any member of my staff and we'll be very glad to respond to your questions.

What we have also done is provided you with Issue Paper 8.1, that should also be in your packet. I believe we hand-delivered that to all the Planning Commission members. The Issue Paper No. 8.1 and the associated tables provide a summary of all the proposed changes for your consideration. We also provided you what we call a Decision Table. That's a tool that we are providing you to assist you with your deliberation process. This Decision Table is very similar to the BOCC consent agenda format. You have the option of voting on a single item, such as, for example, the arterial atlas amendment or you can pull a sub item out for discussion, and I hope and our hope is that this tool will be very, very helpful to you.

So that, in a nutshell, concludes my remark, Mr. Chair, and if you have questions, I will take it, but this is really for you to now hear from the public on what we have been -- what we have put before you. And when I mentioned the Engage Clark County online survey, that have been -- that was made available to the public to use that tool to also comment on the proposed changes and you have all their comment as well. So I will close there and take any questions you may have, but this is your opportunity to hear from the public tonight.

MORASCH: All right. Thank you.

Does any member of the Commission or the Council have questions for Oliver at this point?

BOLDT: I just have a small question. Thank you, Oliver. And maybe, I think for the Planning Commission, you might introduce our legal too, but -- and this may be a question for you, Steve. The question is, is next Tuesday when we probably will close public comment, is that verbal and written?

DIJULIO: Whatever, if that's the decision of the Planning Commission, then that can be the close of public comment. It's really up to the Commission to make that determination. You know, you can leave it open for another 24 hours, but typically the close of the public hearing before the Planning Commission is the close of the time for receipt of public comment. And for those of you who don't know me, I'm Steve DiJulio, special counsel, special Deputy Prosecuting Attorney and special counsel for this process.

BOLDT: Thank you. Very good.

MORASCH: All right. Thank you. Yeah. Unless I hear objection from my fellow Planning Commission members, I think we will close the both written and oral at the end of the hearing on the 24th. That will give us time to read everything before our deliberation on June 2nd. If we held it open longer, we may not be able to read things that come in right before the hearing, given the volume of the information that's being presented.

So I would encourage anyone who wants to comment on this to submit comments in writing. We do read them and we do consider them, and three minutes is not a lot of time to, you know, to get a lot of detailed points across. If you can submit your comments in writing, you can refer to them during your three minutes and then we'll be able to go back and read them in more detail as we prepare for our deliberation.

Councilor Mielke.

MIELKE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm looking at this, I'm kind of missing maps. I wish I had some maps to look at, but at the very beginning, it says Comprehensive Plan Map and Text Changes. So what we have here are the changes that have been made since the last time?

ORJIAKO: Councilor, are you referring to the decision matrix or the Decision Table?

MIELKE: Yeah. The very first thing here on our handout, it says that it's Comprehensive Plan Map and Text Changes.

ORJIAKO: That's how to read that this Decision Table starting with the rural area and then followed by the urban growth areas by each cities. So if you look at the No. 1, Rural, it says comprehensive plan legend: Change the comp plan map legend from three Rural comp plan

designation to one Rural designation.

MIELKE: Okay. I think I -- I think I got it, Oliver. I was a little bit behind. So these are the changes from day one?

ORJIAKO: This is the changes that reflect the approved Preferred Alternative that is the purpose of this update.

MIELKE: Okay. Thank you.

STEWART: And can you remind us what date the Council adopted these Preferred Alternatives to move forward to the Planning Commission.

ORJIAKO: The Preferred Alternative was approved by the full five Council members on February 23rd.

STEWART: Thank you.

MORASCH: Okay. Any other --

BLOM: Regarding the close of testimony, I think it would be helpful if we allowed for with Council's approval for 24 hours after the close of verbal testimony. I just think a lot of times we hear things and someone doesn't have the documentation, so to not be able to get that the next day, I just think it would be helpful if there was one more day for people to submit something in writing that supports their oral testimony.

MORASCH: How about by close of business on the day -- on the 25th?

BLOM: Sure.

MORASCH: Any objection from any of the Planning Commissioners or Councilors to close of business on the 25th?

MIELKE: Good plan.

STEWART: Agreed.

MORASCH: All right. Then that will be -- that will be when the public record will close for written materials.

PUBLIC: Mr. Morasch, would you move your microphone closer so we could hear you better, please. Thank you.

MORASCH: Is that better?

PUBLIC: Thank you.

MORASCH: Oh, that's pretty loud. Okay. All right. Thank you.

All right. Well, if there's no other questions or comments, I think we're ready to move to the testimony. And we will take elected officials first and we have the city sign-in sheet, Eric Eisemann from the City of La Center.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY - Cities

EISEMANN: Good evening, Mr. Chairman, Planning Commission members, Councilors, staff. My name is Eric Eisemann. I'm the planning consultant representing the City of La Center. I'm here to give you the mayor's greetings this evening and he's asked me to make a few comments on the City's behalf.

First of all, I'd like to start by thanking the staff for several years of hard work. We've had a great relationship with the staff and they've done a good job of reaching out to us as a community and we certainly look forward to wrapping this up with the good work that they've done as well.

I'm here to encourage you to support the Preferred Alternative. In particular, the City has submitted into the record an agricultural de-designation report related to the 56 acres out at the La Center Junction that we propose to use for commercial purposes and jobs. I strongly encourage you to take a look at that report, if you haven't already, because it does document how the City believes that we've met the WAC criteria for de-designation.

I'm also here in support of the school district's request for 17 acres expansion to the UGA for their school purposes for a middle school in the future.

I'm also here recognizing that before you is a request to remove the second bridge over the East Fork of the Lewis River. The City has no objections to that. It cannot serve the City at the Junction side and so we do support that.

Just as a way of letting you know, we have adopted our comprehensive plan based on the Preferred Alternative. The final park CFP is going to the council for review at their next meeting in June, and the transportation CFP will be finished at that time. So we are pleased to have been able to work with you on this and we'd be happy to answer any questions you might have.

MORASCH: All right. Thank you. Any questions?

EISEMANN: Thank you.

MORASCH: All right. Thank you for coming.

Do you know who's running the timer?

BOLDT: I'll run the timer.

MORASCH: Okay. You'll let me know then?

BOLDT: Yeah. We just figured out that all of our timers are behind us so I'll let you know when your three minutes are up and yell at you or something.

MORASCH: Okay. We don't have any other city officials signed up. Is there any other city official that's here that didn't get a chance to sign in that wants to speak today? I don't see anybody.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY - Public

Okay. Well, with that, we'll move to the general public testimony and the first person on the list is Sydney Reisbick.

REISBICK: This one isn't in writing yet, but for Lucy who follows me, who should we give the papers to be passed out?

MORASCH: Probably to Sonja.

REISBICK: Sonja. Thank you.

BOLDT: Rebecca.

MORASCH: Rebecca.

REISBICK: I would like to talk about the concurrencies between the capital facilities plan and the EIS and the Preferred Alternative. For the cities, they've done a pretty good job of handling that and doing the six year.

Okay. First of all, you're supposed to do an estimate of cost for 6 years and 20 years and then show how you're going to fund for the 6 years, and the cities have done a pretty good job of doing that. For the county rural areas, there are some inconcurrencies and some holes.

Water availability is presented both in the EIS and in the capital facilities plan only for public water. There's no consideration at all of the individual wells, and the problem that's shown in a State EPA study of a critical shortage of water for the individual wells, and we do have people de-watering each other's wells as we speak. Sewers adequate for the cities, but again, when you get into the septic tanks in rural areas, we're depending on new technology that hasn't been tested for the long term.

As in the last discussion of capital facilities plan, the 2000 plan is not funded. It's the same thing, capital facilities we're estimating at close to a billion dollars and that's been taken down to $500,000, and you should ask Community Planning which projects have been taken out so that you can look and see with the population growing which ones are taken out and what consequences you can see of that, and that's without even including the new rural zoning change increases in rural population.

Stormwater is in both the Environmental Impact Statement and the capital facilities plan. It only goes to 6 years. A, it's left out; and, B, it only goes to 6 years, under the 20 it says 6 years. There are holes.

MORASCH: All right. Well, thank you very much. Does anyone have any questions? All right. Thank you very much for coming. Be sure to submit any additional comments you have in writing, we will read them.

REISBICK: You will get them. Thank you.

MORASCH: All right. Thank you. Lucy Krantz.

KRANTZ: Hello. I'm Lucy Krantz and I want to thank all the Councilors and the Planning Commission and everyone here for allowing us to speak.

And I have some questions about the Preferred Alternative and feel that there's many people out there who have no idea what this was going to do to them in tax consequences. And we'd like to -- you know, some people, we need to know what these changes will do to the taxpayers who are affected, you know, by this clustering, by this division, the ag land.

And so we really request that you talk to the assessor and have them explain what the tax consequences would be for those who are going to divide, those who are not going to divide and those who currently have a use permit. And I thank you very much. Appreciate that very much.

MORASCH: All right. Thank you. Any questions? All right.
Next on the list is Gus Harb.

HARB: Good evening, Mr. Council Chair, Board of Councilors, Planning Commission and staff. My name is Gus Harb, Harb Engineering, 701 Columbia Street, Suite 111, Vancouver, 98660. I'm here on behalf of the Saddle Club in regards to their property located on 10505 N.E. 117th Avenue, which includes two parcels. Parcel one is 200096-000 and the second parcel is 200138-000.

We made original request via an e-mail back in April 26th requesting that the current -- the property has a current comp plan of mixed use, but the zone is not consistent. The zoning is light industrial. All the properties surrounding this particular property to the south, it's all mixed use which is a project called Fountains. To the north is a square dance and north of it also is another 14 acres that is also mixed use and we were actually the applicant about seven years ago on all of those three properties.

What we are requesting, apparently, I think on the staff report that was represented to you now, it does state that the only property that could be rezoned under the comp plan, you can only zone it to mixed use, which would be consistent. So basically what the staff is looking is to have both comp plan and zoning consistent.

As I mentioned, this property is surrounded by residential to the south, to the north, east and also, like, across 117th to the west. We would like -- right now currently, I think it states that property owners were contacted for the preference and Table 12 shows the proposed changes. Apparently that was done, I think, about a year and a half ago and supposedly no one at the saddle club remembers requesting to change it to light industrial.

So on their behalf, we'd like to keep it as mixed use for the comp plan but change the zone to match. I think also, once it's developed under mixed use, I think -- I don't know if you have it as part of your staff report, one of the new strategy - and I'm going to read it - I think that's presented by the staff is change zoning to allow more areas to support diverse housing types, including small lots, multi-family, duplexes, accessory dwelling units, cottages and co-housing.

Developing this property into mixed use, and we're ready to develop it next year, would allow the types of houses that is listed here because the current mixed use zoning in the Title 40 requires a minimum of three different types of housing, whether it's single-family detached, attached multi-family, cottages and we're ready. So I would ask your support on that. Appreciate that.

MORASCH: Okay. Thank you. I do have a question. I want to make sure I understand.

HARB: Absolutely.

MORASCH: The property is currently zoned light industrial you said?

HARB: Correct. Has a zoning light industrial but the comp plan is mixed use.

MORASCH: And comp plan is mixed use.

HARB: Yes.

MORASCH: And what you're asking for is for the comp plan to be -- I mean, excuse me -- for the zoning to be changed to mixed use --

HARB: To be consistent.

MORASCH: -- to match the comp plan?

HARB: Exactly. And all the criterias that are listed in Title 40, and I think Mr. Oliver can probably support that, is this will meet all the criterias and we've done so on the property to the south, and two properties to the north, we've done that a few years back.

MORASCH: Is the property undeveloped or developed currently?

HARB: Right now it has a saddle club. They've already actually --

MORASCH: A saddle club.

HARB: Yeah. They've already found a property in Battle Ground so they are moving to Battle Ground and we are the future owners that would like to develop to mixed use.

MORASCH: Okay. Any other questions? All right. Thank you.

HARB: Thank you so much.

MORASCH: Kelly Shea.

SHEA: Hi. I'm Kelly Shea, Coldwell Banker Commercial representing the saddle club also, and I want to thank you folks for taking the time to listen to us.

I've been working on this for a year and a half trying to sell the property for the saddle club as industrial. I'm an industrial specialist, so you would think I would want to keep it industrial, but it's unsalable as industrial. I could not sell it.

The gentleman that just spoke is requesting it to be mixed use zoning as it says on the map. The saddle club asked me to talk to you and tell you that they definitely want it changed to mixed use. They have had so many complaints from the neighbors to the east and the south

that the noise that's produced, and if we left it industrial, it would probably be worse. They have another property that's under contract to move the saddle club, so we're just waiting to see if we can get this changed. Any questions?

MADORE: I have a question. What were the tax ID numbers for those parcels or the parcel numbers?

SHEA: It's 200138, 20096.

MCCAULEY: With three zeros on the end?

SHEA: With three zeros on the end. Pardon me.

MADORE: 20096-000.

HARB: No. 200096.

MADORE: Okay. Thank you.

MORASCH: Any other questions?

QUIRING: I have a question.

BARCA: Go for it.

MORASCH: Okay. I couldn't tell who said that. Eileen, yeah.

QUIRING: It's echoing throughout the --

MORASCH: You need to get your hand up so I can see.

QUIRING: I wanted to ask Oliver, is this -- would this be consistent? Is this a possibility just --

ORJIAKO: During your deliberation, the PC can make that recommendation to the Council. You heard the testimony, so that will be your recommendation. Whatever your recommendation is, I think if it is zoned MX, it will be consistent, so... but that's not what it is today and that's their request. So if you make that recommendation to the Council, they will be considering your recommendation.

QUIRING: Okay. Thank you.

ORJIAKO: You're welcome.

MORASCH: All right. Any other questions? All right. Thank you very much.

SHEA: Thank you.

MORASCH: Next we have Lee, Lee Jensen.

JENSEN: Not now, sir. Thank you.

MORASCH: Okay. Are you planning to testify on the 24th?

JENSEN: At this time, I am not planning on testifying. I don't know what I would like to do on the 24th. Can I reserve that?

MORASCH: Yeah, that was my thought. Your name is here, but I don't want to preclude you from testifying on the 24th. So I'll put a line through your name, if that's okay with you.

JENSEN: Oh, thank you.

MORASCH: All right. Okay. George Sundem. Is George here?

BOLDT: I think that's just for the record.

MIELKE: Espinosa.

MADORE: Pardon me?

MIELKE: Is that the name you called?

MADORE: Espinosa, is it?

BOLDT: No.

MORASCH: No. It's George it looks like Sundem, S-u-n-d-e-m. All right.
Moving on. Todd Renee Klein.

KLEIN: No comment.

MORASCH: All right. Did you want to reserve the right to testify on the 24th?

KLEIN: No, we won't be in town.

MORASCH: No. Okay. Mark DeFrees.

DEFREES: Good evening. So together with Todd, we have a 52-acre parcel - he has 32; I have 20 - but it seems to be kind of spot zoned because we're surrounded by five-acre parcels and I would like to request that we could get down to a five-acre zoning which would be consistent with what the neighbors and the surrounding property owners have. I know the current e-mail I saw was going from a 20 to 10-acre parcels.

And that's my other question is when we go to Option 1 or Option 2 on this latest proposal, are we basically doing a smaller cluster thing? Can anybody answer that.

ORJIAKO: I think it would be premature for me to really answer your question, sir, because I don't know what we -- the Councilors asked us to provide two options, one requiring in order to subdivide 20 acres to two 10s, we're requiring a clustering of two one acre or an acre and a half, depending on whether the property can perk on a corner along property line, in this case leaving 18 acres in for agricultural use.

And the other option is to have two 10-acre standalone, but it will require that a building envelope be provided and approved by the County so that we can meet the test of protecting ag.

So with those two options, we don't know which one the Councilors are going to approve or the Planning Commission is going to recommend to the Council to consider, so I'm hesitating to say what the outcome will be, but that's the two options that are on the table for discussion.

DEFREES: Yeah. Okay. So you're going to boil it down to one or the other?

ORJIAKO: That will be yes.

DEFREES: Okay. And I also would like to comment on both of our parcels together, there's a 12-inch PUD water main that fronts the whole property, so it appears to us that at some point somebody had planned on providing a lot of water to that area to support growth out there and I see things maybe going a different direction, but, you know, there was kind of some capital money spent to support, you know, families being raised out there and so forth, and then with these options, I'm not sure if that's going to happen or not, so, but...

ORJIAKO: I think the Councilors want to correct me. I don't know which option the Planning Commission will recommend to the Council, but all I can say is that those are the two options that are up for consideration. I don't know if you want anything to add.

OLSON: Yeah. What is your parcel number, do you know?

DEFREES: It's 235685-000.

OLSON: And I think if I'll just -- I think right now, we're not committed to one or the other or possibly both, so I think we want to make sure that there's flexibility, so we haven't made any --

STEWART: And the other issue there is we thought the possible options should be that we should look at alternatives to the one option that was offered, and I don't think we fell on any one specific option, and I think that's still as an alternative and that has not been decided yet, that discussion has not been completed by the Council.

MORASCH: Commissioner Mielke. I mean, Madore. Sorry.

MADORE: Thank you. As I understand it in the work session, the Board asked the staff to prepare both a -- both versions or at least two versions of the cluster. One was the original one that the staff prepared which required, mandated cluster and the new one that's to be considered as well equally is the option, the flexibility that could be chosen by the owner.

DEFREES: Okay. Well, I would like to go on record stating that I would like to have the option of what I can do with my property.

MADORE: I had one more question for you, if that's okay. You currently -- you mentioned that the surrounding properties are what size and generally speaking the predominant parcel size?

DEFREES: The majority of them are fives. On my east property line, they're two and a halves. It's part of a cluster that was done, I don't know, early '90s or such. There is one parcel that touches a portion of my line to the north that is a ten. Todd's parcel is to my west, but west of his on his west line is all fives and then to the south is all fives.

MADORE: And so your question or your desire is that yours would be made fives as well to --

DEFREES: Yeah. I mean, that would be my ultimate preference, if I could have a wish.

MADORE: Thank you. Okay. Thank you.

I do have a question for staff, if that would be okay. I assume that we're taking public testimony not just simply to listen for it and just to check it off, it's done, but also to be able to allow us the flexibility to potentially seriously consider the requests that are made. Here we have an example of one and the question is, do we really have that choice between now and the time that we approve this that we could actually grant this request legally?

ORJIAKO: That will be something that I will ask our legal counsel to answer. I don't think we are in a site-specific request.

DIJULIO: Without understanding the property at issue but addressing the broader question, if the Planning Commission and the Council in their deliberations determines that some property in the county would be better characterized in light of its surrounding circumstances and all of the other factors that the Growth Management Act directs, services, support facilities, all the rest of those factors that you've been considering for a long time, then you certainly can make that determination.

And, of course, any time you make such a determination, it might have impacts otherwise on your planning, because if you put more population in one area, you might be have overburdening, overcompensating, in other words, for your compensation, for your population demands.

It is, as you know, as you've studied these issues, somewhat of a balancing effort, but certainly in answer to the Commissioner's question, you can find that a particular area is more appropriately identified for this purpose, but that may mean that you're going to have to reduce an area somewhere else.

MADORE: Okay. Thank you.

DEFREES: Thank you.

MORASCH: All right. Any other questions? All right. Thank you for coming.
Mark Collier.

COLLIER: Hello. My name is Mark Collier and I'm representing the Public Health Advisory Committee tonight and I have a letter here that has been reviewed by the committee and I'll kind of summarize it a little bit and add some points.

The Public Health Advisory Committee or known as PHAC's role is to advise the Board of Public Health, which in this case are the County Councilors. The PHAC strongly believes that the language of the Growing Healthy Report should be included in the update to the comprehensive plan. In our meeting that we had this week, we discussed it again and reinforced that belief.

The Public Health Advisory Council became aware of the influence of the built environment several years ago, and in 2010, the PHAC with the Health Department assistance and the Community Planning Department developed the Growing Healthier Report. This report addresses many ways the built environment impacts health, for instance, diseases that are influenced by physical activity and diet, such as heart disease, diabetes and obesity.

The built environment does impact health and it's best to have policies that encourage good

health in the areas of environmental quality, safety and social connections, affordable quality housing, access to healthy food, active transportation and land use, parks and open spaces and economic opportunity. It should be noted that the Planning Commission at an earlier date reviewed and endorsed the Growing Healthier Report and the County Commissioners agreed to include the report in the comprehensive plan in 2012.

In summary, it has shown that the built environment does affect health conditions of people in communities. It is best to have a built environment that allows people to thrive.

MORASCH: All right. Thank you. Any questions? All right. Thank you very much.

COLLIER: Thank you for the time.

MORASCH: Jim Karlock.

KARLOCK: So my name is Jim Karlock. I thank you for the opportunity to be here.

I kind of superficially looked through this plan and you know this looks just like Portland's plan. It even has a light rail in it. Although the people voted down light rail multiple times, it's still in this plan. You have increasing density in all of the neighborhoods through in-fill just like Portland. You and Division/Main Street is lined with (inaudible) apartment buildings. I'm sure you've seen these all over Portland.

You're going to have more traffic congestion due to the emphasis you're placing on bikes and buses just like Portland. You're forcing people to reduce car use in favor of slow wasteful mass transit. And make no mistake about it, mass transit wastes people time. They waste -- it wastes energy and it wastes money compared to a private car.

And then - this is laughable - you want to get rid of cul-de-sacs, although cul-de-sacs are the lowest crime way to build housing because there's only one way in and there's nobody, generally speaking, except people who live there. You don't have pass through with casual criminals. And if there's a stranger on the street, you got a pretty good reason to ask him what he's doing there.

So you can predict the same results as Portland, unaffordable housing, poor traffic congestion and overcrowded neighborhoods. All you got to do is take a drive across the river and see what this plan is going to do to Clark County. Even President Obama's chief economic adviser advised against restricting land use because restrictions, such as found in this plan, increase housing costs, slowed growth and hurt low income people and minorities. You'll find a Wall Street Journal article that mentions the plan with a link to the actual speech given by this White House adviser.

Now, the planners are professionals. They know all about these downsizes. These have been known for decades. This is no new news. And worst, they've watched for over ten years as Portland planners have driven minorities out of their neighborhoods and destroyed their long-term neighborhoods.

So why do planners choose to do what Portland's done? The only possible conclusion is they simply do not care who they hurt. Their plans are more important than people. Even worse, the planners know this plan is going to hurt low income people. And the planners know that racial minorities are disproportionately low income. So the planners know that this plan is a racist plan. There's no other way to put it. This is a racist plan.

You must completely rewrite this plan to remove all elements that increase housing costs and you must completely rewrite the plan to remove all elements that are unwanted by the average person unless, of course, this is a plan to dictate a lifestyle on people.

MORASCH: All right. Thank you.

KARLOCK: So that pretty much covers it. Thank you.

MORASCH: All right. Any questions? No? All right. Thank you.
Jim Levesque. Or, no, Joe, sorry, Joe Levesque.

LEVESQUE: For the record, Joe Levesque from Camas.

Steve, we crossed -- I talked to him on the telephone. I gave you guys something today, the other day too that I had given to Peter Golik about going to the grand jury while all this stuff is going on.

BARCA: Joe. Joe, will you talk closer to the microphone, please.

LEVESQUE: Yeah.

BARCA: That a way.

MORASCH: Now we can hear you.

LEVESQUE: You can hear me now.

MORASCH: I can hear you now.

LEVESQUE: Yeah, I'm getting up there. I don't like it. I don't like what's going on. I don't like what's going on in this county at all. I used to know this country when it was a free country.

You asked me earlier when did it change. You know, when this country was started 200 years ago, they've been fighting for freedom for thousands of years. Freedom is what I fight for. I had good friends of mine die for this country. They're not here anymore. I don't like to see what's going on. I want to know -- to go to the grand jury of what's going on in this county.

Over 50 years ago, I had a partner. We built two 60 units in 55 days with three snow storms. I was doing pretty good. The mayor of the town asked my partner, how did you do that? She says, look, let me tell you about the people in the Northwest. They're good. They're kind. They're honest. They're decent. They're law-abiding, but, boy, are they dumb. Now, that doesn't mean you guys are stupid, but you're still dumb. There's a lot of stuff going on that we don't know about.

Now, going back to freedom here. I'd like to see an eagle out there and I don't see no eagle flying around with a laptop around his neck. All of this is a waste of money. Altogether I built homes for over 200,000 people in my lifetime, affordable homes. They don't have affordable homes in this community. Now, you guys think this is happening by accident. This is a manufactured economy that we're living in. Now, if what I said is true, it's a good idea to find out why and who's behind all this.

I don't see the BIA here, Board of Realtors here. I don't see landlords here. I don't see management companies here. Why? Because they're all benefiting from this. What's going on right now has already been predicted in the book that I'm reading right now called United Nations Agenda 21. They're shooting for one world order. When you're in love with your country, you're concerned about your country, and that's exactly where I'm at, I don't like what's happening. We're losing this country and you guys are pawns of the United Nations right now and you don't even know it.

What's happening right now has already been in black and white. It's already been written that it's going to happen and it's happening. I could talk for hours about this stuff. The biggest committee meeting I ever go through is between my two ears. I got a whole list of stuff to talk about, I just talk from the top of my head. But I love my country and I don't like what's happening.

As far as freedom goes, as far as comp plan goes, in my opinion - I'm not an attorney. You're an attorney here - if any of these people vote for any plan that they come up with and any person that benefits from it, wouldn't they excuse themselves because of a conflict of interest or could they? I'm asking you.

MORASCH: All right.

LEVESQUE: I think there's a conflict of interest.

MORASCH: If our attorney wants to make some general comments about conflict of interest, I think that would be fine and then we'll open it to any other questions.

DIJULIO: The comprehensive plan process that we are currently in is considered a legislative process. This is a countywide consideration. Washington has the strictest conflict of interest and appearance of fairness laws of any place in the country.

Our officials, both Planning Commission and County Councilors, are subject to the strictest standards regarding interests in the activity that they vote on both as a matter of the common law of the state as well as statutory restrictions.

The less form of restriction applies when you're dealing with legislative acts such as this. In some respects, every councilor and every commissioner has an interest in the votes that they take regarding the county comprehensive plan. It's hard not to have some interest if you own a piece of property in this county.

So if there is an issue that comes up with respect to a particular vote, then we'll deal with it at that time. I'm not aware of any particular issue that has come before the Planning Commission or the Council, but when it comes up, it will be disclosed and we'll address it at that time.

MORASCH: All right.

LEVESQUE: I'll give you the conflict of interest right now. This man doesn't want me to say anything. The conflict of interest, if any of you people who benefit from all the other things that are, if you benefit from your own, if you own your own home right now and you don't vote for Alternative 4, you have a conflict of interest. That's my own opinion. I could be wrong, but I like this guy, but I still want to know from you guys if you're going to go to the grand jury of what I'm talking about? Because today I talked to Washington State University in Vancouver as well as in Pullman, I told them what I wanted to do, but I need help.

BOLDT: Excuse me. You're out of time. Thank you.

MORASCH: Yep, thank you.

LEVESQUE: Are you going to go to the grand jury with this stuff?

MORASCH: I think you've used your three minutes, but I want to thank you for coming in. If you have additional comments, please feel free to submit them in writing at any time before the close of business on May 25.

LEVESQUE: United Nations Agenda 21, please read it.

MORASCH: All right. Thank you.

LEVESQUE: There's another book too on what's wrong with that book --

MORASCH: Sir, we need to move on to the next speaker, but submit your book recommendations in writing. Thank you.
Paul Childers.

CHILDERS: Good evening, Mr. Chair, Councilors. My name is Paul Childers and I am representing the Public Health Advisory Council. I think Mark mentioned pretty much a lot of the different things that I was going to bring up to you, but I wanted to point out a few other things.

The Public Health Advisory Council was started some 13 years ago in order to address issues and advise the Public Health Board on health in the community. And one of the things that we came up with in 2010 was the Growing Healthier Report, which I think we gave the Board in 2012 for their approval, and we are -- the only thing that we are asking at this particular point in time is that the current Board follows the same precedent as far as allowing inclusion in the report to shape the community as far as the health is concerned. Thank you very much.

MORASCH: All right. Thank you. Any questions?

BLOM: On this one, the report or on our decision matrix here, it says Strategies from the Growing Healthier Report, change zoning to allow areas to support diverse housing types, and then it goes on to list, is the recommendation on that specifically for county land within the urban growth area or is it outside of the urban growth area or is your recommendation just in general? If so, Oliver, is this saying we're going to incorporate these strategies in the county area but inside the urban growth area or in all rural lands as well?

ORJIAKO: I think I will say that it's countywide, when however, the policies that we are incorporating will apply to the unincorporated portion of the county.

BLOM: Thank you.

MORASCH: All right. Any other questions? All right.

CHILDERS: Thank you.

MORASCH: Thank you for coming.
Barbara Anderson.

ANDERSON: Good evening. I'm here tonight for your Parks Advisory Board.

There are two aspects of the comprehensive plan that we have supported in our organization. The first part of the capital facilities plan was the parks and open space plan that you passed earlier. We have now brought back a second aspect that we are supporting, and that is looking at financially bringing to fruition the plan that was in the comp plan for parks. And there is a need to increase the PIF funding, and the Parks Advisory Board understood and we're concerned about the large increase required, but there hasn't been an increase since the early 2000s.

So we looked at staging it and made that recommendation to staff and they redid it and are bringing that forward now as the second part of the comp plan for parks, and we certainly support it. It was passed unanimously within our ranks and we hope that you support that too. Increasing cost is always uncomfortable but very necessary and long overdue for this. Thank you.

MORASCH: All right. Thank you. Any questions? All right. Thank you for coming.
David Alt.

ALT: I am here to encourage the use of Alternative Number 4. I don't care for the other one in that it takes away from the property owner. Many people have worked for years to acquire a parcel of land. They have made tree farms, dairies, whatever, and used their land. They put their blood, sweat and tears into it. Now to be told by the government how they can do it, what they can do with it, I understand that there is things that it's for protection of the people that some of this stuff is done, but there's a lot of times I think the bureaucrats take over and take away from the individual, and that's what I see in this Number 2.

Number 4 gives the property owner a chance to do what he wants to do. It's his land; it's not your land. Have you asked him what he wants to do? Yeah, we've had a lot of meetings and we've had a lot of hearings and whatnot, but how many of these people will not come down here and talk as I didn't for 30 some years until I finally got my fill that I don't care what I say or anything else anymore, that I used to laugh about some of this stuff that goes on, but it's really sad that how -- please, listen to the person who owns that land. What do they want to do? Don't tell them they can't sell it today. Don't tell them they can't sell it tomorrow. It's theirs; it's not yours. Give them that respect. Don't strip it away from them like it's being done so many times in so many places.

One world order, yeah, that's where it's going. Do we live in a socialist community? No. Blood, sweat and tears have been sacrificed for this country so we can be free, so we can be one nation under God, respect that thing of what those guys died and fought for us.

From the day of the founders writing the constitution, the words wisdom were written because of the influence of the Bible because of their love for the country, for their love for the fellow

man. That is what recognizes them, the wisdom, the ownership, the blood, sweat and tears that these people have put into this land. Give them that chance. Don't take it away from them. Give them the chance to do what they want with their own land. Please, Number 4.

MORASCH: All right. Thank you. Questions? No?
All right. Stan Greene.

GREENE: Stan Greene, P.O. Box 227, Heisson, Washington 98622.

First of all, I want to object to limiting the testimony to one time because I haven't had a chance to testify before the Planning Commission. I have to do it now, but then I lose my opportunity on the 24th. Whether we're for it or against, you should allow everybody to have a full open discussion. This, when you shut it off like this, it reminds me of 1994 in the growth hearing, Growth Management Hearing Board. So I have wished to meet with the Planning Department because I think I have some good ideas and I've waited two weeks. I've made -- asked the secretaries and nothing has happened.

I strongly suggest that the GMA plan please, please include a goal of enhancing timber production in Clark County by encouraging the conversion of open space land to timberland and encourage the conversion of unused ag land into timberland. And also, this is part of the code, reduce fees for timberland applications and make the process and application easier. And for the record, our parcel is 230277-000 up in Yacolt.

We've chased -- under the jaws and the oppression of the Growth Management Act where we can't live on our own land for more than 20 years and so something needs to be done. And if we can live on our own land, we can manage it better. Some of you people get that and understand it. But what we need to do is make some mitigation here so that we need to get more timberland production in Clark County so that us few people that have been screwed over by the GMA since 1994 can live on our own land.

Now, I want to get your attention. If I gave you a hot stock tip, you buy a stock for $15 and it goes to $1,000, you've perked up, you've got my attention. And I will be submitting over this weekend data from the Department of Natural Resources, from landowners and from timber harvesters, loggers, that you can make - and this is for Jeanne and Oliver and all the other people that don't understand it and I'd like to answer questions and so on - you can make money off of five acres and I will be submitting the proof that I've collected. If you invest $1500 in five acres and the planning and you do a harvest at 35 years, you'll make about $30,000 and you'll get another -- you'll get a total of about 100 to 115,000 if you do it right and let it grow to maturity.

So it's important that we do encourage, get something in this plan, please, that lets the public know that it's important to grow timber. There's unused land in the property that's growing

weeds and grass and it should grow timber. Now, please, many of you know me, ask some questions.

MORASCH: All right. Thank you. Any questions?

MADORE: I have a question. I want to make sure I understand. The open space and their cluster remainder parcels, are they prohibited now from growing timber, or what is it that you're asking more flexibility for? I want to make sure I understand.

GREENE: Okay. I'll just give you an example. I won't name names, but I know a person, in fact, he's one of my relatives and he bought 20 acres over in the Ridgefield area and they had had timber on it and he logged it off. It wasn't managed right. He got very low price for it, and maybe it even cost him to log it because it wasn't taken care of right, but he's turned his property into open space so he gets the tax discount. But why doesn't he grow timber there?

And there's another whole factor, and I need to get more information from Jim Vandling, because you can have the timber and there's this whole new thing with the carbon, exchanging the carbon and it will increase the value of the timber, and even if you don't harvest it, you sit on it for years and years, you can get paid with these carbon credits. But Jim Vandling, the County forester, can explain that better, and it works.

Now, let's see. Trying to answer your question. I do think that some of these unused pieces of property and I do have some neighbors even that they have tansy and they have weeds and they probably have it in open space and it should grow timber.

Now, in a rural area, if we had some kind of zoning and if I could explain more to planning and meet with you people individually, if we had a zoning of six acres, like an AG-6 or an ag FR-6 where we would have five acres of perpetual timber, maybe agriculture if they're really going to produce and make money on it, whereas with the agriculture you have to show that you make it every year, with timber you don't have to prove that because it's such a long-term, you know, full harvest is 60 years.

You could have harvest in thinning, maybe at 25, 35 years, unless you do alder, then you might have a full harvest in 35 years and sometimes alder price is higher than the fir, but maybe I'm rambling, but it seems to me that we should grow more trees. It enhances the environment.

MADORE: So I hear lots of advantages in growing trees. Got all that.

GREENE: Yes. Yes.

MADORE: And the question is you mention open space.

GREENE: Yes.

MADORE: Is there a restriction that does not allow timber to be grown in open space?

GREENE: I don't know if there's an outright restriction, but the people that I've talked to that have open space, they think it's too much trouble to grow timber. What's the tax advantage? They have to have a timber management plan that came into the RCWs in 2014 and that's great to have, as long as you can write it up and do it right and follow it; whereas, open space and, you know, planning can correct me on this because they know much more than I do, but it's easier to sign up for open space and you get the same tax credit, but you're not, in my opinion, reducing the carbon out of the atmosphere that the trees will do, enhancing the environment, and it provides jobs too because people have to do pre-commercial thinning, harvesting and so on, it helps the county.

So final thing, please put something in there about, as Oliver spoke - I'm trying to think of the word - the option of innovative zoning, you know the words better than I do, but something like that where we could -- I don't want to be an enemy, I want to help you people and I want you to help us citizens. We want to work together. We want this county better, and from my experience, growing timber can make the county better than having weeds and grass.

MADORE: Thank you.

MORASCH: All right. Any other questions? All right. Thank you.

GREENE: Thank you. I will get my --

MORASCH: And be sure and submit any additional in writing.

GREENE: I will get this in writing.

MORASCH: Perfect.

GREENE: Please look it up. And for the people that didn't hear me testify with my emotional testimony on the 3rd, it's about an hour into the tape on the 3rd and the written testimony will come out, I don't know, a week or ten days. So thank you very much.

MORASCH: All right. Thank you. Yep.
Milada Anderson.

ALLEN: It's Milada and it should be Allen.

MORASCH: Pardon?

BARCA: Yes.

ALLEN: I defer my testimony until next week, so please save my right to speak.

MORASCH: Okay. I apologize for your name. It says Anderson on my sign-in sheet. Steve Schopp.

SCHOPP: Hello. My name is Steve Schopp. I live in Tualatin, Oregon. And although I see no horns sticking out of anyone's heads in here, I'm still a little bit disturbed as to why you would be proceeding down a path that you are. And I'm not here to globally discuss Agenda 21 or anything, and I don't think you need any of that.

I've been a builder and a property owner and a landlord throughout the Portland area for many years and I've watched what's going on out there the entire time. I've been an activist for a long time. And everything you're doing right now is identical to what Metro did 25 years ago. It's verbatim. It's staggering.

Two days ago at PSU, there was a seminar entitled Is It Working by Roger Geller, a prominent PSU individual, went through a whole bunch of graphs and everything and displayed how, no, it's not in every conceivable measurement. But your task here is to try to figure out what to do in Clark County and I wonder what you did.

Now, obviously there's the concept of, well, we don't want sprawl. Alternative 4 was, I suppose, scary and it signaled to the alarmist sprawl. Well, the property owners that were ready to use their land were going to use it at such a glacial's pace. Now, all those property owners out in Clark County don't have a paving machine in their garage ready to bulldoze and pave over the county. So it's not the prevention of sprawl that you're worried about. So what is it? One can only assume it's exactly what Metro did that spawned the housing crisis.

Now, today's Metro says that they're not responsible for that. The constrained land supply is not responsible. But a former Metro president Dave Bragdon admitted it crystal clear in his own writing that absolutely our urban growth boundary and our in-fill densities resulted in the housing prices to rise and it's horrible now. They can't fix it. You can't build affordable housing now as a government and subsidize it all fast enough to fix that problem, and here you are trotting down the same path. And you can't depend on a speaker, commenter to come in here and explain to you these things. You will not grasp it. You won't -- it won't be credible. You won't use it.

So I got some other ideas of what you can do, and at my own expense, I will get a luxury bus and take every one of you, the Planning Commission and the Councilors and show you the outcome, because the whole objective here is to do something that's pitched to you as

preferable, as an alternative to encourage in-fill. What's the sense of encouraging something if it doesn't happen? Do you encourage for the sake of encouragement? Do you do something alternative for the sake of alternativism? Well, of course not. And I can tell you, throughout the landscape of the Portland region over there from the inner city to the suburb cities to the outer reaches, it has gone haywire.

You can see it with your own eyes and I can prove to you beyond seeing it with your own eyes that Metro itself, when confronted by their own individually, independently elected auditor, when she did three audits in 2010 and 2011, she called them on the carpet essentially saying, look, you're not checking the effectiveness of your planning strategies.

One of the audits was for transportation. Metro admitted they're not checking the effectiveness of it so whether or not they're actually working. The other one was for transit owner development. The same thing, they don't check their outcomes. Those audits are readily available, it will show you. The other one was public communication. They spent the vast amount of their money on advocacy, not finding out what works.

And so if you see it with your own eyes, and I can tell you, I'll just give you one example - I know my time is devoured - out in the edges where you think you're stopping sprawl, the ugliest part of the development of the entire Portland metropolitan area is the very high density developments that Metro mandated. They're Urban Village and Villebois. It was supposed to be a mixed use urban village, vast thing. It took $150 million of public subsidy with urban renewal.

One of the biggest proponents was the former mayor, Charlotte Lehan of Wilsonville, a month ago she sat in a meeting, a public meeting like this, says, well, you know, it didn't work out so well because none of the commercial elements worked out because the market wouldn't support them.

MORASCH: All right. I think your three minutes are up, so I'm going to have to ask you to wrap it.

SCHOPP: And the final thing is - here's the whopper - you think the smart growth and the in-fill is producing more walkers, more bikers and more transit users, and that's the ultimate purpose of it, right? It's not happening and all the data shows it. That's why TRI-MET and Metro don't want to track itself themselves. So you take away that and you're ruining sprawl --

MORASCH: Okay. You've had way more than three minutes. I'm going to have to ask you to wrap it, to stop now and submit any additional comments you have in writing.

Are there any questions?

SCHOPP: Okay. Elected officials are obligated to be more thorough than you're being.

MORASCH: All right. Thank you.

SCHOPP: Now, I urge all five of you to get out there and figure out what's really happening because you're copying a model that should never be copied.

MORASCH: I'm sorry. You've well used your time, so thank you for coming.
Margaret Tweet.

MADORE: I do have a question. Mr. Schopp, you indicated that those audits are --

BARCA: Come back up to the microphone, please, if you're going to talk to him.

MORASCH: Yeah. I'm sorry. You went so far over your time that we weren't able to ask for questions. Like normally with speakers, I ask if there's questions, so we will reopen it for questions.

MADORE: You indicated that audits are available, the feedback documents are available?

SCHOPP: Sure. Absolutely.

MADORE: Can you submit that with your written so that we can know where we can get to that?

SCHOPP: Absolutely. Absolutely. And I would really urge you, before you jump this gun - because you have all the time in the world to get this right - please take the tour with me, devour the audit material and you will know what to do, at least three of you will.

BARCA: Mr. Schopp.

MADORE: Thank you.

BARCA: Mr. Schopp.

SCHOPP: Yeah.

BARCA: Very passionate on your belief system.

SCHOPP: It's factual, sir.

BARCA: What you didn't include, which would be helpful to me, would be the ideas that you

said we would want to see and we would want to see what's working, and you talked a lot about what's not working, what I didn't hear or I didn't see, which I hope to see in written testimony, then, is for you to give us examples of what does work.

SCHOPP: Sure. Alternative 4 works just perfectly fine.

BARCA: So Alternative 4 is not an example. It's your choice on what you'd like to see. If you want to be helpful on giving an oppositional position to what you believe is already County's direction, help us by painting the picture of what works, not what you would like to see happen, but show us what works. I would like to see that.

SCHOPP: Well, if you're generally interested, that's perfectly fine. But the fact is that I've been down this road many, many times and for me, I think you're obfuscating the issue, so...

BARCA: Okay. I don't need you to go through it again. I'm asking you to help us.

SCHOPP: Well, I'll tell you what. To avoid disaster, because you have all the time in the world, you better get out there and take a look at first. There's plenty of options. There's 50 states doing 50 different version of things with cities all over their states. This is the wrongest decision you could possibly make. The worst decision. And I can prove it. If you'd simply subject yourself to seeing it, I can prove it. Free ride.

MADORE: So, Mr. Schopp, I think what's being asked here is in your written testimony that you can submit examples of what doesn't work and examples of what does work on the ground. Thank you.

SCHOPP: Certainly. Certainly.

MADORE: Thank you.

SCHOPP: Certainly. And I think the planners all know that. They're not limited in an orb here, a cave. The awareness out there and the landscape across the country is significant. So let's not pretend like there's no options nobody knows about, you know.

MORASCH: All right. Thank you. Please do submit your written testimony.
Margaret Tweet.

TWEET: Excuse me. I'll just turn in this written testimony because when I asked about the testimony, I wasn't told about the two, choose a date, until I got here --

MADORE: Okay. So you would like to come back --

TWEET: -- and I did ask in writing about what opportunities there would be and I think this is a new thing about pick a day.

MORASCH: Okay. So would you like to come back next week?

TWEET: Right. But I'll go ahead and submit this that I have in writing. And who would I submit that to then?

MORASCH: Okay. To Rebecca back here.

TWEET: Thank you.

MORASCH: And I will mark this so that you can come back on the 24th.
Okay. Carol Levanen.

LEVANEN: Carol Levanen for Clark County Citizens United.

Clark County Citizens United is opposed to the Preferred Alternative. We believe that it was a last-minute choice. The Preferred Alternative was adopted in November 24, 2015. At the last minute, in an hour's worth of time, a new alternative came forward. We believe that that does not comport with the GMA.

The comprehensive plan. We oppose the comprehensive plan because there are many things in that plan that the public has no idea is in that plan. There's not been any public process for most of what is in that plan. Now, you can argue that there was a rural lands task force. You can argue that, well, the Health Department worked with this. But I believe the public has no idea what is in that plan.

Cluster ordinance. We are opposed to that. The cluster ordinance is mandatory. There's numerous regulatory schemes in there that prevent a landowner from doing anything with their land. We're opposed to Alternative 2 because Alternative 2 doesn't do anything. The land is all smaller than the parcels that it would affect and the majority of those parcels wouldn't be able to do anything anyways because a cluster is mandatory to it.

We believe the plan has not had an appropriate public process. The people have no understanding of what you've been doing here. You have not given the information on a public forum. You are refusing to do a public forum at this time. So now the people are going to have to decide whether or not they're going to try to do something when they know nothing about what it is you're doing.

The resource designations are flawed. They've always been flawed. They've been flawed since the court ordered that you were supposed to make corrections to those in 1997. An aerial

photo does not tell people what a resource land designation has. It doesn't tell you the proximity to the urban areas. It doesn't tell you the economic viability of the land. It doesn't tell you anything, and Clark County did all of its resource land with an aerial photo and that was all. We have one document to prove that all they used was an aerial photo and staff interpretation. That is clearly erroneous under the GMA.

OFM population projections aren't -- there's not a cap on rural growth in the OFM population projections. February 21, 1997, the court rendered that the upholding of petitioners - that's us, Clark County Citizens United - who challenged the Western Washington Growth Management Board and we won on all five counts -- all -- all five counts and we won in five courts, including the Court of Appeals, which upheld OFM projection numbers are not to be used as a cap on rural growth, and you're continuing to use an erroneous formula in order to compose this plan.

All of those things were erroneous under the State law, under the courts and you need to stop doing this and you need to reverse this. This plan is exactly the same thing you did in 1994 and we will not accept it. Thank you very much.

MORASCH: All right. Thank you. Before you go, are there any questions? All right. No questions.
Susan Rasmussen.

RASMUSSEN: Good evening. Susan Rasmussen for Clark County Citizens United.

It's not GMA's goal to halt rural lifestyles. The Department of Commerce's guidelines say to define rural character in conjunction with the rural residents themselves. Who can better define rural features than the citizens who actually live and work in the area?

The Department supports diversity and rural lifestyles. It makes sense to allow the indifference in defining rural character. Their consideration should be valued above other considerations in designing the futures of their own properties. CCCU doesn't drive into town week after week to tell the urban citizens how to design the futures of their neighborhoods. That isn't respectful.

I sincerely hope everyone here tonight pays attention to that issue. The County has failed to include the rural landowners as stakeholders. It is GMA law, any group of citizens that are impacted by the County land use and zoning regulations are required to be active participants throughout the planning process. Rural landowner issues suffer as a consequence if they're not involved. The citizens weren't offered a range of alternatives let alone a broad range of options that lent any recognition to rural perspectives. This is not GMA compliant.

Eight months prior to the three plans presented, CCCU had already established an extensive body of testimony filled with concerns from the rural landowners. This was intentional to ensure rural issues would be recognized this time. The three plans were presented.

Surprisingly none of the issues had been incorporated into the maps.

Instead of an alternative that lent a rural landowner perspective, the planning staff gave us apathy and we were left to fend for ourselves if we wanted a rural Alternative 4 plan. This is concrete evidence. The planning staff disregarded the intentions of the public participation process. The process was nothing more than a superficial exercise. It was fluff. Once more, the desired outcome had already been written without regard for the public process.

The plan was intentionally managed in such a way as to directly lead to a previous foregone conclusion. The Board was fed a restrictive diet of information that would lead them to a predetermined outcome. This action severely impairs the abilities of the Board and PC to conduct the important business of making well-reasoned and balanced decisions. This action further degrades the public process. This public process and all the associated foundational documents comprise a campaign and the staff are the lobbyists. That is not their duty.

There are reports that were intentionally excluded from the process that indicate support for change in the resource lands is overdue. The USDA Census of ag, the GlobalWise report all indicate trends towards smaller intensely managed farms. Instead of those reports, you're given the Growing Healthier Report that reads like a scare tactic and the County will quickly succumb to a fresh food shortage. When viewed in combination, the evidence overwhelmingly indicates rural landowners were disadvantaged at every opportunity. This is discriminatory and exposes a fatal flaw in the public process.

The public participation plan for this update was meaningless; however, the process for the update worked like it was intended to work. It excluded the rural landowners from the process and ignores property rights among the other 13 goals and exploits property owners for environmental concerns.

MORASCH: Thank you.

RASMUSSEN: This also allows unabated advancement --

MORASCH: I think you've gone over your time, but I'm going to open it up to questions now. Any questions?

RASMUSSEN: Okay. I included my e-mail on the document I sent around and I will gladly respond and give you my resources if you question them. Are there any questions I can answer? Thank you for your time this evening. You have important work to do.

MORASCH: Thank you for coming. Thank you.
John Matson.

MATSON: I have a copy for everyone at the table. I'm in favor of Alternative 4 and common sense and facts that have been submitted. I have 25 acres just outside the urban growth boundary.

Since 1994, predominantly the lot size is two and a half acres or less. I was zoned AG-20. I can't divide even 25 into a 20 and a 5, but should be able to divide into two and a half acres. Too much of the county is in Forest 80, Forest 40, AG-10 and AG-20 and can't divide. That's not fair.

Emotions and feelings are mostly ruling the opposition against Alternative 4, against opening lots in rural areas as they say roads aren't adequate, small acreages won't produce as much, not enough water, will pollute too much, destroy timber production and farmland, which has been proven false by a professional here about the septic systems.

Professionals have facts and proven opposite, septic tanks pollute less or less pollution than public sewer and water it recharges the ground. Timber can be managed and logged down to one-acre parcels. PUD has plenty of water for 60 years. Two and a half acres produce so much and people can live in a park every day.

The rural Clark County has 320,000 acres, and if we could put 8,000 lots, that would be one house per 40 acres and 8,000 lots wouldn't be built for probably the next 20 years. That's not urban sprawl. Urban Clark County has approximately 55,000 acres. I can't put the second house and divide my 25 acres into two and a half parcels because they say roads aren't adequate, can't break up the farms, not enough water, septics will pollute too much. Septic systems are engineered today to work in most soils but didn't work 40 years ago.

I live on Ward Road between 99th and 119th Street and I can't put the second house or divide into two and a half acres and not -- now in the last year, four subdivisions are started within two miles of my home on Ward Road. One 12 unit on 2.2 acres, one 147 lots on 24 acres, 77 lots on another on 13 acres and 113 lots on approximately a little bigger lots of 10,000-square feet. This is within two and a half miles of my place. Where's the water? Where did the farms go? No pollution? How come Ward Road wasn't and isn't adequate for my second house?

From where I live on N.E. -- on Ward Road and west of 503 between 99th and 119th Street, in the last two to three years to the present of 2016, there's about eight to ten subdivisions going of 100 lots plus per each and several smaller, plus a 240-unit Rock Creek Apartment. Talk about urban sprawl. What about the roads, farms, water, pollution? This is pretty unfair as we cannot even have family to enjoy the rural area and help us when we're getting old to keep up with the work. And you can't make a living on 10 to 20 or 40 acres farming.

Carol Levanen has submitted so many honest facts over the years, so let's go by facts and truth and proven accomplishments. Let's be fair about urban and rural property owners. Just think in the mile and a half wide between where I live, 119th Street and 99th Street to west for four

miles, there's 3800 acres and there's about over -- I don't know how many lots going in there, there's about 1500 lots going in on there, so this is urban sprawl. So let's be fair to the property owners that have lived here all their life, over 100 years, and more from when our forefathers moved here, so...

MORASCH: All right. Well, thank you for coming. Before you run off, are there any questions? All right. Thank you.
It looks like Gary Lawhead.

LAWHEAD: Good evening, Council and Planning Commission. Thank you for this opportunity and I appreciate the work that you're doing to try and put this thing together here in very short order.

My name is Gary Lawhead. My wife Chris is with me tonight and we are rural landowners in the Ridgefield area. We have 20 acres, been on the property for about 20 years now. We're third generation on my grandfather's farm. In fact, the Roth unit of the wildlife refuge is named for him because of the land donation he gave to them decades ago.

I would support as much flexibility as possible for those of us in the AG-20 community. There are plans that we would like to do to get our fourth generation family on to the property at some point in time and would support as much flexibility as you could possibly give us in that area.

I do have leading to a question of my own. We live on a private road to access our property and there are 15 residences that access the property by this private road. We are one of four in AG-20, although, the remainder are five-acre parcels. In the proposal that I've been reading, there is some road restrictions and I was wondering if that would apply to a private road access, the example being if they were to go to another ten-acre parcel, the access to that property would be via private road and how much restriction there might be, Oliver, if the lot suggested may be a ways off the private road?

ORJIAKO: I think that there will be opportunity as depending, again, on which option the Councilors approve. We will take a look at, you know, access issues. The cluster that we are proposing requires that the smaller parcel size be cornered along property line and taking access to existing road or private road. So those techniques and technical issues access with and so forth is something that we will be reviewing and hopefully make firm as the Board and the Planning Commission makes a decision on which option to support.

MATSON: Okay. Thank you.

In closing, I know it's a tight balance with the growth that we're expecting in this county in the next 20 years, and for those of us out there in ag land would appreciate as much flexibility as

you could possibly give us. Thank you very much.

MORASCH: All right. Thank you.

MADORE: Before you go, I've got a question.

MATSON: Any questions? Yeah.

MADORE: You indicated that your neighbors generally are about five acre in size?

MATSON: Yes.

MADORE: And your parcel, you have 20 acres. Can you identify your -- so in other words, you would prefer your parcel to be like your neighbors, about five acres?

MATSON: That would be my desire, yes.

MADORE: And can you identify your parcel?

MADORE: 220437-000.

MADORE: 20437.

MATSON: Yeah. 220437 and then the three 0's.

MADORE: Thank you.

MATSON: Any other questions?

MORASCH: All right. Well, thank you. Thank you much for coming and --

QUIRING: Steve.

MORASCH: Pardon? Did you have a question?

QUIRING: I have a question not of him, but I just want to ask the question about these two options. I want to know the difference between the cluster option where the lots can be placed in corners or near using the same road, what is the difference with the other option? What is the other option?

ORJIAKO: The other option allows two separate tax lots. What that option is suggesting is that the proponent show where the building envelope is going to be. That's just the option. That's

one of the --

QUIRING: When or where did you say?

ORJIAKO: Where.

QUIRING: When?

ORJIAKO: No, where.

QUIRING: Where the building envelope will be on that --

ORJIAKO: Ten acres.

QUIRING: -- ten acres?

ORJIAKO: Yes.

QUIRING: So a 20 can be 10?

ORJIAKO: If you take your 10 -- if you take your 20 and go straight to two 10-acre separate lots, the suggestion or the proposal is that you show where the building envelope is going to be. That's it.

QUIRING: Okay. Thank you.

MORASCH: All right. Any other questions? Okay.
Kirk VanGelder.

VANGELDER: Kirk VanGelder, rural property owner out in east of Orchards, and my notes are kind of all over the place.

First off, I want to say, though, that I'm angry that I have to be here tonight. We thought we put this to bed last year and I'm really disappointed that those who voted against Alt 4 are making us go through all this again and potentially lose that good option.

As you know property prices and availability are horrible and atrocious around here, and this current plan is going to just make that even worse. Now, I got to tell you, though, that works out really good for me. I've got four or five parcels. That's going to make their price go up, but that's not good for my 13 kids who I would like to have live around me and that's just being priced out of the market the more we restrict the rural options.

So I'm going to request that you do the minimum harm that the GMA forces on rural property owners, minimum. No more than we have to do and that's what we had with Alt 4.

And then I also want to say that the cities all have their own advocates. Our advocates are you five that are our Councilors and our representatives for rural, and it doesn't feel like we have a lot of representation there. I remember that we had a meeting, I think it was back in January or February, everyone was invited and, unfortunately, the three new ones, two new and one existing didn't even show up and that really was disappointing to me.

Number 4, I pay approximately $14,000 in property taxes to the County every year and I got to tell you that hurts when you know that the County is fighting against you. You're spending money, giving them all kinds of money and then they take your property rights away. The clustering, forest, no, optional. On what I'm hearing with the explanation, I'm not even sure that that is a good option.

So I want to kind of finish by saying I strongly support Clark County Citizens United recommendations. They're well thought out. They're well researched. They've been litigated. What more can we ask for there? And you five are our representatives. I'm hoping that you will listen to us. Thank you.

MORASCH: All right. Thank you very much. Any questions? All right. Thank you. Marnie Allen.

EISEMANN: She'll be back next week.

MORASCH: Marnie will be back next week. Okay. Are there any other sheets?

BOLDT: Nope, that's it.

MORASCH: That's it.

All right. Well, that concludes the public testimony for tonight and we will be having public testimony again on May 24 and, of course, we will read anything you submit in writing. And I would encourage people, even people that come to testify verbally, I would encourage you to submit your comments in writing. I mean, I'm taking notes as people talk, but, you know, it's always helpful to have something written to refer to.

NEXT STEPS

With that, I guess I'll turn it over to Oliver for next steps. Do you have any comments you'd like to make?

ORJIAKO: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

What I will suggest to the Planning Commission and also the Councilors, you may be struggling to see where is that Option 1 and Option 2. It is posted on our Grid. It's posted on the Planning Commission Grid as well as the Councilors' Grid and that was also, I believe, included in the survey that was done. So take a look at that two options.

I believe we also issued a press release that it is available following the work session we had with the Council, so we made those two options available. So when we talk about Option 1 and Option 2 so that you can read it and see what is in it, and I'm hoping the public will also read that and, perhaps, come prepared on the 24th to talk more.

What I did was more of a summary of what is in Issue Paper 8.1. It's a good summary, but all the details are in your item Note 1 and Note 2, but it's all on the web, you know, for anybody to review and come prepared to make comment.

Following your next hearings, then you'll go into your deliberation and I'm hoping that we will be available to help you as you deliberate and clarify. Again, we'll make ourselves available between now and when you begin your deliberation. Reach out to me and my staff and we will help answer your questions and that goes for the Councilors as well.

MORASCH: All right. Thank you.

Is there any -- Chair Boldt, do you any closing remarks?

BOLDT: No. Thank you very much for coming.

MORASCH: All right. Thank you all and we will see you on May 24 at 6:30 and we are now adjourned.

BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS

Marc Boldt, Chair

Jeanne E. Stewart, Councilor

Julie Olson, Councilor

David Madore, Councilor

Tom Mielke, Councilor

ATTEST:

Rebecca Tilton, Clerk of the Board

Minutes Transcribed by:

Cindy Holley, Court Reporter/Rider & Associates, Inc.