

Commissioners I think the direction and the understanding was very clear including the agreement that Mr. Pederson put on the record about what he was willing to agree to at the time and now here we are back trying to get another four lots with the issues that are in front of us.

I find it fascinating that this is the point in time when we've decided to come back and address those things when what's in the record that the County went out of their way to change from the Planning Commission to make an agreement on is now being asked to be jumped over again. So I think we're doing them a favor by not voting on it and I'd like to make a **formal motion**, then, that says we pass this to the Commissioners without recommendation.

ALLEN: **Second.**

DELEISSEGUES: Any other discussion on the motion? Yes? No? It's been moved and seconded that we pass this on to the County Commissioners with no recommendation from the Planning Commission. Can we have roll call, please.

ROLL CALL VOTE

BARCA: AYE

ALLEN: AYE

VARTANIAN: AYE because I think there's a certain amount of fact finding that needs to happen again because I'm hearing very mixed testimony about is there a ditch, is there not a ditch, is it filled in or is it not filled in, number one, and the fact that the Commissioners themselves decided to override the recommendations of the Planning Commission the first time and change not only the number of lots but the zoning. So as far as I'm concerned that took that right out of the hands of the Planning Commission. They are the final authority and that's where I think the decision should be made.

WRISTON: AYE

DELEISSEGUES: AYE

DELEISSEGUES: That concludes that hearing item and we'll go on then to 18th Street extension, CPZ2009-00018. Do we have a staff report?

NITEN: I'll turn it over to Mike here.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS & PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION, continued

- 15. CPZ2009-00018 18th Street Extension** The cities of Camas and Vancouver have requested that the County amend the Arterial Atlas to include an extension of NE 18th Street from NE 192nd Avenue east to Goodwin Road as a principal arterial. Re-classification of NE 18th Street and NE 192nd Avenue to principal arterials at the NE corner of Section 30 has been requested by the City of Vancouver to be consistent with their revised sub-area plan for Section 30. Re-classification of some

existing segments of Goodwin Road and NE 28th Street to principal arterials and the extension of NE 242nd Ave from NE 28th Street to NE 14th Street as a minor arterial street has also been requested by Camas to be consistent with the city's capital facilities plan.

**Contact: Mike Mabrey (360) 397-2280, Ext. 4343
or e-mail: michael.mabrey@clark.wa.gov**

MABREY: Good evening, Commissioners. CPZ2009-00018 is a proposed amendment to the arterial atlas to extend to NE 18th Street, yeah, can I get some overhead, please, between 192nd Avenue and Goodwin Road. This proposal was initiated at the request of the Cities of Vancouver and Camas, and I was going to talk from some maps real quickly, you have some responses to the SEPA and some early documents that you received with the staff report at the work session two weeks ago, and so I'm going to focus just on the material that's come in since that point in time, which I think will pretty effectively touch on the issues.

The location is shown on the map and let me just put an aerial up there so that you can see a bit about the terrain and some of the other physical features. This is Harmony Sports Complex, there's about 1700 feet of public right-of-way right now along the north edge of the 300-foot wide BPA corridor, so that was established with the platting of this subdivision for Fairview Slope I believe it's called. It varies in width, it's to 55-foot wide roughly, the proposal essentially would put a line on a map that would show the extension of NE 18th Street to Goodwin Road as a principal arterial typically with a four lane or a five-lane cross-section in the future. This likely could be four lane because there's not likely to be anywhere to turn or any need for left-turn lanes.

As you can see on the west end there is an area that is in the hundred year floodplain. And the contours are hard to read here, but essentially it's fairly mild slope, and then right in here there's a short area that is a pretty significant slope, drops down off of the edge.

DELEISSEGUES: Michael, I don't think your pointer is showing up on our map here somehow.

MABREY: Okay. Well, I'm trying to move this little thing right here. How about if I do that. So right in here the slopes are kind of steep for a short distance and then goes back to being a flat area. One of the real driving forces behind this is the substantial amount of urban growth boundary that was approved in Camas with the 2007 comp plan adoption, so we're looking at a road connection possibly right here to serve a very large expansion area north of Lacamas Lake.

In the letter that you received today from the City of Camas they include some numbers that were also included in the traffic analysis that's in your packet that estimate 4200 additional households, 3400 new jobs and about 6500 new p.m. peak hour trips being generated from this area in Camas north of Lacamas Lake. In addition the Section 30 plan over here has been updated by the City of Vancouver and their traffic analysis concluded

that this 18th Street extension would be necessary as a result of the narrow right-of-way for 13th Avenue. And there is a letter from the City of Vancouver in your packet in which they make the case from the transportation point of view at least that extension of a five-lane arterial at least to Goodwin Road is going to be necessary in the long term. So that's the transportation argument in brief.

On the other side there is a substantial amount of evidence that we have in addition to floodplain, at least the potential for wetlands. I'm having trouble locating which map that is up, well, let me put this one up first and then I'll locate Brent's map in a second here. This is the map that was included in the material provided by the Washington Natural Heritage Program and this is a State of Washington Division of Natural Resources, they have identified an area that includes both sides of Goodwin Road. Here's Goodwin Road, here's Camas Meadows Golf Course, the ski lake, and they have identified an area of about 290 acres that is bounded in yellow as an area that they would like to see as a natural area preserve and the identification of that area essentially, I guess, gives the DNR some authority to go out and negotiate for purchase of land.

DELEISSEGUES: If you superimposed that on the expansion of the urban growth boundaries for both Vancouver and Camas, how much of it would be in there?

MABREY: Not very much. This is really zoomed in and I think there may be other, there are larger scale maps in your packet, it's the last document before the SEPA material, so it's the second green tab I believe.

At any rate, as we go through these I understand they change scale and so it's a little bit difficult to follow, but the reason that I showed this is that it's fairly well-known that there is populations of Bradshaw's lomatium which is a Federally protected endangered species across Goodwin Road on the golf course site and what was new with this map was that it showed a couple of spots that apparently have been identified by the DNR folks as having populations of vascular plants that could be in the rare or endangered or are in the rare or endangered species class.

And then they have this map of this kind of yellowish color here which is a broader grouping of plant communities. And I don't pretend to be able to speak intelligently about this, but that was the basis on which they identified this proposed natural area preserve was some indications that those plant species occurred in this area.

DELEISSEGUES: Do they see great harm in sending a road across this area to the rest of the area?

MABREY: I think in their testimony the concern was that once you split it up, and essentially a road would likely if it followed the north side of the power line it would go roughly in this -- here's the farm property, the farm buildings that you've probably seen on the other arterial, so it would roughly go through the farm building and could go around whatever is located here, but it would leave at least portions of this site split off from this preserve area as they've identified it.

Now there is also a broader proposed natural area which would also be split, some of the southern portions of that would be left out.

WRISTON: Mike, while we're talking about this, while we're talking about DNR, you said that gives them this National Heritage Program that we talked a little bit about at work session and I didn't get a chance to really look it up, but I don't know if it's new or I didn't know that DNR had this mandate, what are the effects of it? You said that it gives them the right or the ability to go out and purchase land, I mean what is the program, what is the effect of those lines that they've drawn there?

I mean so they have the ability to go out and purchase land, do they have the ability to prevent us from putting roads across it? Or I mean what's the difference between that and what the DOE or the National Wetlands Inventory and the County Wetlands Inventory and our Critical Ordinance, how does all of that come together? Good question I think.

MABREY: Well, yeah, it's a great question and I'm not sure that I know all the intricacies in terms of an answer but --

DELEISSEGUES: I'm not sure it comes together.

MABREY: Part of the --

WRISTON: Maybe not.

MABREY: Well, part of the way it comes together is outlined in Brent Davis' memo here and what he's saying I think is that if indeed there is a Federally protected species and it happens to be located in an area that is a wetland, then you've got some really serious issues in terms of wetland mitigation. So those two together makes it into a special Category 1 that's very difficult to get permitting to go to put a road through, but that's really more on the normal regulatory side.

In terms of the declaration of this being a natural area preserve, I'm not aware that it comes with any legal --

WRISTON: Teeth.

MABREY: -- teeth or background, police power. To my knowledge it boils down to here's an area where they've identified some species that are fairly significant in the big picture that they're pretty serious about protecting and then they come up with strategies to do that, one of them being purchase of land, but it could also be several other strategies.

So I mean I've looked through the documents that were provided to me and they were largely on the technical side talking about what the justification for determining that, declaring this a natural area preserve was, what the significance of the species were and then what some of the management strategies would be were the division of natural resources and it's hard to have the ability to do management.

VARTANIAN: On the last map that you had up there you had the natural preserve area or natural area preserve --

MABREY: Right.

VARTANIAN: -- and then you had in the yellow, I'm sorry, the red outline the proposed natural area, what's the difference other than one's red and one's yellow?

MABREY: I don't know, but I think you'll be able to get some testimony that clarifies that issue for you, I'm not really clear myself on what the difference between those two is.

DELEISSEGUES: I didn't see anything in their memo that suggested they were going to buy any of this land, did you?

MABREY: No. But, I mean, I got the memo the day of the work session and haven't really had any follow-up contact with DNR or the Natural Heritage folks since.

ALLEN: And of course in the E-mail they say that they can only acquire lands from willing sellers, are there many owners out there or is that all one ownership or do you know anything about that specific area?

MABREY: There are several ownerships but not very many and I can't really speak to it from here. Let's see. It all depends on where the line actually goes obviously.

ALLEN: Sure. Sure.

MABREY: The BPA corridor is here, there's a property here that's owned by a company that I believe is based in Camas or Vancouver.

ALLEN: And of course I see quite a lot of parcelization in that area already.

MABREY: Well, on the north side there's really a fairly large farm parcel.

ALLEN: So if it avoids that north property, then they would be technically going through the parcelized land, but also I can see that there would be very much concern about fragmentation of the natural habitats that are continuance or contiguous. So did they specify if there's going to be any mitigation available especially in this area that appear to the south of that line appears to be already parcelized?

MABREY: Well, the area south of the line that's parcelized is two large lot subdivisions but there's a 300-foot wide BPA corridor between that, so I think this has always been contemplated to be along the northern edge of the BPA corridor and perhaps using some portion of the BPA corridor if possible.

ALLEN: So that would be, quote, unquote, a good candidate for a trail?

MABREY: Well, there's already a master plan for the lake-to-lake trail, the extension along Burnt Bridge Creek Trail that would -- it's in the park plan to go in this BPA corridor and in fact throughout the BPA corridor all along the south side of 18th Street.

ALLEN: And there is no way to design it so that the connection or the expansion is adjacent to the southern boundary of that corridor?

MABREY: I think those are the kinds of decisions that would have to be made at the time that any road construction project is designed; however, the disadvantage of moving it south is that the road itself would have to be completely within the BPA corridor and it's unlikely that the BPA would go along with that and it would have greater impacts on the property owners to the south as well.

ALLEN: Of course.

DELEISSEGUES: So actually what we're being asked tonight is to look at an amendment to the County's arterial atlas, not necessarily the final location of the road?

MABREY: Right.

DELEISSEGUES: So that once it's part of the atlas, then they can take a look at where the road should go and what the implications would be in each of those locations and start making some decisions, I guess, based on what they find?

MABREY: Yes. And that would not likely happen for a substantial amount of time unless the City of Vancouver took the initiative or the City of Camas because the County doesn't have any interest in building this connecting road. This area is actually in the, and you could follow this line, this is the City of Vancouver's urban growth boundary, so all of the road would be within the City of Vancouver's urban growth boundary and would likely be built, if ever, under their jurisdiction after annexation.

DELEISSEGUES: But I would agree with you that unless the City of Vancouver and Camas come up with some sort of interlocal agreement, it looks like most of the development is in Camas --

MABREY: Right.

DELEISSEGUES: -- that the road would serve so I don't know how happy Vancouver would be to do much of the independent construction of the road.

MABREY: Well, there's a representative from the City of Camas who can speak to this, but they raised the issue initially when they started looking at access to their urban growth boundary expansion and recognized that the portals on the edges of their --

DELEISSEGUES: Both cities.

MABREY: -- urban growth boundary were not going to be adequate to handle the traffic and so this was a solution that they have proposed. And in fact the City of Camas put it into their capital facilities plan, put a price tag on it, and as I understand it it's included in their traffic impact fee rates. So you may ask for more clarification of them, but that's my understanding.

DELEISSEGUES: So even if the County decided not to put this in the arterial atlas right now, once the urban growth boundaries were adjusted on both sides, Vancouver and Camas, they could go ahead and put it in their transportation plan and go ahead with construction, couldn't they?

MABREY: Well, yes. It wouldn't require an urban growth boundary change --

DELEISSEGUES: No.

MABREY: -- it would just require annexation --

DELEISSEGUES: Right.

MABREY: -- it's already essentially in both of their plans, but technically we have jurisdiction currently so the request is for us to put it on the map so that nobody gets surprised down the road.

DELEISSEGUES: So that they don't take the heat.

MABREY: Well, it could be that too.

DELEISSEGUES: Any questions of Mike? Any further report, Mike, does that conclude it?

MABREY: That's pretty much it. I just wanted to emphasize, really, the practical effect is that it would prevent permanent structures from being located within that narrow strip at this point in time.

DELEISSEGUES: Questions of staff?

ALLEN: But if it's a BP right-of-way, you would not be able to build there anyway.

BARCA: It's not on the right-of-way --

MABREY: Right.

BARCA: -- it's adjacent to it.

ALLEN: Adjacent to it.

MABREY: Yeah. Well, currently there's about 60 feet on the, 60 foot, 50 some foot wide strip on the east end that's 1700-feet long, so that's outside the BPA right-of-way so the assumption is that it would roughly follow the north side of the BPA right-of-way with some variations as needed in the future.

DELEISSEGUES: Any other questions? Okay, thank you. I don't believe there's an applicant other than the County.

BARCA: Well, there's the City of Camas.

DELEISSEGUES: Well, we'll go to the --

MABREY: Whoever signed up.

DELEISSEGUES: -- hopefully the sign-up sheet has got everybody's name on it.

ALLEN: And then also Brent may be able to give us some information too.

MABREY: Yeah, Dave Howe is here in case there's questions specific to habitat.

DELEISSEGUES: I don't see his name on here.

MABREY: Brent's not here.

DELEISSEGUES: Does either representative from the City of Vancouver or Camas want to come and add to the staff report?

MABREY: The Vancouver representative said that they had a Fruit Valley subarea plan hearing so they couldn't make it tonight.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

CAROTHERS: I'm James Carothers, I'm the City engineer for Camas, I just wanted to give you a point of clarification on the TIF comment. Currently we don't have a TIF set up for this area so there's no TIF on the north urban growth area of Camas at this point, that's not been funded itself, let alone any monies coming in to build a roadway. I just wanted to make that clarification.

DELEISSEGUES: What's your assessment of how soon this might be built, I mean, if you were going to make a guess about timing of the project? That's kind of hard.

VARTANIAN: Careful.

CAROTHERS: This would be quite a ways I think into the build-out of that urban growth area to the north of the lake and so we're not seeing -- basically we have right now there's

one developer that's kind of chomping at the bit to get application in which we currently are not taking applications, so I see it being years, years down the road before there's adequate funding to build such a roadway and actually the need to have it built as well.

WRISTON: Are you currently not taking applications because of the transportation issues?

CAROTHERS: Yeah. We're really looking at the master planning of the area and there are certain things we need to see done in the way of planning before we accept any applications.

DELEISSEGUES: Without this road is there going to be a concurrency issue with the development?

CAROTHERS: Probably not up front it wouldn't be, at some point there might be, there probably would be a concurrency issue.

DELEISSEGUES: Any other questions?

BARCA: Yeah. Mr. Carothers, the DNR commentary about the proposed natural area, did you have time to see that?

CAROTHERS: Yes, I did.

BARCA: Is there any comments from the City of Camas on it as it's presented?

CAROTHERS: I don't know that we had any comments, I submitted the memo to you today and understand the concerns of both DNR and Department of Fish and Wildlife and see those as concerns that are adequate concerns, but at this point I don't necessarily see that as a means of ruling out a roadway being able to be built through that area.

BARCA: So alternative proposals about alternate routes, there's been no discussion about that?

CAROTHERS: There's been some discussion about 13th Street as an alternate, that currently does not match with the plan that the City of Vancouver has for Section 30. It also is a little more circuitous from the standpoint of transportation, it's not as beneficial, but we do understand the environmental concerns that have been posed.

BARCA: So it isn't as ideal because it's not a straight line, I think everybody kind of understands that part, but there's been some discussion about it?

CAROTHERS: There has been some discussion and the discussion with the City of Vancouver and Camas staff led us to believe that from the transportation standpoint that 18th Street is a more adequate place to have the arterial route.

BARCA: Thank you.

DELEISSEGUES: Any other questions? Okay, thank you very much.

CAROTHERS: Thank you.

DELEISSEGUES: And you say there's no representative from the City of Vancouver?

MABREY: Right.

DELEISSEGUES: So, Mike, correct me if I'm wrong, but when we put the line in the arterial atlas showing a desire probably at this point in time to eventually connect up the road so it goes through, there's no certainty that that's where the road would go, all it does is authorize somebody, the County, Cities, to take a look at the alternatives of connecting point A and B and it may or may not be the line that shows on your map for example?

MABREY: Yeah. This is a bit unusual because the request is coming from outside the County, there's no existing right-of-way, well, there's only a small existing right-of-way at this point in time 1700 feet, but it's normally more of a technical how to get from point A to point B issue and oftentimes the straight line is the cleanest answer with variations to that line to be determined later.

DELEISSEGUES: That's where you would start?

MABREY: Right.

WRISTON: But if --

DELEISSEGUES: The other thing is you may not after you study all the alternatives and the proposed straight line and whatever else you come up with, it may be prohibitive to build the road at all so it doesn't have any effect really.

MABREY: Well, I think both the letter from the City of Camas and from the City of Vancouver have kind of recognized that issue that it's possible that once the detailed alignment is completed that it could become prohibitive. It's also possible that you'd find the route that worked just fine. The City of Vancouver makes the point, I think, that it's in the public interest to at least have full disclosure and discussion and put something out there so that it's not a big surprise later on.

And I think there are arguments to be made either way; however, I would hate for somebody to go away from this -- if the Planning Commission and Board decided not to put this in the arterial atlas, I would hate for somebody to go away and think, well, then it's a dead issue because ultimately this is going to be annexed by the City of Vancouver and they're going to do what they choose to do.

WRISTON: By us putting it on the arterial atlas, though, if anyone does anything in or

around that line, that issue will come up; correct?

MABREY: Right.

WRISTON: I mean that's --

DELEISSEGUES: Yeah, that's true.

WRISTON: -- that's the one way that that issue will come up and there will be discussions of whether or not --

MABREY: Right. And there is an area that's currently in urban holding and would remain so until annexation, so I mean the --

WRISTON: So we're saying --

MABREY: -- what we have is maybe a farm house that wants to locate in the middle of where that line is at best.

DELEISSEGUES: So nobody can do anything with it anyway if it's in urban holding?

MABREY: Yeah, I think that's essentially true.

WRISTON: But, anyway, there are some ramifications that would (inaudible).

MABREY: Yeah, cell phone towers and, you know.

DELEISSEGUES: Any other questions of staff before we go to the sign-up sheet? Okay. First on the sheet is Ginny Braunagel.

BRAUNAGEL: No, I just came to get an education and express my concern about the wildlife and the environmental and --

DELEISSEGUES: Well, could you come up to the microphone, please, so we can get it on the record. We want to hear it.

BRAUNAGEL: I've never been to one of these, what do I do? My name is Ginny Braunagel, I live at 19518 NE 16th Circle so I'd be looking at that road out my backdoor and my major concern is about the environmental impact, the impact it's going to have on my surroundings. I didn't come prepared to say anything really smart.

DELEISSEGUES: Any questions of Ms. Braunagel?

VARTANIAN: That's as smart as it gets usually so don't worry about it.

BRAUNAGEL: I'm just John Q. Public.

MABREY: There's a letter in your packet from her as well, it goes into more detail.

BRAUNAGEL: Thank you.

WRISTON: Thank you.

DELEISSEGUES: Okay, thank you. Ted Labbe.

LABBE: Yes, thank you for the opportunity to come talk to you tonight. My name is Ted Labbe, I'm with Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife at 2108 Grand Boulevard here in Vancouver, and we submitted comments on the 18th Street road extension and I'd like to kind of touch on a few issues tonight.

Before I get into that I want to clarify the natural resource conservation area designation. DNR has these two designations that they use and what they do is as part of their statewide natural heritage program plan they have identified places where you have concentrations of rare plants and rare ecosystems and then they've attempted to delineate those areas and it creates kind of a management strategy for them to be able to go in and identify willing sellers only and buy those people out in some cases or sometimes secure conservation easements.

Their two designations are for two separate purposes, the natural area preserve is really kind of a less intensive, more hands-off management style where they're really trying to preserve the existing plant communities or do management practices to sustain them and the NRCA is usually something bigger, and as in this case it sort of encapsulates the smaller natural area preserve and it allows for more human uses like grazing in some cases, timber harvest.

I've seen some up on the Kitsap Peninsula where they're actually doing timber harvest inside an NRCA, not the style that they do on the school lands that they manage but a lower intensive management regime that attempts to kind of safeguard the area around the natural area preserve. So this is a fairly new one that they've designated and that's why they don't have any property currently within it, it has no regulatory purpose bearing whatsoever.

WRISTON: Thank you for that.

LABBE: Yeah, I hope that helps. And actually if you want to go on their website it explains it in a little bit more detail and gives you like the RCW and WAC codes behind it all. So, again, thanks for the opportunity to come and talk with you tonight. I think the significance of this area the Lacamas Prairie is, you know, I think part of it, the significance of it is underscored by the fact that you received comments from three separate State agencies concerned with the future or conservation of Lacamas Prairie, Department of Natural Resources, Department of Ecology and our agency, Department of Fish and Wildlife.

And I want to encourage you to read through John Gamon's submission, I think his does the best job of kind of giving you an overview of what the resources are that are there and kind of explains some of the issues there. There are at least six species of rare plants, perhaps more, in the area and part of the issue with the road extension going into the arterial atlas at this point is the road alignment passes through in areas as Mike showed you that has documented rare plants, includes wetlands, and as I think Mark Cline with Ecology pointed out, and also Brent with the County, that that makes issues of mitigation much more complicated it falls out of alignment.

Lacamas Prairie is the largest remaining wet prairie habitat in Washington State and it's significant just for that alone. There are only 12 ownerships as John talks about in his memo within the NRCA and so even though this is an area that's rapidly urbanizing around it, there is a real strong potential that we can over time buy out willing property owners and protect this for the long term. I think it's important that we don't just focus on the boundary of the natural area preserve, that's part of the reason why DNR has this NRCA.

And roads alter hydrology, and John talks about that in his memo, so it's important that we don't just focus on the lines on the map, but we consider kind of what's going on around the Lacamas Prairie. And roads, I've seen it many a time, alter hydrology and it's the altered hydrology that's one of the things that DNR has identified as one of the long-term management challenges for the Lacamas Prairie, so we need to be kind of conscious of that when we think about putting this road extension into the arterial atlas.

So I want to hit on a couple other small points too that I tried to raise in my letter. We have in the county right now an active process that Gordy's working on, the rural lands task force, this road passes right through a farm albeit that's in the urban holding designation within an urban growth area, but it is an operational farm. The actual right-of-way passes right through the farm buildings so I think we need to think about how we align our transportation policy with our goals of protecting rural lands and sustaining working farms, working landscapes.

Our agency, although we don't have the greatest history of being upright about this and forward, is we support working landscapes, we support working farms, those are the landscapes in the lowlands that sustain a diversity of fish and wildlife resources much more so than rural high density residential development, and when you put this into the arterial atlas there are some potential issues with the viability of that farm and I think you talked about that earlier. So I talked a little bit about the need for the landscape contacts of what's going on around this area.

One other small point. I feel like, and this is an aside to the comments on fish and wildlife conservation but it is relevant to when we think about where the County puts its resources in the future, we need to be conscious of opportunity costs. Putting this in the process involved, putting this in the arterial atlas, the planning, then it triggers by staff and the engineering departments how viable is it, will it get into the six-year transportation improvement program, all of that leading up to the design and building of it do we want to

put resources into building roads in outlying areas of the county and how does that take resources away from maintaining the existing transportation network we have in the more built-up areas of the county and how does it take away from other capital improvement projects that we need to keep our community viable.

I don't think those sorts of things kind of come up enough when we're talking about these roads and on the periphery and what it's going to cost to maintain them and how it takes away from transportation dollars that are needed elsewhere, for instance to repair fish blocking culverts that the County still has a backlog of.

So, anyway, I kind of got off the subject of fish and wildlife, but I do want to come back to that again that this is a pretty important area, there have been regional assessments that are much bigger than the County in their scope, we've had ecoregional assessments which are statewide that have pinpointed this area as a high conservation value area. I think that's all I want to say tonight and I would again encourage you to look through and actually read John's memo that came in the other day because I think it gives you good background on the ecology of the area. Thank you again.

DELEISSEGUES: Okay.

ALLEN: Did you say that this was the largest remaining area in the United States or did I mishear?

LABBE: No, I said this is the largest remaining wet prairie habitat in Washington State. And there's wet prairie down in the Willamette Valley, but this is all we've got in the state and it has similar attributes to what we see in the Willamette Valley much more than in the prairie we see further north around Puget Sound for instance.

DELEISSEGUES: When you were talking about the farmhouse did you say the right-of-way went through the farmhouse or the easement or what did you say?

LABBE: Well, the extension goes right through the farmhouse and the farm buildings.

DELEISSEGUES: You mean the line there?

LABBE: I think the right-of-way does but I'm not sure about that, we could check right here.

DELEISSEGUES: But if it's a right-of-way --

LABBE: No, it stops just short of it.

MABREY: Well, there's no house on the property, there's three farm buildings as I understand it from the Assessor's, like a machine shed, a barn and another outdoor shed, but, yeah, if this were to extend along the north line, it would go through two or three different buildings.

DELEISSEGUES: But there's no existing easement there or right-of-way now?

MABREY: No, there isn't, right. That's just a line on the map --

LABBE: So it's the path of the road, I misspoke.

DELEISSEGUES: Yeah, I just picked that up.

WRISTON: Will you leave that up?

MABREY: Pardon me?

WRISTON: Will you leave that up?

MABREY: Sure, yeah.

DELEISSEGUES: Any other questions of Mr. Labbe?

VARTANIAN: Yeah, I have if I can say it a quick question. You indicated that road building has an effect on hydrology which is kind of a self-evident truth, do you have a way to measure or forecast or what's your preference about where to put a road so it would have no or minimal impact on nearby wetlands?

LABBE: Well, the process, and that's a great question, this process that we have in the county for adding roads to the arterial atlas is such that we kind of add them in and then we address the environmental issues later and that's a little bit problematic. And we've spoken to that before, I think last year we commented on the extension of or the addition of the La Center bridge to the arterial atlas, the same sort of issues where it would be nice to be able to look at what those environmental issues are in advance of it going in.

In this case it's not possible given the level of resources we have for -- I mean the way the process is set up we can't deal with that at this time, but when road extensions do get done, there's engineering studies and that sort of thing gets addressed. But I don't know, that's an excellent question, there's no way to really deal with that with the process we have now.

VARTANIAN: But assuming, well, I may be getting off topic here, would you think it would be worthwhile for the County during its next comprehensive plan update which is probably about 9:30 tonight take a look at environmental impacts before even redefining urban growth boundaries? I mean very often we're --

BARCA: You are off.

LABBE: That would be my preference that that would be much more --

VARTANIAN: I'm sure that's your preference, trying to get it out there.

LABBE: -- thoroughly addressed, yeah, that's, yeah, sure, I could say that as a generalization.

VARTANIAN: Because rather than going through an urban growth area and then have people come in and develop and mitigate wetlands and all that good stuff, they would just stay away from some areas.

LABBE: Right.

WRISTON: We can't even pay our bills.

LABBE: But that's kind of off the table tonight.

VARTANIAN: Oh, I understand, no, no, just philosophically.

LABBE: But, yeah.

DELEISSEGUES: Well, one reason we can't or don't, we probably could but we don't do an environmental impact statement on an alignment that we put in the arterial atlas we have no idea if that's going to be the final alignment or if we'll even put a road in, I mean.

VARTANIAN: Yeah, but it's like a step in the direction.

DELEISSEGUES: Yeah, it's the first step in saying that we want to connect point A and B, but we don't really know if or how we're going to do that until we put it in the arterial atlas, provide the funding for somebody like yourself to go out and start working on these things and develop the criteria and eventually an alignment and design or maybe decide not to build any road at all because of all the things that you mentioned tonight.

So putting it on the arterial atlas is just the first step in doing the investigative work that we need to do to make those kinds of determinations. If we don't do it all we're doing is allowing time to go by until the urban growth boundaries are annexed by Vancouver apparently in this case and maybe losing some time and some opportunity to make those kinds of studies now instead of later, that's all I see.

I think that's what Mike said too, that eventually somebody's going to have to take a look at it if that's what they want to do and we can either look at it now or put it off until Vancouver does annex it, but in either case there's not going to be a road built until then, I'm sure the County's not going to invest in a road there.

MABREY: Yeah, I would concur.

LABBE: Can I ask a quick question about that?

DELEISSEGUES: Sure.

LABBE: Is it possible with arterial atlases to show a range of potential locations so that it doesn't get kind of locked in place? I know that sometimes when these things go into the arterial atlas they're sort of like, well, that's where it's going to go, could there be some process whereby there was uncertainty about the east end or not?

DELEISSEGUES: I think that always goes with an amendment to the arterial atlas. That has to be because there's no certainty, all the arterial atlas really shows is what would be the best way to do it from an engineering and transportation standpoint. If that works out, fine, but if it doesn't because of some of the concerns you've raised and others that will probably come up in the studies, then that range will be investigated until they either decide, yeah, there's a better way and it might be north, south, who knows which, or that it can't be done at all, it's not feasible.

WRISTON: Actually there is a way or there used to be a way that because I hate these lines that go through and I fought one because they had one go right through our quarry and which is now 192nd, and then they had one going right through Section 30 and I believe, and this is way back, you know, 10, 12 years ago, at the time rather than showing it go through somewhere that had an 80-foot drop, they just showed kind of an area saying a road needs to go somewhere in this area, we don't know where because of the topographical problems, but a road needs to, you know, it was more of a notation rather than a line.

DELEISSEGUES: Yeah, we could do that.

WRISTON: But when the time comes I have another thought anyway, but there is a possibility of doing that I believe because it was done ten years ago, you don't necessarily have to draw a specific line I don't believe.

VARTANIAN: I think what happens very often when you put a line on a map a certain mind-set starts to develop that we're concentrating on this area. Granted we may not do anything there, but people start looking at it and saying, oh, good so there's going to be a road somewhere in here, we can start taking a look at subdivisions or whatever is of concern.

DELEISSEGUES: It becomes a preferred alternative I think.

VARTANIAN: Yeah, in people's minds, and maybe unintentionally, but I mean that's what winds up happening. As soon as you put a line on a map people start thinking there's something going to go there and that's the discussion, yeah.

And number two, so much of what we plan is predicated on arterial atlases as far as where there's going to be a road so we can expand the urban growth boundary and all that good stuff until a development comes in and gets approved right where that road would have been and then we find out but that road was going to connect to something else farther out

eventually so we've got now a whole thing that doesn't look forward far enough in advance. But, again, that's a bit off topic.

DELEISSEGUES: Another consideration is that when development does occur the developer always has the option of coming up with an alternative and if the County or the City, whoever it might be, agrees that that alternative serves the purpose as well as the one that was proposed, they can do that. And so there's no certainty of where the road's going to go until it actually does go and that could be a long time from now the way I hear it.

I don't see any downside to not putting it in the arterial atlas right now except that it would delay these studies getting underway that might prove that this is not a good place for a road. I mean it might be better to do it now than to wait and at least people wouldn't be spending years and years and years with the uncertainty of whether a road is going to go in there or not and that's the advantage I see of doing it now.

VARTANIAN: Isn't there a potential of since we want to, hang on, don't go away, since we are considering putting this 18th Street in, considering it, rather than even putting it on the arterial can't we just have somebody look at it, I mean change the process some, have someone look at the potential of putting a road there and then deciding if we want to put it on the arterial map?

BARCA: There's no money.

VARTANIAN: Don't bother me with details like that.

WRISTON: We're broke.

VARTANIAN: I understand that.

DELEISSEGUES: Details.

ALLEN: But then also it's not the County that's proposing this, it's the City of Vancouver and the City of Camas.

DELEISSEGUES: Exactly.

VARTANIAN: Then why are we here.

BARCA: Who's next?

WRISTON: Let's finish the testimony up.

DELEISSEGUES: Any other questions for Mr. Labbe even though he left?

ALLEN: No, he's still there.

DELEISSEGUES: No, I know you're still there, I just wondered if there was any more questions anyone had for him? Okay. We'll go on to Russell Wegner.

BARCA: Thank goodness.

WEGNER: Good evening. I'm Russell Wegner, I live at 19910 NE 16th Street, Camas, Washington, unincorporated Clark County somewhere in between Vancouver/Camas. We have I believe Camas sewage but at Vancouver sewage, but anyways we're right in no man's land, so I appreciate the conversation that I'm hearing about the arterial atlas. I was hoping George would be here because some of his points I thought --

WRISTON: He'll be right back.

WEGNER: -- were very well pointed that the arterial atlas -- quite honestly I've been here three years and this is the first time I've ever encountered any of this kind of situation. I do appreciate planning, I respect the responsibility of good planning and growth and being smart about future development, the arterial atlas is highly symbolic and I feel it does have perception. Many of these things that I'm hearing coming up are maybe postponed and dealt with later; however, I feel that it's a serious responsibility to look at something before it's put on a formal map of planning and given the perception.

The situation with this is that what is, and I think George made another point about the environmental, I think that they say, well, to put this on an arterial atlas my understanding is you do a SEPA checklist which is not a formal environmental review, and then you have some reports and you put it on this arterial planning map and it's there, so there is no real formal environmental review.

Now I understand the other side of the situation that says, well, if we have to do an environmental and there's no environmental impact study until the shovel is ready to hit the dirt; however, I see that there's got to be somewhere in between that makes a lot more sense and that means that -- and I look at John's, Brent Davis' report from the wetland biologist, we have the John Gamon, let's see, Brent's came in on August 11th, and these are voluntary memos coming to you, Ted is here as a voluntary action on Department of Fish and Wildlife, there's no involvement in this process to put this major arterial map movement with all these environmental professionals to actually contribute to this process.

So I'm looking at this now, and then we have the Department of Ecology weighing in too, also a voluntary comment. Now I'm not here to beat up on the process here, but I do feel we want to do a good job and as a member of the community and someone who does live nearby I do have my selfish reasons. I see thousands of geese land in this farm and I know about the habitat, I think that you don't need to do a formal environmental impact study to put it on an arterial atlas, but you should have formal professional environmental consultation as part of the process before you go ahead and do this and I think that is one key point I want to make.

So on the SEPA checklist, that's all I had to look at as a member of the community, they said, okay, here you go, take a look at that and see what it tells you about what they've done to look at it. So if you don't mind I'd like to just comment on a few things I just saw in that. Is that okay?

DELEISSEGUES: Sure.

WEGNER: So first of all Section A asks if there are other plans related to the proposal and it says the answer is no. Well, wait a minute, no other plan, I know of -- I'm not a planner that do the widening of 18th Street between 192nd and 164th, I thought okay, well, why didn't they comment on that. And I don't want to nitpick too much, but it just seems like the Department Section A, Number 8, and this is something -- and this SEPA checklist by the way it says that this is a Determination of Nonsignificance is I believe the term they used to refer to the environmental impact of this area. Correct?

DELEISSEGUES: I think --

WRISTON: They write it though.

WEGNER: What's that?

WRISTON: They write it.

DELEISSEGUES: I think Mike could clarify that the SEPA checklist here is only drawing on the map, not construction of the road.

WEGNER: But this would be a document that says we'll put that on the arterial atlas which I feel has major perception in the community that this is something that they're going to plan or they're going to study?

MABREY: Right. Right. We're going to study, exactly. And we can go on all night about the SEPA checklist, but the fact is it flushed out the comments and the level of scrutiny that you were asking for.

WEGNER: That's not true.

MABREY: That's why we have comments.

WEGNER: That's not true.

MABREY: Well, I'm sorry, but the reason that we have comments from the Department of Ecology, from the Division of State Lands, from Department of Natural Resources because we sought comments, that's what the SEPA did.

WEGNER: They're in the mailing list and they're notified.

MABREY: Right. And I called them but --

WEGNER: They're notified but it's not a mandated requirement to have it as part of the process.

MABREY: Well, that's the purpose of the notice of the SEPA going to them so that if they know something that we're not aware of, they can provide comments. And in fact they can appeal the action if they get their comments in within the deadline.

WEGNER: I realize they have opportunity to comment, they have opportunity to contribute, are they formally required as part of the process to do the arterial atlas to have their consultation brought in as part of the process? No?

MABREY: That's correct, they're not required to.

WEGNER: Thank you very much, sir. So, anyways, I just feel we're going to spend a lot of time, money, resources on this when there are such serious environmental issues putting -- what if you brought that in early? You mentioned earlier doing more environmental review prior to putting it on the arterial atlas, just put it in the right order and I think that, you know, I don't think you need to do a full environmental impact study, but do some formal environmental homework before that's required before it's put on the arterial atlas, not necessarily whether they happen to respond to the notices with these overworked agencies that are to get it to the top of their heap, it needs to be mandated.

So the situation with the Department of Natural Resource that was already covered earlier, but I think that they asked in the checklist, yeah, it is a Determination of Nonsignificance, I just think that to put that at the title of this with what's out there and then to say that the this has been -- asks for an environmental information that has been prepared prior to the proposal, has there been and the answer is none.

And you got this National Heritage Foundation that's done this yellow boundary and they're saying there's been nothing done to identify this area on this checklist and that's already out there from the State of Washington's Department of Natural Resources, I think the checklist is inaccurate in all due respect. And just I know that it's not a, it's -- I don't know what the purpose of it is to be quite honest.

We already talked about the prairie, you guys understand about the species that are there. I agree with all those points, the Bradshaw's lomatium it's identified as an endangered and threatened species, it's in the path of the project and it needs some serious consideration and if there's any typically roads, you know, Federal, that's a Federal issue and I doubt the County wants to get involved with that.

And I'll speak to some comments about, I keep vibrating here, sorry, should I be further away, anyways. The other issue is Camas lilies. Well, that area every year that area major floodplain, I mean it becomes a lake, it is a major flood area, I believe it's the largest Camas lily field in Clark County, and I think that one of the questions in that checklist here

does it have historic and cultural significance and they say none, and meanwhile the City of Camas has on their website how we got our name was the Camas lily and the importance of the Camas lily to the ecological balance.

It says the upper, here's a quote from the Camas -- the below excerpt from Camas Lilies from the Science Education, Outreach and Citizen Involvement and Natural Resource year, it's obviously an environmental publication, but it says that "the upper Columbia basin and network with the network of inventory and monitoring has identified the Camas lily as a key park resource and high priority vital sign and indicator" --

BARCA: You need to slow down.

WEGNER: Pardon?

HOLLEY: You need to slow down.

WEGNER: Okay. Excuse me. Okay.

MABREY: I can give you the document.

WEGNER: Well, I'll just be quick, I'll be quick and speak slowly. It's "the Camas lily is a key park resource and high priority vital sign or indicator of ecosystem health for long-term monitoring. Camas lily, an ecologically significant wetland species, is historically one of the most widely used root crops of the Nez Perce people and remains so for many tribal members today. It is also a focal resource at many historical events and memorialized." That's from the National Park Service.

So it's identified as a ecologically significant wetland species, I don't think it's endangered, but obviously the city of Camas bears the name from this lily and that's the largest Camas lily field in the county that they'd be basically putting the road right over. So the -- I don't -- obviously we got wetland, we got a major swale, we got tributaries, there's habitat, we have owls, we have frogs, major frogs, we have migratory birds, I see thousands of geese, I just think it's a prairie that has a lot of great things going on.

So the cost, I think that there's real issues here, there's a Costco that's about to -- just was in the paper that they want to put up at 192nd and 1st Street, the routes of traffic there I think needs to be more carefully studied as a whole. For example, if you look at the map there's this sharp L-turn from 18th to 192nd and it's a very dangerous corner. I think that one thing that I know it's been studied but there's no easy answers for this area by the way, that's for sure, but one of the issues is connecting 18th to 13th, I believe as a common sense I think it has to deal with the going around the sports fields and through a fire pit and through one of those pits that was dug, but if they can eliminate that harsh L-turn and connect 18th to 13th as a four-way intersection, I think would be a very effective way to handle traffic there.

And I also think that the widening of 13th Street which is Goodwin to 192nd would be a

much more popular route because you're going to have people not using that 18th Street extension also and they'll always take Goodwin because they're going south, only the northbound people will go on the 18th Street, they'll always go to Goodwin either way because they're going towards Highway 14 and Portland and they'll always take Goodwin anyways.

And then there's issues about is it the smartest way and the best way for traffic flow and I don't think that's been fully studied to this thoroughly, they've looked at it but I think there's no any easy answers. If you have mitigate and cost, so cost is a big one too because I think they said \$9 million, but if they would have to do mitigation and deal with all the environmental issues, I'm sure it would be much, much more.

So I think we need to also focus on other areas of the county and the infrastructure we have. This report, this map planning, was done I believe based on the growth management and it was 2006/2007 the economy was much different than it is now, I think with the growth plans that -- yeah.

DELEISSEGUES: I wonder if you could quickly summarize your discussion, we've got a lot more to do tonight --

WEGNER: I know. This is my --

DELEISSEGUES: -- and you've been going on for about 25 minutes.

WEGNER: This is my final point and I appreciate your patience but I --

DELEISSEGUES: Yeah, but it's running thin, I think.

WEGNER: Okay. Anyways, I just think that the -- it's a situation where there's other things to focus on the existing infrastructure which we have and that basically the growth doesn't need to go in that direction as much as they are calling for. And so thank you for your time.

DELEISSEGUES: Wait a minute now, any questions? We may have questions.

BARCA: Let me make this as a comment, Mr. Wegner. Just for clarification purposes we see the SEPA checklist all the time and it's always predicated on the idea that this is just the plan change, this is never disturbing the dirt, so it's always a Determination of Nonsignificance, but it does alert other regulatory agencies. So the SEPA checklist went out and then the commentary came back, so in that essence it did do what you were hoping --

WEGNER: Provoking comment.

BARCA: -- was going to happen. And we're used to the idea that it's a Determination of Nonsignificance, it doesn't mean anything in the big scheme of things, but it always starts

that way.

WEGNER: It always starts that way?

BARCA: Right.

WEGNER: And one of the things I was told by the planners when I went to the open house was don't worry, it's not for a long, long time, you don't, you know, you're not going to have to worry about it, but I just feel it's highly symbolic and a big perception to put that on the map and I think it's premature and I think that the professional and more studies should have been done before it's on the arterial atlas, it's a serious move to do that.

BARCA: And it's not on the atlas yet.

WEGNER: I appreciate that.

DELEISSEGUES: Any other comments or questions?

WRISTON: No. Thank you.

DELEISSEGUES: Okay, thank you very much.

WEGNER: Thank you for your time.

DELEISSEGUES: Does anyone else in the audience wish to testify on this? Okay. None, we'll return it to the Commission.

RETURN TO PLANNING COMMISSION

WRISTON: I'll start. I'll blow everyone's mind. I think this is insane. You know we --

VARTANIAN: You think it's what?

WRISTON: I think it's insane. 192nd had a couple of alternatives as it headed down through Fisher quarry, the alternative they ultimately chose, which was probably the right alternative, required them to go through a fairly small I believe Category 1 wetland that causes a two-year delay. And I believe it was a two-year delay and also cost probably millions of dollars not to mention the millions of dollars that was wasted on the original line that was drawn through the quarry.

So these lines do have significance in that they if put in the wrong place and then studied not just from a perception standpoint, but then studied and millions of dollars are spent just to come up with the fact that this doesn't work, which even to me, which will surprise you guys, I mean just looking at this I don't see how this is going to be feasible from a cost standpoint and an environmental and justified from an environmental standpoint when

you've got Goodwin coming right down to 13th and 13th crossing right over to 192nd.

And the only justification for not doing that alternative that I heard was Vancouver's sacred Section 30 plan which I don't believe, I don't know if it's adopted yet, I don't know what stage that's in.

DELEISSEGUES: I don't think it is.

WRISTON: I don't know that, is the plan, I don't know that all the -- but their lines, there's still lines drawn, their roads can be changed.

I guess where I'm going is that widening 13th or doing what you need to do to 13th and then working with the handful of landowners and the plan in Section 30 and working with those roads within Section 30, which I can tell you is not a wonderful habitat area because it's a former gravel mine and sports fields and shooting range, would be a lot easier and make more sense.

I agree with Mr. Wegner, people are going to head south anyway and make more sense and just eyeballing it serve more population and more utility to Camas which I believe would be the purpose. So, I mean, just by eyeballing it I think it makes more sense to put the line down on 13th and have Vancouver rethink its infrastructure or whatever the lines that they've drawn and again working with the handful of landowners in Section 30 and how that all comes together.

So I think that's going to save a lot of time and money and headache in the long run. My vote would be no tonight to putting it across where it is right now because I just don't ever seeing that happen or we're just going to waste a lot of time and money.

DELEISSEGUES: George.

VARTANIAN: Me too. Plus the fact that I just think the process is a little bit backwards but we're not going to change the process tonight, but I think I agree with Jeff that it just makes more sense to go on 13th if we have to put something some place because there's something there already, why go in and mess up whatever's possible to be messed up when something is perfectly serviceable other than the subdivisions that are down there or the parcelization that's down there already is bigger lots and maybe, maybe more money involved as far as the people that live there. But regardless I think there's something there already that may just need to be widened somewhat, but I don't see the purpose of 18th.

DELEISSEGUES: Ron.

BARCA: I believe based on the City of Vancouver, Matt Ransom's letter, what Jeff is proposing has already been detailed out although they state that it isn't their first choice, it appears that it's very viable even in their own text, and that was going to be specifically what I was going to point to and bring up the fact that with DOE and DNR and Fish and Wildlife all coming across and saying, yeah, once we saw what's going on we'd really like

to bring this to your attention and make it viable for you to understand that we're a public entity, we're not in a situation where we're going to be depriving some private property owner of their ability to do something, this is a public choice that we're making right now, and we don't have to make this choice to go ahead and take this land that's already been designated as very important for wildlife purposes, for cultural purposes and draw a line across it, we don't have to draw that line tonight, and I would agree that it's not the right choice to draw that line.

Now whether we want to go ahead and make the recommendation to follow the City of Vancouver's alternate choice I'll leave that to the Board in front of us, this Planning Commission, to decide that, but I believe your proposal is very viable and that's where I'm headed.

ALLEN: And I agree with everything that was said. I am a proponent of strategic planning and strategic planning would be great if we didn't have all of the other on-the-ground constraints. In this particular case the strategic plan of drawing the straight line across very valuable resource is not smart and violates, really, all of the conservation purposes of our beautiful environment because it's an opportunity lost that once it's fragmented by the road and the hydrology is changed, then you can never go back and undue the harm that had been done to the environment and to the communities of the environmental resources.

So it's an opportunity, there would be an opportunity lost, and of course there would be opportunity costs as well because then if we draw this imaginary line going across very valuable land for environmental purposes, then we do not take the opportunity somewhere else; i.e., the 13th. And to me the 13th would be a very reasonable alternative. Whether or not it fits into the City of Vancouver's plans, I believe going the other way it would be detrimental to the environment.

DELEISSEGUES: Well, I'm in no hurry to put a line on a map either but not for the reasons that have been stated. What I think is that we ought to recommend back to Vancouver and Camas, both of them, that they take another look at the alternative, particularly the one that Ron pointed out as well as the extension of 18, as well as any other alternatives they can come up with and give us a better rationale for why one or the other should be put in the arterial atlas to begin with.

Knowing what they know now from the reports, Mike, that you've gotten back from the agencies they may very well change their mind about 18 and go with the alternative that they've mentioned, I don't know. I don't think they're locked into anything right now. I do think, though, that it would be beneficial to the property owners and everybody concerned if they would get on with it so that there's some certainty about what's not going to happen if they don't know what is going to happen.

If they can rule out some of the alternatives right now at least there would be that much more clarity to the picture and the landowners would know a little more than they know now which is nothing, no certainty to the process at all yet, and if anything could be done by the Cities, I know the County's not interested in it, it's not going to be our road and we're

not going to spend any money, if they don't want to do that now, then I think we should defer any additions to the arterial atlas until they do know more. So I guess I concur too with everything that's been said.

WRISTON: Yeah. I guess one way we could approach it is to send it back to -- I wouldn't mind seeing that alternative that they have through Section 30, Mill Plain, and again this is years ago, I'm dating myself, but Mill Plain originally kind of came across, cut a corner and then I believe went up into SE 1st Street and the developers of Columbia Tech Center, which is Section 31, wanted Mill Plain to come right through the middle of their development.

And 18th skirts Section 30, I don't really know how they tie into 18th, it would be nice to see that, how they're thinking of tying in 18th, but I can see how 13th could come up, go right through the middle of Section 30, connect into 192nd, and then go on back up to 18th or what have you somewhat like Columbia Tech Center did with Mill Plain eventually connecting into 192nd and that was a realignment from the arterial atlas.

So I wouldn't mind kicking it back to Camas and Vancouver. I'm telling you that, I mean, from my standpoint unless there's a huge justification for running this line across 18th, my vote would just be no, we'll defer it if they can't come back with a better alternative.

DELEISSEGUES: I know at our joint planning session with the City of Vancouver they did mention that they had not come up with any final plan for Section 30 so it's open and that's a very good possibility that they could look at that.

WRISTON: There's a handful of landowners in Section 30 and they're all trying to figure out who's going to get frontage where and this and that and it's dynamic, but a road's got to go through there and like CTC did with Mill Plain. Mill Plain kind of cuts right through the middle of it and it's nice, you have development of both sides of an industrial park or a mixed use area of a fairly large arterial --

DELEISSEGUES: The other thing --

WRISTON: -- literally.

DELEISSEGUES: -- that I see if they persisted in going across the extension of 18, a straight line across that they propose for the arterial atlas amendment, the mitigation for that could be very expensive, it could be a raised bridge section across there if it's wetlands and they're worried about the hydrology on both sides or a viaduct, whatever you want to call it, but I don't see any way that they could go across there with a standard road section without causing an awful lot of trouble. And drainage and everything else would be a real problem. But that's just my assessment not knowing anything about it, just from what I've heard.

ALLEN: Well, hopefully once they look at the responses that you had received as a result of the SEPA checklist that they can see that the comments that were received indicate that

there are serious environmental concerns with the proposal as is and that there are many endangered and threatened species within that area, and then there are also going to be a lot of costs associated with that, just that by itself, but hopefully since they have not finalized their Section 30 that now there might be an opportunity for them to look at it from a different perspective.

WRISTON: So I'll make a motion if --

BARCA: Please.

WRISTON: I'd make a motion that we send this back to --

MABREY: Well, there's nobody to send it back to. Basically you just recommend denial and the Board will hear additional testimony or they won't. I mean I don't know whether the Cities --

WRISTON: Well, we can ask the Cities to give us an alternative, can't we?

MABREY: When?

WRISTON: We could recommend --

MABREY: You want it to come back to you in three months?

BARCA: Yeah.

WRISTON: Yeah.

BARCA: Six months, we'll be here.

WRISTON: Do we have a mandate to send it on to the Board or can we --

MABREY: I don't know what the right process here is frankly but I think you're --

WRISTON: I guess what I'm saying is I'm not ready --

ALLEN: County counsel --

WRISTON: -- to take a vote without looking at --

ALLEN: Could County counsel maybe --

WRISTON: -- the alternative.

MABREY: Well, I thought I heard recommendations for denial from all five of you and in essence --

DELEISSEGUES: That's what you heard.

MABREY: -- there's not any process to go back to the Cities. I think the record could go forward with each of your individual concerns and either the City addresses them or doesn't address them and the Board makes a determination.

DELEISSEGUES: I think we've made our individual concerns, why don't we just go ahead and make a motion for denial and leave it at that.

WRISTON: Well, I guess the problem with that is depending upon what happens you don't necessarily get a line on the depending on what the Board does. And I guess we can take that extra step, but I thought we had the ability to say we'd like to see additional information. I mean like for instance one thing I really am having a hard time, I'm not familiar with the current status of Section 30 and the various alternatives, I wouldn't mind seeing that before I made a decision.

DELEISSEGUES: We could make a motion for denial with a recommendation that Vancouver take a look at what you're advocating.

MABREY: It wouldn't have any arterial atlas implications either way though. I mean Section 30 is in the city limits, it won't go on our map. It might affect how we classify 13th Street at some point in time but --

WRISTON: No, I understand that, I'm just saying that rather than make it --

MABREY: But that would require a whole different process.

WRISTON: Rather than make a complete recommendation of denial that we get a little bit more information. I mean it's up to you. If you guys just want to make a complete recommendation of denial and have it go to the Commissioners that's --

DELEISSEGUES: Well, that's what I want to do.

BARCA: Yeah. Because I think Mike's kind of painting us into a corner around the idea that says the part we're recommending to go back and visit is out of our purview to go back and visit, the City of Vancouver would have to voluntarily come forward up to where 18th Street, I mean, I'm sorry, 192nd and 13th come together. So we could recommend that 13th become the new arterial because that's within our purview and deny 18th and then let the City sort it out.

WRISTON: Chris, are you, Chris is looking, I always --

ALLEN: Is looking it up.

VARTANIAN: Now we got trouble.

WRISTON: Looking at you, Chris.

VARTANIAN: Now we got trouble, he's got this huge book.

WRISTON: No, I saw him scrambling looking at me.

HORNE: Well, the codes at 45.10.040, this is a Type IV process, this is legislative that comes to the Planning Commission, and under Subsection D that deals with public hearings it talks about your process and goes on and says "at the conclusion of the Planning Commission's hearing the Planning Commission shall announce one of the following actions: That the hearing is continued; if the hearing's continued you have to give the date and time, place so that you're going to re-advertise it."

And then the second alternative really is a combination. It says that "the Planning Commission recommends for, against or in favor of an approval of the application with or without certain conditions or that the Planning Commission will recommend neither against or for."

So in terms of what the code expressly contemplates it doesn't discuss a remand.

Now with certain County applications I know that you've asked for more information and those have come forward, but in terms of asking an applicant to develop a new proposal, at least it's not discussed in the options that the code gives you on under (D)(2), it's either a continuance, for, against or no recommendation.

VARTANIAN: I think what we have here is an application in front of us and either we say "yes" or we say "no."

HORNE: Or no recommendation.

VARTANIAN: I'm sorry, or no recommendation.

WRISTON: Well, it's kind of weird, it's not an application. I mean it's a --

VARTANIAN: Well, okay, whatever you want to call it, we've got something in front of us that we need to pass on and we can either pass on it --

WRISTON: It's our arterial atlas.

VARTANIAN: -- or we can say "yes" or "no." And I haven't heard anything to tell me why we need to put a line where 18th would be, and I haven't heard anything why I want to approve this except for --

WRISTON: Well, I'll just make a motion to deny.

VARTANIAN: Second.

DELEISSEGUES: Good for you. Any discussion?

WRISTON: I give up.

DELEISSEGUES: Moved and seconded that we deny the amendment to the arterial atlas on 18th Street. Roll call, please.

ROLL CALL VOTE

BARCA: AYE

ALLEN: AYE

VARTANIAN: AYE

DELEISSEGUES: I vote NO just so we can get on with some further clarification on the whole situation

WRISTON: AYE

And those are four AYE's for denial; right?

WISER: 4/1.

WRISTON: And one no for, okay.

BARCA: You voted no for clarification?

WRISTON: One no for clarification which was what I was trying to get.

DELEISSEGUES: Just to get on with it. I still think I would like to recommend, though, that they make an effort to take a look at the alternatives and particularly as pointed out in their letter from Vancouver, I mean the City of Vancouver's letter.

VARTANIAN: Well, hopefully they'll do that before they come in front of the Commissioners, the Board anyway.

BARCA: Okay. We're done.

MABREY: I'll be talking to them tomorrow.

WRISTON: The City or the Board?

MABREY: Yes, the City.

DELEISSEGUES: It's 10:00 and it's two more hours that we've been here and we'll take another break for ten minutes.

(Pause in proceedings.)