



proud past, promising future

CLARK COUNTY
WASHINGTON

COMMUNITY PLANNING SUMMARY MINUTES

Rural Lands Task Force Meeting #1 – June 2, 2009

Members Present: Ginger Burr, Sharon Bussler, Ingrid Dankmeyer, Dan Dupuis, Russ Grattan, Doug Hagedorn, Monty Multanen, Mike Posey, Danny Walsh, Byron Woltersdorf, Bill Zimmerman, and Robert Zumstein

Staff Present: Commissioner Marc Boldt, Oliver Orjiako, Gordy Euler, Jose Alvarez, Chris Cook

The meeting began at 6:10 pm. Oliver from Clark County Community Planning welcomed task force members and the audience to the first meeting of the Rural Lands Task Force (RLTF) 2, and introduced county staff. Members of the task force introduced themselves and told the group a little about themselves. Three members (Ingrid, Mike, and Bill) from the Agricultural Preservation Advisory Committee have been added.

Commissioner Boldt gave a brief explanation of what he wanted the group to focus on: rural economic development in compliance with the Growth Management Act and keeping timber and agriculture operations going. He stated that the Board had met with the Planning Commission about the rural lands review and that the possibility exists for a presence at the County Fair in August.

The group agreed that Ginger Burr would continue as chairperson and Dan Dupuis as vice chairperson. Meeting will be Tuesday evenings, starting at 6:00. The Dollars Corner Fire Station is fine as a meeting venue.

Gordy brought the group up-to-date with the Rural Lands Task Force 1 and what has happened since last summer. Staff had the RLTF 1 recommendations available at the County Fair last August. About 600 responses were received to the question “What should Clark County do to help rural lands?” Gordy also stated that the Board has adopted a set of rural principles and values based largely on the work of the RLTF 1.

Chris provided a brief history of the state Growth Management Act (GMA), which was adopted in 1990 to 1) to change the way growth occurs; 2) to protect resource lands (defined as lands used for agriculture, forestry and mining); 3) to protect critical areas (defined as critical habitat, wetlands, flood hazard areas, geologic hazard areas, and critical aquifer recharge areas); and 4) to require a capital facilities plan. Clark County’s first comprehensive plan under the GMA was adopted in 1994; updates were made in 2004 and 2007.

Chris made the point that the Board re-affirmed the comprehensive plan assumption that 90 percent of the projected growth (in the 2007 comp plan) would go to urban areas and 10 percent to rural areas. To change this split by increasing rural densities would violate the GMA unless there was a corresponding shrinkage of urban growth areas. Considerable discussion ensued about how the population split was arrived at, and what it means for planning purposes. Gordy reviewed projects the county has planned or is already engaged with:

- The county railroad as an economic asset
- Rails with Trails
- Wineries ordinance
- Biomass plant
- Equestrian plan
- Review of surface mining overlay
- Review of UR lands (working with cities)
- Shoreline Master Program update

Gordy reviewed the task force work elements as laid out by the Board:

1. *Rural center economic development opportunities.*

These are nodes/hamlets/villages; not characterized by urban density or by urban uses. There are seven rural centers (LAMIRDs) in the county. These are a logical place for economic opportunities. Possibilities: Mixed use in rural centers; land uses consistent with rural character; additional rural center commercial and/or industrial lands.

2. *Maintenance of farming and forestry operations.*

GMA requires the designation of resource land and regulations that support resource-based industry. The work of the Agricultural Preservation Advisory Committee is complete. Possibilities: Implementation of maintenance strategies; review of the right to farm/log ordinance; cottage housing/rural cluster ordinance provisions.

3. *Rural economic development opportunities.*

Biomass plant; wind farms; Rails with Trails. Possibilities: Recreation and tourism opportunities; railroad-related recreation/tourism opportunities; railroad overlay district.

4. *Rural areas that are next to develop (Future urban reserves areas)*

This will most likely be a city/county partnership effort, as these areas will be adjacent to current UGAs.

5. *Rural areas where natural landscapes dominate over the built environment*

Are there areas that should not develop? Possibilities: Open space; parks; critical areas; fish recovery areas; Legacy Lands program

The group agreed to start in with Item #1 Rural Centers at its next meeting.

As a last item, there was twenty minutes of public comment. ('Public comment' will be on the agenda; the task force can decide where it wants this item to be).

The next meeting will be Tuesday, June 16, 2009 at the Dollars Corner fire station 12, 21609 NE 72nd Avenue, beginning at 6 p.m. The meeting adjourned at 8:15 p.m.