

Three Creeks Advisory Council
April 8, 2010
Clark Regional Wastewater District
10:00 am to 12:15 pm

Members Present: Dan Bodell , Jim Carlson, Michael Harris, Denny Kiggins, Ron Lauser, Vaughn Lein, James Spinelli, Ila Stanek, David P. Taylor, Ron Wilson

Alternates: Laura Hudson, John Peterson

Absent: Commissioner Tom Mielke, Hal Dengerink , Lynn Valenter, Beth Holmes, Dave Taylor, Bud Van Cleve

Staff Present: Gary Albrecht , Laurie Lebowsky, Jeff Niten, Oliver Orjiako, Kelly Sills, Mary Beth O'Donnell

Oliver Orjiako called the meeting to order at 10:05AM. The minutes from the February 11, 2010 meeting were unanimously approved. Vaughn Lein arrived and took over as chair for the meeting. A review of the agenda resulted in no additions or corrections.

Jeff Niten opened with a presentation of the Discovery Fairgrounds sub-area plan (SAP). A staff report was emailed to the council as well as handed out at today's meeting. The area is part of Three Creeks and the second sub-area the county has taken on after Highway 99. The area is bounded by NW 11th and 164th on the South, 209th on the North, and 29th on the East and has the Amphitheater and Fairgrounds within its boundaries. An Advisory Task Force (TF) was formed last September and met six times ending with the last meeting on November 19. The group approved the initial recommendations document which was handed out. There were two open houses, the first on February 11 and the second March 16 and were well attended with over 50 at both. The first was in conjunction with the Fairgrounds Neighborhood Association and notices went out through them. The second one had a postcard notice sent to every person that owned property within the sub-area. Now we're looking to this advisory council for their recommendation.

The zoning map adopted in the 2007 Comprehensive Plan update was shown. One of the mandates from the Board of County Commissioners (BOCC) was to reserve this area mostly for employment. In September of 2007 there was a lot of Light Industrial (ML) property (job producing). Whipple Creek runs along the eastern boundary adjacent to 10th. With the wetlands and critical areas associated with the creek, the TF felt the ML zoning was not appropriate for that kind of land. That use requires a lot of flat, dry land so we were looking for uses more compatible with office campus or business parks. The TF came up with the new zoning recommendation of Office Campus (shows map), which allows for office types from medical to banks and a more cohesive site design than ML. We did not want to remove all ML from the area so there are still some areas that provide for ML in order to locate contractors offices and such. They chose that spot because it's dry and flat and next to the arterial I-5.

Initially we had mixed-use in the area where ML is proposed. Most of the TF felt a mixed-use next to I-5 was not the best, so moved it closer to 179th. The area north of 179th has not changed. The Bria property Annual Review was done in 2008 and those land use designations haven't changed. We felt Office Campus was also more appropriate because there is mixed-use next to it, rather than ML. Also, north of 199th is some Community Commercial (C-3) and they thought that would be appropriate for the convenience of people working close by to be able to get lunch, go to the dry cleaners, etc. Secondly, there's no exit from the freeway there so it can't be a regional draw, it serves local commercial only.

The area west of the Fairgrounds was recommended as R-120 (½ acre lot sizes) which provides for single family homes on larger lots. There's also potential in the future for an equestrian overlay if they want it when that time comes. Currently it's zoned R1-12 so the density went down quite a bit. Jobs, which were the directive from the Board, would go from 7,000 to 3,026. But industrial jobs potentially would go from 622 to 2,300 which is what we looked at and were excited about.

As stated in the staff report, providing job producing lands was the major point for this area. The TF accomplished that with the zoning designations they've recommended to this council, the PC and the Board.

Dan B. asked if there would ever be an interchange at 199th. Jeff said there's a certain separation distance between exits required by WSDOT standards and with one at 179th and one at 219th, that's been met.

Vaughn asked if there's been discussion of making all four corners of 199th commercial. Jeff said the TF felt the designated acreage there was enough to meet the needs of the local area.

Some neighbors were concerned with the zoning that the TF recommended to the north of 199th. What was adopted in 2007 and what has been recommended now has not changed. It was BP in 2007 and is recommended for BP under the current plan. Neighbors concerned with that zoning have expressed a desire to have a single-family home district. R-120 would be the largest that could be applied and we've done that west of the Fairgrounds.

Mr. Fournier, previous owner of Shorty's Nursery, would like to move the C-3 from the east side to south side of the intersection on 10th. Jeff has advised him and the neighbors north of 199th to come to meetings and express their wishes.

Ron L. asked if there is a wetlands overlay on the north piece along 199th and how much of that is actually usable. Jeff said that's Gee Creek and not a great deal is usable. These maps don't show definitive boundaries of wetlands. The SE corner is probably not a useable piece so putting it all back on the west side is a good idea. Also, most of the north side is not going to be a good spot for industrial use due to the wetlands.

Kelly Sills stated he's not certain of the objections to the BP zoning. Jeff said there's been a petition by the neighbors submitted to him and to the Board's office that it's too wet for industrial so single-family home sites would be more appropriate. They couldn't sell their property for BP uses while neighbors on the other side of 10th could and they don't want to look at a "Wal Mart". It's an economic concern rather than a planning concern. Oliver mentioned that some of the property owners are in the audience and they will have an opportunity to speak during public comment.

Ila commented on the job situation. She did a quick calculation and said we're losing 3,223 jobs and gaining only 1,663 and it doesn't seem like good exchange. Jeff said generally commercial jobs are not viewed as family wage jobs while business park and industrial jobs are. Dan B. said part of that reduction is based on real estate designation and therefore a phony number. That's why the designation was changed from red to purple showing, though it's a lot of land, there's not much potential. Kelly asked if there was discussion on what these changes would mean to the transportation infrastructure in the area. Jeff said Mike Mabrey would address that in a moment. But he wanted to add that on the map the strong black line at 164th is the boundary for the sub-area but the TF wanted to leave the area adjacent on the other side colored in as it's integral to the development of a bridge over Whipple Creek connecting 10th north and south. This was a very strong recommendation from the TF.

Mike Mabrey followed up saying the bridge over Whipple Creek is in the existing arterial atlas and the Metropolitan Transportation Plan. It's the default option that we expected to see happen. Some advantages are that it provides better access to employment land south of the sub-area.

Initial research into the cost of the project showed a \$30M bridge project. The design team looked at alternatives. They looked at the existing right-of-way as a potential overcrossing of I-5 at, or just south of, 164th street that would provide secondary access to the Fairgrounds. Two options are still on the table. They haven't been fully evaluated yet but expect later this year there will be a work session with the Board and we'll ask them to decide which alternative seems more feasible. It's an important decision that will affect the regional traffic pattern and the earlier we can make it the more effectively we'll be able to analyze traffic at the 179th interchange.

The traffic analysis is underway for 179th interchange area. The initial results based on existing land uses will be coming out today. In the next month the consultant team is working on a "no build" alternative and in June they'll be developing a list of eight alternative design projects to be evaluated through the summer for a preferred alternative later this year.

For the remainder of area, there was a detailed circulation plan done in 2008 after this land use was adopted. There's a good grid of streets that were added in the area because there's not the ability to cross Whipple Creek. The proposed changes don't rock the boat that much in terms of land uses and traffic patterns. There's still residential on the east and west side, and employment on the north. Our TF didn't see any major impacts that would require a substantial change to road classifications or circulation plans.

Kelly asked, with the additional jobs produced, what would happen to 10th Avenue and also to the West side of I-5? Mike said 10th Avenue is now a county owned arterial and is expected to be able to support the planned growth in this area when fully developed to an urban standard. The 179th interchange analysis will look at what happens on the south terminus. It won't become a four lane road. On the west side, in terms of traffic impacts, those will happen at the intersections. We've adopted an arterial atlas amendment that extends grid streets so there are more than those two choices.

Vaughn asked for any further questions. He said we'll wait (as a group) to act on it after the public comment period.

Laurie Lebowsky was next to present the county's Bike and Pedestrian Plan. She works with Oliver in Community Planning and is the Project Manager. Gary Albrecht is also working on it with her.

Why a Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan? There is a state statutory requirement, RCW36.70A.070 (6) (vii). We are collaborating with other jurisdictions and local stakeholders in developing the plan.

The bicycle part of the plan is an update, but the pedestrian part is completely new. The county developed a bicycle commuting plan in 1996 which was discovered when researching for this plan. After it was developed, it sat on a shelf.

Key points of the Bicycle Plan:

- Update 1996 county bike commute plan
- Expand on trail connections developed in the Vancouver-Clark Parks plan. Use that plan and take it to the next level.
- Identify safe bike connections in Clark County
- Coordinate with local jurisdictions

Highlights of the Pedestrian Plan include connecting the on-street system with the trail system. The inventory process is a big task, so the Planning Committee decided to inventory only the unincorporated part of the county. There was a sidewalk inventory developed during the Hwy 99 plan. Laurie just developed one for the Salmon Creek area. With the Hwy 99 plan, projects were identified and the same thing will be done for Salmon Creek. The missing piece will be the

Orchards area. In the Fairgrounds area, there's a lot of undeveloped land so the sidewalk plans will be part of the development.

Some general issues of the plan: why?

- Aging: As we age and can't drive, it is important to have pedestrian connections to transit, etc.
- Health issues: More and more, diet and exercise have a big impact on a community. Public health officials are looking at land use as a way to address our health issues.
- Cost effectiveness: Bike and ped facilities are cheaper to construct and in terms of the cost/benefit ratio - you get more benefit than from roads for driving.

Aging and Clark County:

- Nationwide, 60% of the Baby Boomers will be retiring in next 3 years.
- In 2009, 10% of Clark County will be 65 years or older. In 2030 that increases to 19%. Eventually, we'll all get to a point where we can't drive anymore and we need safe alternatives.

In a recent transportation survey, 59% of the respondents said the way to address traffic congestion is to improve public transportation and make it easier to walk and bike.

The second highest factor of health that can be changed is that of inactivity and diet according to the Journal of American Medical Association on modifiable factors associated with U.S. deaths in the year 2000.

Cost for road improvements: What can be done with \$60M? In 2008, that was the value of Portland's 300-mile bicycle infrastructure compared to that same amount it would take to build one mile of freeway.

Stakeholders involved are schools, Clark County Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee, Community Choices, Clark County Bicycle Advisory Committee, local bicycle group, cities, C-Tran, and WSDOT. Laurie introduced individuals from these groups who were in the audience.

The committee has developed a vision which emphasizes safety and safe routes for children walking or biking to school, people being able to walk or ride to transit, enjoy natural beauty, make appropriate transportation choices available, and to encourage active transportation and promote economic development opportunities related to biking.

The committee's guiding purposes and principals are to identify barriers to walking and biking, identify needed improvements and develop systematic improvement plans, enhance safety, develop benchmarks for increasing bicycling and walking in the county (to implement plan for documentation in the coming years), and involve the community and representatives from surrounding cities and the state to help develop the plan.

Alta Design in Portland has been working with the county as an outside consultant on this project.

Key work tasks:

Develop a 20 year project list, design guidelines, parking guidelines, and funding plans to implement the results of the planning efforts.

Time line:

Develop plan by June of this year

BOCC work sessions, one in July and one in November 2010

PC work sessions in August and October 2010, followed by PC hearing in November

BOCC adoption hearing in December 2010

Completed tasks to date:

Held public open houses to solicit input on barriers to biking and walking in the county
Worked with volunteers to inventory existing bike system around the county; based on developed bicycle lanes and paths
Development of education and outreach strategies; Draft bicycle parking guidelines
Gap analysis
Developed working groups
Draft of Bicycle and Sidewalk project lists for April advisory committee meeting

The next committee meeting is Tuesday April 13, 4:30-6:30 PM, 6th floor Public Service Center. It is open to public.

Laurie gave the web address for information on meetings, products developed, making comments, and joining an email list.

Dan B. asked what the highest priorities are that have been identified for correction within the Three Creeks area. Laurie said criteria developed to rank bike and pedestrian projects was based on their vision plan. They will be ranked based on safety, connectivity and health benefits. During the Hwy 99 sidewalk inventory it was a top priority. There are issues with the right turn lane on Hwy 99 and the way it's configured now so we want to update that to make it safer. There was a Salmon Creek SAP meeting yesterday that addressed bike and pedestrian connections. One of the issues is the different subdivisions in the area with no direct connection between them, from residential areas to commercial areas.

Jim C. asked what the coordinated effort between cities and the county is to build this biking structure. Laurie reiterated that there are stakeholders and smaller cities involved right now. They will be meeting with the Planning Commissions of the small cities. As far as statewide requirements, they've moved the update to the Comprehensive Plans out to 2014. We will make recommendations to the cities and it will be up to them to make those improvements.

Oliver added that this is a broad overview of what Laurie is working on. Before we go to the PC, if there is a map completed as far as Three Creeks is concerned, we will share that with the council.

Kelly asked if the ADA community was integrated during public outreach. Laurie said there is a member of Vancouver-Clark Parks on the committee who has worked on many ADA issues.

Dan B. asked if there is a map showing areas of bike and pedestrian accidents so you can highlight those problem areas. Laurie said Public Works has that data as well as WSDOT and City of Vancouver.

Lisa Goorjian, Vancouver-Clark Parks, added that the data is available to the advisory committee and the consultant has looked at it. The Bike and Ped Coordinator from the City of Vancouver is also on this advisory committee. This group can leverage lots of information and data then decide how to use it. To clarify, the county did adopt a trail and bikeway system plan. So within this Three Creeks area there are quite a few regional trails identified; the north/south power line trail that goes through the Hwy 99 area; the Salmon Creek regional trail. The nice thing about this plan is that it's focused on all of the bike/ped access that's in the right-of-way. The trail plan looks at more of the greenways and separated paths that aren't part of that right-of-way, but this plan is asking not only how do we get to commercial and residential areas, but how do we get folks to the pathway and trail systems that are arterials for bikes and pedestrians. Parks is excited about this effort and happy to be at the table.

Vaughn asked for public comment on the Discovery/Fairgrounds SAP. Steve Yokum, 20716 NE 10th Avenue, came forward. He stated that after the last open house, a group of neighbors got together in opposition to the proposed zoning. 60% of people in the area are opposed to the

zoning mainly because of what is planned for the area (shows picture examples of commercial businesses next to residential property). He commented that the means of getting public information out is about 60% effective. Information is coming out in different formats. He recommended coming up with a consistent way to inform people about the SAP. Some people are older and don't have access to computers.

Steve showed the location of his parcel on the map. He said he has no value in this except he has sympathy for the people who own property affected by the proposed zone change. There is concern over the wetlands which he said is not correctly depicted in the aerial photo. He's spoken to Ted Leibe (sp?) of the Department of Fish and Wildlife and they are currently reviewing the EIS on this area. They have some concerns as well. There are fish in the lower portion of Gee Creek and due to financial constraints they may come up into the area in question.

Basically, his group has decided to try and change zoning now before it's adopted to save fees down the road. He showed another picture of a property across 174th and 10th, north of Fred Meyer and interviewed the owner who has lived there 20 years. He ran into the same issue with zoning that they will if this is changed. He bought the property as commercial. The setbacks have changed over the years and it doesn't have the same value today. He's paying by the square foot. He's butted up against an office campus park that they want to adopt there.

Steve said with the wetland issues and the terrain of the land not being suitable to build on (not flat enough), he and his group would like to get support from the committee to go back and rezone this and consider Rural Residential. That would allow people to determine what they want to do with their land in the future. Right now it is zoned Industrial Reserve. It's inside the UGA with Urban Holding overlay. Jeff showed current zoning on the map. Jeff said, today the zone north of 199th is BP (business park). Under our proposal, the zone that was applied in 2007 for this area north of 199th is not changing. Kelly asked if BP would have the ability to work around the curvature of wetland areas in terms of development. Jeff said it's absolutely feasible, which is one of the reasons why they chose that type of zone for areas adjacent to Whipple Creek.

Steve said in conclusion, and in compliance with what Laurie said about the growth of bike paths, 10th is a designated rural riding area. Bicyclists use it every weekend. Maybe in conjunction with the bike people we can get their support to rezone it to Rural Residential and 10th can be a corridor down to Gee Creek. That corridor goes all the way to the WSU campus.

Jim C. asked if all the neighbors are in agreement that they don't want this to happen. Steve said yes and sited owners who are involved and the ones he still needs to talk to. Jim asked what they want it to look like. Steve said anything would be better than to look at this office park stuff. He is really opposed to this zoning and asked for the council's support. Denny asked to see the map Steve brought. He has signatures with him too. Ron W. asked how long this has been zoned Light Industrial? It was adopted into the UGB in September 2007. Before that it was AG or Rural 5 or 10.

George Espinosa, Real Estate broker, 20801 NE 10th Avenue spoke next. He is concerned about property values. Since 2007 he has not been able to close a sale of residential property in the area because of the way the zone has changed. He can't get an institution to loan on property that is a non-conforming use. Also, he's talked to the residents themselves about what the proposed zoning does to the value of their property. Some parcels, such as his personally, will be basically worthless because it's dissected by the creek, it's only 2-1/4 acres, and in a plan where you have to mitigate the impact on the wetlands you might have 1/10th of an acre that would be usable in an industrial setting. Something that puzzles him is, as residents they have problems trying to do various things with their property because of the impact on this fragile environment. Then the county comes in and says they're going to tear it up and pave it over, so we've got more run off, etc. He doesn't understand that part. The big issue is the value and the effect on the residents. They're not going to be able to sell it as a residence. The highest value in real estate is in residential property because there are many more buyers for that. If a developer comes in and

has to mitigate all the environmental problems, the infrastructure, etc., what can he pay for that land initially? We are the wholesalers and that's his big concern. What he wants to avoid is getting to the point of having to hire expensive attorneys to come in and fight for them.

Denny asked if he wants to keep it Rural Residential. Mr. Espinosa said yes that would be ideal and the best way to protect the wetlands and the fragile habitat for wildlife.

Randy Printz, Attorney with Landerholm et al, had comments regarding the bridge on 10th above Whipple Creek. He's worked with the Amphitheater and the Fairgrounds Association. For the continued and increasing success of development in the area, there has to be another way out of the area besides the 179th interchange. The TF could not have put it in much stronger terms that they support that. He is asking this group to do the same and urge the Board to do whatever they can to seek funding, move it as high on the list as they can reasonably do in order to enable the Fairgrounds to thrive, as well as the Amphitheater. There are other commercial (and mixed-use) areas that were added to the UGA in 2004 and 2007 and right now to access the services along 134th you have to get on I-5 at 179th and get off at 134th and utilize two interchanges. WSDOT supports having a parallel path along I-5, though transportation dollars are tough and there are some environmental constraints getting over Whipple Creek. But in order to start the process we need one environmental review and two design reviews at a minimum. Anything this group can do to recommend to the PC or the Board that they continue to seek funding for and priority for that connection would be really good for the Fairgrounds and the Amphitheater. The project was originally part of the Amphitheater then it came out and went back in and came out again. It's not a matter of need, but of funding. At least keep it visible and as high a priority as they can.

Vaughn asked what about crossing the interstate at Union road? Randy replied that's a design possibility and Transportation looked at that. One thing you would find is that while you'd reduce the potential environmental impact, the bridge itself won't have a huge environmental impact as it will be well above the creek on pilings. But the analysis of that will be substantial. To put it on 20th you'd only have a two lane bridge and you might just be buying yourself a different bridge. He is not aware that the county has done an in-depth transportation capacity analysis that has looked at the numbers, and it should be looked at, but it's clearly not a better design.

Vaughn asked for the committee's recommendations on: the intersection at 199th and whether the commercial on the SE should move to the SW corner; Whipple Creek bridge; and the parcels to the south of the study area.

Dave Taylor commented on the Whipple Creek crossing on 10th. It would probably be half of what it would cost to do one over I-5 at Union Road. 10th Avenue makes more sense from the traffic flow and cost standpoint.

Ron W. commented that the bridge over 10th Avenue should have been done a long time ago. A positive is the relief it will give to traffic on 134th Street. Mike mentioned earlier, a \$30 million cost for the bridge. If you look at how much it will improve traffic, we're spending \$140 million+ on the 139th Street fix which is huge and personally if \$30 million helps traffic and opens up a lot of commercial property by the Fairgrounds that would support good jobs, it seems like a bargain. Jim C. agreed.

Dan B. said if you can build a mile of freeway for \$60 million, we could buy ¼ mile of four lane for \$10 million. He is in support of the comments about the 10th Avenue bridge. Brainstorming to look at alternatives is good, there are no bad ideas. As to concerns from the public on the northern tip of the UGA, he senses the whole point of that was to preserve land from getting divided into smaller residential subdivisions. Unfortunately, it's not going to stay the idyllic meadows we have today. It's going to be something, someday. This group has to step back from the immediate pain that someone is going to suffer by having their land zoned so they can't do whatever they want with it in expectation of the greater good for jobs in the future which we have to have. We've established this as a core area for a job center and changing it back to R-5 won't meet that goal.

This is not the venue for us to try and change zoning that's already designated. It's in the Comp Plan too and is a bigger deal than this.

Jim C. respectfully disagrees. He thinks there are alternatives that haven't been discovered yet. There are uses that are way more advanced than putting in a business park with a swamp next to it. They (the public comments today) represent 90% of the homeowners out there. He is defensive about citizen rights. It's inside the UGA so we, and the property owners, need to deal with it. We need to hit certain criteria and create some job growth and he is not certain BP is the right thing for it.

Ron L. said looking at the financial feasibility from a development standpoint, the property on the north side of 199th should go back to Rural Residential. The ecological impact of putting a business park in that area is probably not going to happen as it's too expensive to build on it due to the amount of wetlands. Creating jobs might be a good idea, but whether or not anybody is going to do it there is a big question. People in that area are probably correct that it should stay a residential area.

Jeff said to clarify this, we can't move the UGB outside of the county process, to open up the entire Comp Plan for the entire county, we can't shrink it. So the largest SF home zoning designation we can allow is ½ acre, R-120. In order to meet target densities for UGB under GMA, the largest we can have is a ½ acre.

Mr. Espinosa said what they're asking for is Rural Residential which allows for 1 to 5 acres. Jeff said we can't do that. Mr. Espinosa said with the topography there he would think some lots have to be variable sizes in order to be buildable. That's why he thinks this is the best way to protect the fragile environment because you could build around it. With a BP you have to put so much land into infrastructure and that shrinks because of the environmental constraints. Jeff said it's not that you have to break it down into ½ acre lot sizes. It just means you can't go any smaller. Inside the UGB, there is no larger SF home size than ½ acre. So you could keep it 1 acre, you don't have to break down. But you couldn't go to 5.

Dan B. asked if we owe it to the PC and Board to reach, if not a consensus, at least a recommendation on the sub-area as a group. Vaughn said we could send forward our recommendations as modified to the PC. If there's something we don't agree on at least the written documentation would go forward with the discussion. The PC would then have the opportunity to read that and hear further testimony at their hearings. We don't have to send forward a package that we agree 100% on at this point. If we have agreement on the 10th Avenue bridge and the 199th Street intersection, that could be included in terms of our recommendation as changes. If we don't have full agreement on the other part then the record goes forward to the PC.

Mike Harris made a motion to vote on each of the three, Ila S. seconded, unanimously approved.

First vote on the SE corner of 199th to move the commercial from the SE corner to SW corner. The reasoning is because of the wetlands. Ron L. made a motion to approve, Ila S. seconded, unanimously approved.

Second vote on 10th Avenue bridge over Whipple Creek south of the Fairgrounds as favorable vs. going over the freeway. Dave Taylor motioned to approve, Ron L. seconded, unanimously approved.

Third vote on going from BP (current zoning) to Rural Residential or something else, which we cannot put Rural Residential within that urban area. At this point we could not make that designation but we could have a discussion on what we think it should be. Either it would remain as BP and the current standards or an alternative to that.

Vaughn said his concern is that it's already in the urban area. Maybe something was missed in 2007 when this was coming through. That always happens no matter what you do. He understands their concerns. He's also concerned that people visualize BP to be the worst looking business park but there are ways you can do a decent design and address the environment correctly. Whether that could be done in this area would be up to the developer, how much money they could put into it. His concern is trying to go back to Rural Residential when it's already BP. For years the county was criticized for not having light industrial land and still is. There are proponents that say we don't have enough for BP. There's the economic emphasis to promote jobs. He's torn on it. His feeling personally is to keep it BP as is and it will take a lot of years to transition out.

Denny asked if it can be a marriage with different zoning in that area. Vaughn said that could be part of another process as it comes forward. If you look at some of the things we've looked at here, for example along Hwy 99, and different ways of approaching design and flexibility, if it doesn't become as usable as what we think it will within 10-15 years, someone will come back and say okay this is what is going to make that work. We see that throughout the county and the urban area. Sometimes you have to have that hard line where you have residential up to farm land, or you have other types of things up to farm land. You see more of that in Oregon than here. It's a transition that doesn't happen overnight.

Jim C. asked if we had a TDR (transfer development rights) program in place where we could find other sending and receiving areas for this type of land or some more appropriate usable land, would that be a way for that application to work? Jeff said under what we have currently, no. But that's a possibility in the future. Jim C. said there was a last ditch effort to get that in during the last Comp Plan. Oliver said that TDR is still on the table. He doesn't know what will come out of the Rural Lands review effort or if the Board is going to put it on the work program to consider for next year. Since 1994 we've explored the TDR program within the county and the process failed for a variety of reasons. It is a concept that could be applied here but we have to have the sending and receiving area structured in such a way that it can work.

Dan B. noticed there are still a few larger size parcels, whereas south of that area is even more patchwork and smaller parcels that's going to be in the same situation. He's comfortable with the existing designation and not changing it. If the petitioners would like to pursue a rezone then a more appropriate vehicle he would recommend is an Annual Review. That's the place for that kind of conversation, not as part of this that's going on right now. Mr. Espinosa said that sounds backwards to him.

Jim C. added that part of our job is to look at the Three Creeks area, so we're outside of the city limits. There is a pile of land that sits inside Battle Ground, Ridgefield and Vancouver which is developable land that we don't deal with. But you have to have that in the back of your mind when you look at this type of thing. There's quite a bit of inventory out there and it will be sitting out there for several years. GMA suggests that development take place inside the cities but we have a unique county that has the infrastructure put in place that allows us to do a lot of development. That's part of our responsibility, to guide that development.

Oliver agreed and added that in the news lately, in order to comply with the GMA and the Superior Court ruling, the county removed the Lagler piece of 700 acres outside of the plan that was adopted in 2007. The inventory is shrinking even though GMA doesn't require you to plan for a particular number of jobs, if you look at the plan adopted in 2007 and where the jobs/houses ratios is, significant changes have been made since the adoption of the plan. The conversation that the Board and the community had in the 2007 plan was the idea to look at the Discovery Corridor and try to reverse the commute of 60,000 county residents traveling across the bridge to work. What strategy would the county put in place in the next 10-20 years to reverse that trend? Whether it would happen here or some other part of the county is not certain, but that was the thinking that went into the development of the 2007 plan. Whatever recommendation you have, we will take that forward. It could happen through the plan amendment process. There's no

guarantee that the zone change will be approved but that's one avenue to consider. If you take that chunk out the inventory, or the equation, that's significant.

Vaughn made the suggestion to move forward and asked for a show of hands in support of the BP or in support of staff looking at an alternative use for property. The vote to keep BP was two (2); the vote to look at an alternative use was eight (8). A motion to support the Discovery SAP was made by Ila S., and seconded by Denny K., and unanimously approved.

A copy of the 2010 work program and a list of Three Creeks Council accomplishments was distributed.

John Peterson was asked to comment briefly on the regional sewer plan update. As a reminder, he made a formal presentation last year in June on the feasibility study for the regional sewer district. Three themes came out of the study: do a better job of providing capacity in the treatment systems to allow for economic development in high growth areas; do better from a stewardship standpoint in managing water resources; do both of those at lower costs over time by managing as a regional facility.

Since then we've been completing the study and moving into the implementation phase. There are four agencies that said they'd like to move into implementation and they are Clark County, CRWWD, and the Cities of Battle Ground and Ridgefield. The area being considered is the middle part of county. One of the projects being launched is the regional business plan. This will put together the legal, financial and operational strategy to form this new partnership. They've been going through a consultant recruitment effort. They also want to tie the Three Creeks group into it because it affects so much of the area. They're trying to be diligent during the implementation phase to work outside of the agencies not just internal to them and engage outside stakeholder groups. This group, because of Three Creeks being such a large portion of the area within the region, looks like a stakeholder group and is already a formed stakeholder group. We will bring you a more formal discussion at next meeting.

John introduced Chris Cleveland, a project manager with Brown and Caldwell and Jason Robertson with J. Robertson which specializes in the public outreach and facilitation portion of the work. They've done a significant amount of this type of work in other jurisdictions. They'll be here in June.

Chris said tomorrow is the first kick off meeting with the coordinating agencies and their elected officials. Over the next month they will be conducting one-on-one stakeholder interviews. By the time they come to the June meeting they will be able to share their findings and ask for your thoughts on the importance and function of a regional wastewater utility and how we can best serve the folks of Clark County.

Jason said to reassure the group, they've worked together a lot on these types of projects. They're used to dealing with land use and employment issues. Vaughn commented that often residents get concerned about notification and the question is always how do you reach out to the these people, and how are you consistent with it because there's always some that will get left out. Jason said you have to use multiple forms and that's one question they'll ask this group since it covers a lot of different areas and members are in other stakeholder groups. Ila suggested they create a logo to "brand" the project and make it easy to identify.

Vaughn went back to the schedule for upcoming meetings. In August, Gordy will be presenting an update on urban reserve, and in October will be Salmon Creek SAP with Colete.

Another thing passed out today is a list of accomplishments to date. We can loose track of that and the impact we've had by sending things on to the PC and the Board. Our appointments were up in March. We still have a work plan but it is a limited one. We want to have a conversation

here about whether we see this winding down. Oliver has had staff cut and as the Board sees work programs coming up, we're not positive they'll continue full support of this group.

The other question becomes, do we have a lot of information that still needs to come back to us or other avenues that we can participate in, whether electronically or getting involved with other groups, that will have some of this similar information and we'd still have our foot in what's happening here. How important do you think it is to have a major continuation of this group or can we do something differently? It's been a great group. You seldom see this many accomplishments where the participants get to set in motion what is going to happen in an area. You've done a lot of great work. We've got the Salmon Creek SAP plan coming back to us and we'll hear more from Laurie on the Bicycle and Pedestrian plan on what will be happening within our Three Creeks area.

Ron L. said he thinks we need to keep the group together. When the group was formed, the city of Vancouver looked over this area and they didn't have quite the interest that we have in the area. He thinks having residents from area having input is a good thing.

Jim C. said he likes to participate and is passionate about how the county develops. He would be disappointed if they weren't involved in the process. He sees a lot of value in that.

James S. agreed.

Denny K. agreed also and would like to see the various SAP's through to completion. Vaughn said the county has grants for additional projects but no additional staff so they are taking on more responsibilities.

Dan B. feels for continuity sake, we need reappointments. Should they be one year, or two years? It's important to get this back to the Commissioners. This group's champion is no longer there (referring to Betty Sue Morris). Things will come up forever and we should have a voice in that, it's important to keep going.

Michael H. said maybe we look at a different frequency.

Ron W. feels from a cost standpoint, it saves money in long run. This is a diverse group that gets issues up front and has a chance to shape them as they go along.

Ila said there are a variety of people on the committee to disseminate information, a unique group that continues to be valuable. Perhaps meet quarterly but when you meet less often you lose impetus.

Jim C. said we could look at different ways to do our work – maybe telecommute? He wants to continue to move forward. Ila's not excited about doing more work on a computer. You lose a lot by communicating via computer because you can't hear tone of voice, see the person face to face, etc.

Oliver said he's listening to the comments and he values everyone's participation and input. He's met with Vaughn and Colette and all agreed, land use and transportation issues in this area are not going to go away. It is uncertain what the Commissioners will put on the work schedule for 2011-12. It is appropriate to have this conversation. If you feel the Board should reappoint, we should hear from them. Vaughn asked how soon the group should communicate with the Commissioners. Denny added that he feels it would be a disservice to disband. Dave T. said we proved it in the three decisions made here today. Dan B. said it makes sense to make recommendation to rotate terms. Ila said, terms one and two initially. She wants to see the AG land update at least. Denny K. said our area is so important, especially for jobs, we can't let it slip. Vaughn said he will work with Oliver to put a letter together to the Board asking for continued support.

Gordy Euler will be coming next month and will update the committee on rural lands. There is a work session on April 14 to get direction on recommendation to pursue AG issues.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:17 P.M.