

**CLARK COUNTY
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
Thursday, September 19, 2013**

**Public Services Center
1300 Franklin Street
BOCC Hearing Room, 6th Floor
Vancouver, WA**

6:30 p.m.

I. CALL TO ORDER 6:30 P.M.

BARCA: Good evening ladies and gentlemen. We are going to go ahead and get started on tonight's Planning Commission hearing. Can we start with roll call, please.

II. ROLL CALL

BARCA: HERE

BLOM: HERE

GIZZI: HERE

JOHNSON: HERE

MORASCH: ABSENT

USKOSKI: ABSENT

QUIRING: HERE

III. COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

BARCA: So what we normally do as we start off the hearing is we ask for anybody of the public that wants to come forward and testify on anything that is not on the agenda this evening and we bring that forward at the beginning of the hearing. So anybody that has anything that they would like to bring forward to the Planning Commission that is not on tonight's agenda, this is your opportunity. And seeing nobody coming forward.

PUBLIC: Wait, I have a question. Wouldn't that be that we want to propose for more time before the next meeting?

BARCA: If you're asking about proposing more time for something on the agenda, then please bring that forward at the time we go over the agenda. So no testimony unrelated to tonight's agenda? We will go ahead and get started. I can see that the house is packed. We're going to

have a lot of testimony this evening. So what I'd like to do is I'm going to go ahead and have staff report out first, and then we will go through public testimony. Mike.

IV. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS AND PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION

A. CPZ2013-00015 SURFACE MINING OVERLAY UPDATE

MABREY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mike Mabrey, Community Planning. This is the CPZ2013-00015, the surface mining overlay update. A little bit of background.

First of all, I'd like to apologize, the notice that went out was found by many people to be insufficient in terms of both timing and extent. We are technically required to notify every property owner that might consider themselves affected by this, so we did send out notices, they were somewhat delayed.

The notices went to the property owners that were proposed to have the surface mining overlay added to their property and then property owners within 500 feet of them. So not everybody in every subdivision out there who would consider themselves probably to be affected got the notice, and it's kind of a feature of Livingston Mountain, how it's laid out and how it all comes off of two roads, so everybody feels like they have a vested interest in everything that happens up there. We have a limited ability to do mailings to every or to guess who everybody is, first of all, but I understand the concern that not everybody heard about this in a timely way. And that when the notices went out, some people got them on or before the weekend, and over the weekend our website was crashed and so there was no ability to look up the documents that we were referring you to. Again, I apologize for that, and understand that we've received several requests for a continuance of this hearing to a later date, and the Planning Commission will make a decision on that at the end of the evening.

So moving ahead. This is an update to the entire set of rules that apply to surface mining. They haven't essentially been changed since 1995 when they were first adopted. What's happened in the interim is that the Department of Natural Resources Geology Division was able to through a State funded grant provide Clark County with an aggregate inventory, a map of where all the rock in the county is or is likely to be, and so we had some basis to begin updating the surface mining

overlay map. And in addition to that, we are looking at updating all the policies and all the procedures and the standards that relate to surface mining, so you'll see that in some of the documents at the back of the table.

One of the first steps in, well, the first step that's identified in the statute in adopting surface mining or mineral lands regulations is to find a classification system and agree on that. This is the classification system that was proposed by the Division of Geology.

So there's two levels of sand and gravel, what they call speculative which means that based on geologic information it's probably here, but we don't know much about its quantity or quality, and then sand and gravel that we know about.

PUBLIC: Can you speak up.

MABREY: Yeah. Sure. I'll get a little closer. And for bedrock they had three different classifications, so identified, hypothetical and speculative. I should stop and note that the recommendations that are in front of you are recommendations that were made by the mineral lands task force. That's a group that was appointed by the Board of County Commissioners to dig into the details and work on the whole range of surface mining issues. They've met over the last two years over a dozen times. It was a mix of industry people, Livingston Mountain neighbors, environmental people who had some background in the mining industry. And the process that was used was a consensus process, so everyone at the meeting agreed on each one of the recommendations before it went forward. That doesn't mean that they're perfect, it just means that's the recommendations that I'm bringing to the Planning Commission to consider.

PUBLIC: Are they subject to change before you bring it?

MABREY: They're here as the recommendations of the mineral lands task force. The Planning Commission's role is to consider those and propose changes if they wish, and the Board of County Commissioners will make the final decision.

PUBLIC: But at the last --

MABREY: I'm not going to go back and forth with you. I think we went through the process this morning, and, yes, it's all subject to change before final approval. Okay.

Let me just briefly go over what the criteria have been established by the legislature for designating mineral lands on the map such as the map that you've seen. We have to look at -- we have to identify and classify mineral resources, where they're currently being extracted or where it could be anticipated that they will be.

The criteria are really based on the mineral types and physical properties and distance to market primarily. Other factors to consider are the ability to access, minerals may be lost if the mineral resource lands are not classified and designated, the effects of proximity to population areas, the possibility of more intense uses of the land in both the short and long-term as indicated by the following: General land use patterns in the area, availability of utilities including water supply, surrounding parcel sizes and surrounding uses, availability of public roads and other public services, subdivision or zoning for urban and small lots, energy costs and transporting minerals. It's fairly vague language in terms of what you do with these five criteria that are indicators of possible long-term or short-term more intensive land uses. So this is what we had to work with.

You'll note that there is not anything there that talks about traffic, water quality or water supply in terms of how its effect on people's groundwater, effect on habitat and the intent as is made -- well, there's two things to that. One is a lot of that can't be predicted on the broad scale at which we're looking at, where are the resources, where are the mineral resources and what kind are they and are they potentially of some economic long-term value. That's more of the site-specific considerations when a permit application is submitted, all the traffic studies and the environmental studies have to be submitted at that time.

BARCA: Mike, pardon me for just one moment.

MABREY: Sure.

BARCA: I know a lot of people just came in, and we're getting more sign-up sheets so everybody will have a chance to get their name on the record and they'll be able to get copies of this or choose to testify based on what they want to do. So if you haven't signed up and you want to sign-up, please just hang on, more sheets are coming, okay. Thanks.

MABREY: I think that's the essential background that I wanted to speak to. If we're ready to go

to the maps, there's a couple of late-breaking things that I'd just like to make you aware of that nobody has to make any decisions about, but I received e-mails from parties kind of late in the afternoon that I think we could quickly dispose of.

PUBLIC: Could you speak up a little bit or turn up his mic.

MABREY: I'm usually pretty loud, but I'll bring it as close as I can. This stupid thing doesn't bend very well. Sorry about that. Let's see, where do we want to start here. So this is the general map of proposed areas that's online, very difficult to read at this scale. Let me just see if I can locate the parcel that I want to talk about, and it may take a few minutes, but hopefully not. Okay. There's a property right here, this parcel right here, I think it's about 83 acres, and I got a phone call from them and said we're Cardai Hill, we want to be on your surface mining overlay map, we have lots of good rock. They've never had the overlay before and they're not currently shown to have identified bedrock, they're just outside the polygon. And I could show you that very quickly if you like. So Cardai Hill is looks like this, and the polygon of identified rock come right to their corner.

PUBLIC: I'm Cardai Hill too and part of that rock is on our property.

BARCA: Please, for the general public, everybody that wants to testify will get a chance. I can't get you on the record from the background back there. And so anybody that's got anything worth saying that wants to bring it forward, we'd be happy to hear it, but we can't hear it when you just shout out from the back room or even the front. Okay. So we'll get through everybody, we'll be civil, we'll make sure that everybody gets heard that wants to be heard, but we got to do this one at a time. Thank you.

MABREY: And just for background information, this shows slopes and erosion potential, and the parcel itself is kind of in right in this area. This is zoomed in quite a bit from what you've seen before. That's essentially all the information I have on this. There's an e-mail in your packet with a very brief request from the property owner.

BLOM: Is that property already zoned resource land at this time?

MABREY: I'm pretty sure it's forest, but I can't swear to it. If I may, I'd like to kind of dispose of another small issue, another small property that there's been some concern about. This one was

another site-specific request. We're south of Yacolt, we're right at the bend of Lewis River where the turn to Yacolt is, and this property owner asked to have their property put in the surface mining overlay. It shows up in your map currently. There's been some concern from neighbors about access proximity to the Lewis River and the fact that there isn't really, there's no identified aggregate there, and they're kind of partly in the light brown which is the speculative bedrock area. So just wanted to make you aware of that. Not really necessary to make any decisions about that at this point in time.

How would you like to proceed? Do you want to go to Livingston Mountain? Do you want to go to Yacolt Mountain? That's basically the two that I think we're going to hear a lot of testimony about.

BARCA: I think it's worth for the record us trying to go over the aspect of what's being taken out and what's being requested to go in, because some of it is currently in overlay and is just remaining in overlay and I think we need to be able to make that distinction.

MABREY: So you'd like me to explain the legend on this map then?

BARCA: Yes, I believe for everybody that would be worthwhile.

MABREY: Okay. I think that's great. So anything that's cross-hatched in this map - I'm sorry, I keep moving back - but anything cross-hatched currently has a surface mining overlay. If it's got crossed picks on it, there is a mining permit. If it's got crossed picks in a box, there's a closed mining permit, so they've all finished with their reclamation and that area is done.

Anything that has yellow is currently has a surface mining overlay, and the mineral lands task force is proposing to remove it because there's no indication that there's minable resource there of long-term significance. We've contacted the property owners and they either didn't respond affirmatively or didn't respond at all. So that's the essence of that.

The green, which doesn't show up very green, but that's what this is, are areas that are proposed to get the surface mining overlay either because of the property owner's request, or because through a series of whittling down -- we started from the map that was provided by the Department of Geology and we eliminated everything that was in the city limits of any city, eliminated anything

that was in the urban growth boundary of any city because those areas were planned for higher density more intensive uses, unless it already had the existing surface mining overlay, eliminated all the speculative layers in terms of the classifications, and then, finally, eliminated the hypothetical, well, both hypothetical and speculative were removed from the maps. So what we were left with were several areas of identified bedrock essentially and a few areas of property owner requests to get the overlay, because there was an adjacent mining area or they thought they had something that was worth mining. So that was the process we went through.

And then beyond that, we looked at each one of those polygons. So we looked at this blob and said, well, is there some reason why this should be disqualified. Let me also stop and say, the other layer that was removed was any area that had residential zoning. So if it was rural residential R-5, there's no surface mining overlay going to be added to it. That left only areas that were zoned for resource uses, either forest or agriculture, that had indications on the Department of Geology map that there was identified evidence of quality and quantity of rock there, that was our beginning point. And we further refined it by looking at each area and removing areas that were completely inaccessible or that had slopes that were beyond the pale I guess.

So there was considerations of a number of factors when we looked at each of those areas.

We didn't get into habitat issues, we didn't get into any critical areas issues because the directives in the statute is that it's when you have a resource overlay and a critical area overlay, it's fine to have them coincide, you don't have to choose between them necessarily. Okay. Shall we focus on Yacolt Mountain or Livingston Mountain, do you have any preference?

BARCA: Yes. So just for my understanding, any one of the parcels that has been an owner request to come in still has to be vetted through the map that says that there's potentially aggregate available, is there some way of proofing the request prior to including it?

MABREY: Initially not. So the Matilla that we showed up above doesn't have any aggregate indications on the map, it was the property owner's wish to get the overlay because it was sort of like the open period. We didn't make a decision one way or another whether -- we didn't have any information whether there was good rock in there or not. So that one is certainly an owner

request that's maybe somewhat arbitrary and could easily be removed.

BARCA: And so will we use the WAC as our guidance for inclusion or removal?

MABREY: What the task force used were the criteria for inclusion or removal that are being proposed in the procedure section of the code changes. So currently there are no -- well, there are no clear-cut criteria for adding or removing the surface mining overlay, although the comp plan refers you to this complicated matrix that gets into lots of operational issues including traffic and water, and maybe I think you're familiar with that.

The proposal in the material before you is to make revision of the surface mining overlay map a Type III process, essentially a zone change with criteria specific to that change. Currently there are surface mining and mining related overlays on both the comprehensive plan map and the zoning map, they don't always coincide, some of them have essentially no meaning. The intention is to simplify that into one map, make all opportunities for zoning subject to the surface mining overlay and subject to a zoning change procedure for changing the map.

BARCA: So I anticipate that a lot of people out here are going to want to be able to challenge the overlay, and I am trying to at least create some guidelines where we know that what they're going to be asking for is within or without of bounds of some type of procedure to go forward with. So earlier you did show the WAC and you had it highlighted in yellow --

MABREY: Right.

BARCA: -- and if we're going to be utilizing that based on the guidance of -- I can't remember what you called them.

MABREY: Mineral lands task force.

BARCA: -- the mineral lands task force, thank you, I think we need to try and stick with one common set of boundaries to work with so... Right now it seems to be if the mineral lands task force used that set of criteria, we'll be looking at the same thing.

MABREY: Okay.

BARCA: So let's go to Livingston Mountain, talk about it. Anybody that's interested in speaking on Livingston Mountain, please, when you come forward, state clearly the area that you're

interested in. And since I've already heard from several people that they haven't had enough time to digest the information and are looking for the opportunity to have this hearing continued, please state that during the time of your testimony even if that includes that as your exclusive statement.

Okay. Livingston Mountain, need more time, and then we won't have to reiterate all the same kind of information, we'll just keep moving through the group.

MABREY: Let me make one more point for the Planning Commission's consideration. This was not discussed very much by the mineral lands task force and would probably not be controversial to them, but these two 160-acre parcels are part of the Camp Bonneville land, and the deed transferring Camp Bonneville to the County was fairly clear in that excavation and mining-type land uses were not approved unless an exception was made by the Department of Defense, but there was also provisions in there for changing those land uses and what was acceptable under the agreement, so we didn't exclude these two areas.

Subsequently I've talked to Pete Capell with Public Works and others, and there's really no intention for the County to ever mine them, there's really no access to them. And so if the Planning Commission would like to make a recommendation that these areas be removed, I'm sure that there would not be any concern from the mineral lands task force.

BARCA: Thank you.

QUIRING: Livingston Mountain.

MABREY: Livingston Mountain?

BARCA: Yep.

MABREY: I thought you were calling for testimony.

BARCA: No. No. I just wanted to hear everything you had to say about it.

MABREY: That's what I have to say about it. There is, I'm sorry, one more thing, there is another part of a parcel to the east of here that doesn't show up on this map, but if somebody wants to talk about that, I have other maps and can bring it forward, it's called the WSDOT parcel is what we refer to it as.

BARCA: Okay.

PUBLIC: Can I ask a clarification question? Can I ask a clarification question? Are some of these actually owned by people that were asked to be put in this, or is this what the geology came up with, or is all of it zoned forestry?

MABREY: This is geology and zoning basically. So Department of Geology showed us the blobs where the rock is and we took out any areas that were zoned residential. Now I know that there are residences on some of these large parcels up in the hills, but they're zoned for forest resource so we didn't have a real clear direction on picking and choosing and eliminating a piece of property because there was a house on it.

BARCA: So for the Planning Commission, I have close to six sheets worth of testimony here. So some people arrived very early, and I think it's my intention to not just bring them up zone-by-zone, but to go through the list and have them testify to which location. Is that acceptable to you to do it in that fashion? We'll be jumping around. All right.

QUIRING: I think so. Maybe we should hear about what Yacolt Mountain is as well then.

BARCA: Yeah. And that would be my next request is for you to talk about the other areas of inclusion.

MABREY: I think Yacolt Mountain is probably the only one that you'll hear testimony on, but I could be wrong. Well, let me just, while we're over here -- no, that's not a good map. There it is. Okay. So this is a parcel that is owned by WSDOT, it's this whole big thing and it's just to the east of Autumn Hills, and the portion that is proposed to have the overlay is only that portion south of the drainage creek, so it would be a boundary line like this. And we've heard, we've got some written testimony expressing concern about this being, this drainage goes to Boulder Creek which goes to Little Washougal River, and there may be some testimony regarding that.

Yacolt Mountain, okay. I'm going to go through this briefly. This is a letter from one of the property owners, I don't think he's here tonight, but he went into --

PUBLIC: We're represented.

MABREY: Are you? Okay.

GIZZI: He said we're represented.

MABREY: I'm just going to show you the maps here that are associated with this so you get a little sense of it. This is such a big area it's hard to talk about. Let me start with this. This is essentially an expansion that would - there we go - expand from the fairly small Rotschy/Storedahl pit here to a significant portion of the south base of Yacolt Mountain and then all around it to the east and west. The identified resource went beyond over here, went over here to east of this stream, but it was the mineral lands task force recommendation that the stream and stream buffer be the boundary for the surface mining overlay in this area. I think some of them would like to, would have liked to have shrink it further, but there was just not any place to say here and no further. I mean the rock's there, you're on the hillside, it's resource zoned, it's unlikely that the whole area could be developed, but there is some access to it.

And many issues I'm sure that will be raised in terms of traffic on Lucia Falls and that would result if there were an active mine up there. Impacts to streams that drain directly to the East Fork which is -- these have -- this is a stream that has winter steelhead spawning grounds in it, there's a lot of effort being made to restore the East Fork of the river. So all those are considerations that kind of fell outside of the purview of the criteria that we had to work with from our perspective.

And the property owner, several property owners submitted information. The one that I'm going to focus on here briefly is because it contains a couple of maps. So this shows the drainageways that go up from the East Fork, and this shows the Huntley family partnership property which is if I recall about 200-acres abutting Lucia Falls Road. I've heard from property owners on the other side of the East Fork as well and some that live along Lucia Falls Road who are concerned about again trucks and impacts to houses that are right adjacent to the road, it's a very, very narrow road. And this is the erosion potential is the, erosion hazardous is cross-hatched and the light brown is indicates moderate slopes. That's all I have for that. I'm sure there will be some testimony.

BARCA: So I'm going to ask the public just with a raise of your hand, is there any other area other than what has been shown that is of concern for you? Can you tell me what area of concern has not been shown, please?

PUBLIC: Bell Mountain.

BARCA: Bell Mountain.

MABREY: So the expansion of Spotted Deer here or is it --

PUBLIC: I can't tell.

MABREY: Is it this area right here?

PUBLIC: I can't tell.

MABREY: Oh, okay.

BARCA: Can you make the map bigger perhaps.

MABREY: So is there some proposed addition of surface mining overlay up there?

PUBLIC: Well, we got a notice.

MABREY: You got a notice.

PUBLIC: Yeah, I'm within 500 feet from it.

MABREY: And your property is near --

PUBLIC: On Berry Road.

MABREY: On Berry Road. Oh, okay. It's really hard to get down to the road level in this. Don't die on me now, come on. Help. I can't do anything with it. I need a battery.

BARCA: You're back.

GIZZI: Nope, you're there.

MABREY: Pardon me?

BARCA: Yeah, it's working.

MABREY: So Berry Road is --

PUBLIC: Can you zoom in?

MABREY: I can once I get in the right area, yeah.

PUBLIC: It's east of Battle Ground.

MCCALL: Which way do you want to go? I can steer you.

MABREY: Oh, down slightly. So Berry Road should be right in that area. I suspect --

BARCA: Yeah, bring it down again.

MCCALL: Am I making it better or worse?

MABREY: No, that's too far. I think you must have got it because the expansion of the overlay right there on the bottom, the little square, and that has already been approved. It's a DNR mine called Spotted Deer and it's way up in the hills, not something that probably directly affects you.

PUBLIC: Well, it says 500 feet though.

MABREY: Yeah.

GIZZI: Mike, should we find out?

MABREY: I don't know to what property that refers to, though, I mean.

PUBLIC: It says my property.

MABREY: Yes, I understand. Do you recognize your property in here, because I can't find it among all the little boxes either? I think maybe we'd be better off to try to do this offline, particularly if we're going to have a continuance because we're not going to get there at this scale.

BARCA: So there was one other hand back there for a different area, just state where it is, please.

PUBLIC: It was your very -- I'm sorry, I've got the crud. It was your very first picture up there, Cardai Hill, and we have two parcels up there. One of them is 168 acres we wanted included in the overlay, and the other is 11 acres to be included. And the 11 acre has a little teeny-tiny rock pit that, I don't know, 30, 40 years ago they took rock out of that. The 168 acres, ours borders a hillside that a company tried to come in quite a few years ago and opened up a rock pit there.

BARCA: So I believe you have your name on the list for testimony.

PUBLIC: Yes, it's at the bottom of the sheet.

BARCA: So when it comes to your turn, you can testify then and state specifically Cardai Hill. Any area that wasn't seen on the map that we want to make sure we cover? Ma'am, up here.

PUBLIC: It's a tiny spot, right in the middle is Tebo's rock pit off of 92nd Avenue and 244th Street, it shows that you're proposing adding some there, we're zoned R-5 in that area.

BARCA: Would you bring that forward with your testimony, please.

PUBLIC: I have not signed up to testify.

BARCA: This would be something that we will need to get on the record. Everybody else, we've covered the zones? All right. Great. So let's go through then -- of course. I'm rushing here.

Questions of staff from the Commission?

GIZZI: I'd like to ask a question, if I could. Mike, in the work session we talked about the task force and we talked about the different parcels, but I was a little unclear on the change in process, and I'm wondering if you can talk a little bit more about that, about you had mentioned that the changes in here are proposing to make a change to the surface mining overlay be a Type III change. What is the current process and what is the change exactly?

MABREY: The current process is a Type IV sort of by default because in order to change something on the surface mining overlay, you have to change the comprehensive plan map as well as the zoning map, and there are no criteria other than a map change. So you go through a lot of discussion of policies, a lot of discussion of GMA goals, you never really get down to the issue of why would we do this. So the intention was to have specific criteria that directly related to surface mining overlay, and it would be a Type III because it's only changing the zoning map.

GIZZI: Thanks.

BARCA: Other questions of staff? Seeing no other questions, we will get started on the testimony. I'm going to ask for your patience as we go through this. If you have sent a letter in to staff, please don't read your letter, we already have it on record and we will utilize it as part of the testimony.

I'm going to ask that you limit your testimony to the very pertinent things that we've talked about, make sure you state what area you're concerned about, what your intention is as far as coming to testify tonight, and if you feel you need a continuance. So I don't want to have to limit the time, but we would really like to keep them short. So if we start getting real long, we'll go to three minutes, but I'd like to do it just being neighborly and everybody get a chance to say what they need to say. So we're going to start with Jayne Siroshon Yeah. Was I close?

SIROSHON: Yes. I've never done this before.

BARCA: So, please, come forward, sit down in front of the microphone, state your name and your address for the record.

SIROSHON: My name is Jayne Siroshon.

BARCA: Use the microphone, please.

SIROSHTON: My name is Jayne Siroshon and I live on NE Spud Mountain Road on Livingston Mountain in Camas. My address is 30210 NE Spud Mountain Road, Camas, Washington 98607.

I've timed this out, it's four minutes and I'll just read straight through it.

Livingston Mountain is home to many hundreds of families from farmland settled generations ago to upscale gated communities. Numerous panoramic-view homes generate substantial tax revenue for our state and local schools. This is not an area where occasional homes dot a forested landscape, it is a richly populated neighborhood where vacant lots are in great demand and new homes are currently being built.

Under the new Growth Management Act, Clark County is required to identify, designate and protect mineral resource lands that are not already characterized by urban growth and have long-term significance for the extraction of minerals. As citizens of Washington, we all understand and appreciate the outstanding job our local and state planning departments do in ensuring that our state has resources it needs while maintaining a high quality of life for all its citizens.

As you are aware, when considering areas for rezoning for future mining, certain areas are excluded. And I would like to suggest that when you listen to people's testimony tonight and consider the extensive residential developments on Livingston Mountain, you will conclude that the area is not suitable due to compatibility concerns.

The criteria for all map changes is that the proponent shall demonstrate that the proposed amendment is consistent with the Growth Management Act and requirements, the community framework plan, Clark County 20-year comprehensive plan and other related plans. According to the Clark County Comprehensive Plan 2004 to 2024, an area is unsuitable for mining if, "Adjacent land use presently incompatible with mining," which is "(appreciable residential development within range of excessive noise, dust, blasting, vibrations, etc.)"

WAC 365-190-070, mineral resource lands, (2)(d) states: In classifying mineral resource lands, counties and cities shall also consider the effects of proximity to population areas and the possibility of more intense uses for the land as indicated; among other things, general land patterns in the

area, availability of utilities, availability and adequacy of water supply, surrounding parcel sizes and surrounding uses, and availability of public roads and other services.

I would like to suggest that the areas indicated on the map for rezoning should be re-examined in light of the sizable communities whose quality of life would be impacted if mining should occur.

The land in question is infinitely more valuable to the state as a continuing expansion of existing residential areas rather than degrading the value of an established and growing upscale neighborhood by opening unsuitable areas to mining. Thank you for your time.

BARCA: We're going to be here a long time if there's applause after every one of these. Now Jayne was very eloquent in what she had. If you agree with that, please come forward and just say I agree with Jayne and we don't need to go through each of the steps again, but say what is important to you. Angela Pond.

POND: Hello? Can you hear?

BARCA: We can hear.

POND: I agree with Jayne. I'm Angela Pond, 9011 NE 312th Avenue, Camas, Washington 98607.

I have additional comments to what Jayne has made. There are a long list of reasons why a change to the surface mining overlay to the region around NE Livingston Road and Camp Bonneville would be catastrophic, many of these reasons will be discussed tonight.

Environmental damage to rivers and streams including the Little Washougal River source, blasting that causes damage to our wells and groundwater, blasting that causes damage to our homes' foundations, walls and furnishings, increased traffic on narrow-winding roads without shoulders, devalued property with resulting decreased tax revenue for Clark County, dust, dirt that aggravates allergies and asthma of those living nearby, but the main topic of my discussion tonight is that of noise, not hazardous noise as I read the guidelines to state no greater than 50 db noise will be allowed when measured at the gate of the site, rather my comments will focus on nuisance noise.

As a licensed Board certified audiologist with more than 30 years experience in the U.S. Air Force and the Department of Veterans' Affairs, I am well-versed in noise abatement techniques and in dealing with problems that noise can present to health, well-being, concentration and sleep.

I will read a segment of a definition of nuisance from a legal dictionary. Nuisances may occur in rural as well as urban areas, but they become more obvious when the area is well-established as residential in nature. The fact that an activity of a certain type is permitted in an area under a zoning ordinance does not mean that it may not be stopped if it develops into a nuisance. If an otherwise legitimate activity threatens the health or safety of the community in general, it can be classified as a public nuisance.

A private nuisance is an interference with a person's enjoyment and use of his land. The law recognizes that landowners, or those in rightful possession of land, have the right to the unimpaired condition of the property and to reasonable comfort and convenience in its occupation.

Examples of private nuisances abound. Nuisances that interfere with the physical condition of the land include vibration or blasting that damages a house; destruction of crops; raising of a water table; or the pollution of soil, streams, or an underground water supply.

Examples of nuisances interfering with the comfort, convenience, or health of an occupant are foul odors, noxious gases, smoke, dust, loud noises, excessive light, or high temperatures. Moreover, a nuisance may also disturb an occupant's mental tranquility. That was all a quote from a dictionary called West Encyclopedia of American Law.

It's well-documented in the scientific literature that noise causes hearing impairment, hypertension, ischemic heart disease, vasoconstriction, annoyance, concentration difficulties and sleep disturbance. Noise pollution is disturbing or excessive noise that may harm the activity or balance of human or animal life. Poor city and county planning may result in noise pollution since side-by-side industrial and residential buildings will result in noise pollution in the residential area. Nuisance noise travels well in our region. It's possible to hear conversations from parties ten acres away. Lawnmowers, motorcycles and weapons firing reverberate in the hills and valleys from hundreds of yards or even miles away. There is no doubt that should a mining activity commence in our region, approximately 300 to 500 residents would be subjected to blast exposure, beeping from backup trucks, motor noise from heavy equipment and noise from rock crushers and extractors at a minimum.

Approval of a mining overlay near Camp Bonneville and Livingston Road is contradictory to the reasons homeowners bought and built in this remote and peaceful section of Clark County. We chose to live in the country for the peace and quite we find there. The nuisance noise that would accompany any surface or strip mining is just one reason to vote to deny surface mining overlay in that region.

Finally, I draw your attention to the notice from Community Planning that a few of us in this room received five or six days ago. I quote, where the overlay is applied, mining and rock processing can be permitted, in addition to other uses allowed under the primary zoning. This doesn't mean mining will happen. Establishing a mine still would require lengthy permitting process, including a site plan approval, environmental review, notice to property owners within one mile and a public hearing, if requested by anyone, close quote. In view of that statement, then, it follows that tonight's hearing is the first step toward the creation of such a mine or mines. We strongly and firmly demand that you stop the process now by voting no on the proposed surface mining overlay.

Thank you.

BARCA: Salvatore and Ellen Fanale.

FANALE: Fanale.

BARCA: Fanale.

FANALE: My name is Ellen Fanale and my husband and I live Livingston Mountain --

BARCA: Address, please.

FANALE: Oh, sorry. 31312 NE 94th Circle, Camas, 98607. You're lucky I remember that. Okay.

My husband and I have been up here for a very short time, since January, and I agree with everything that's been said before, so I'm going to just narrow mine to one specific area which is notification.

We were not notified, nor many people. And I understand that according to the County Code it wasn't required for all of us who might be affected by the environmental effects of this, you know, I understand that. But, again, the reason we chose to be in an area was for the peace and quiet and everything that was said before. I want to suggest along with this that any decisions be postponed,

that this be re-adjoined. There was not enough time.

We received no notification except for the fact that I am on the Board of Directors of The Summit At Autumn Hills, and based on getting cc'd on some other things, we were in shock about what was happening in the last three or four days. I'm not sure that what we've seen so far has really explained a lot of what the area is because, again, the maps are very hard to see, and we're more concerned with the environmental issues that will come later.

I want to suggest that any notification should be to the Board of Directors of any association that is connected any place close to Livingston Road and Livingston Mountain so that that can be then disseminated to the rest of the population. I know you can't send a letter to every single person, but the Board of Directors can and we will be able to do that. This is very hard. Again, the maps are hard to see and hard to read, and we need time to be able to address the issues that you are bringing up. This is a slippery slope.

My husband and I came from Los Angeles, we dealt with many, many planning issues, usually not for mining, but usually for building, you know, commercial properties. Once the first issue becomes approved, the slippery slope in our examples have always been slid. We want this to be stopped before it goes any further. And, again, most of this I will just address had to do with notification and expanding your notification efforts. Thank you.

BARCA: Thank you. Tyler McCullough.

MCCULLOUGH: I agree with Jayne, I need more time and everybody else so far. My name's Tyler McCullough and I live at 29400 NE 70th Circle in Camas, Washington. I have one clarification question to your question from what was that, from a Type III to a Type IV plan change?

GIZZI: From Type IV to Type III, yes.

MCCULLOUGH: Type IV to Type III. So if it's -- I guess my question to you is if it's in Type IV, do you have to adhere with the comprehensive 20-year plan more than if it's a Type III?

MABREY: I think you have to make findings of adherence to the comp plan either way, but the Type III is -- the Type IV is a comprehensive plan change. You're changing the map in the comprehensive plan, to a less extent the zone -- what's being proposed is to make it all on one map,

make it a zoning map and make it a zoning map change.

MCCULLOUGH: I am going -- you have a bunch of stuff in front of you here, but a lot of it's been addressed. But one of the things that hasn't been addressed is I believe the mineral lands task force has done a good job with their goal that they have gone out to go after. The problem is at no point is any property owner that's impacted by the surrounding activities taken into account. And everybody that is out there, there's no city water, and if the water is impacted at all, your property values almost go to zero if you can't drink it, if you can't do anything. Yacolt has had a lot of problems, they've had a lot of problems directly linking because they've had conflicting testimony with geologists.

I work in the finance industry, and I think we've proven that the professionals are not always right and they get things wrong all the time. And so I would propose in the policies that, let's see here, that there would be setbacks of one mile to any proposed site, and that -- I lost my place here, sorry. All right. I'm going to jump around here.

I want to go to the actual policies that they have here. These policies came from the 20-year plan. The 20-year plan also includes what he had addressed that they didn't consider earlier which is the matrix for assessing mineral resources as adhered to as a part of Clark County's 20-year plan.

There is several different provisions in there that deem property unsuitable to be included for a mining overlay. One is visual impact, if it would either create or destroy, it is not considered feasible for the surface mining overlay. If it would -- if it has a biological impact, if there's any endangered or threatened species on that site it would not be, and there's been no studies done for that area. Why this is important is if you include this in, and you find out any of these things later, that you're going to be in legal battles from here on out and that wastes everybody's time.

I'm going to go now to the changes of the newly proposed 40.250.020, and if you go down to Section 4, this is where you get plan approval for the mining sites. It states that a hearing of public notice shall be held no less than 12 months within the approval of a mine and not prior to, and I believe that was a typo, but I think it was a big typo that any hearings or public input needs to be prior to the approval of a mine.

And also with in terms of water quality and the problems of Yacolt is there's no established precedence, that the burden of proof is on the property owner right now if his water is affected by mining. There should be baseline tests done from any well within a one-mile radius of any mining to establish water quality and quantity, and if at any time that is affected, it is not the burden of proof of the property owner, rather that the parties doing the mining have to compensate the property owner with his property value as a whole including his dwelling, or provide city water services to that residence. I look forward to speaking to you at the next meeting. Thank you.

BARCA: Wendy McCullough.

MCCULLOUGH: My name's Wendy McCullough. I reside at 29400 NE 70th Circle, Camas, Washington 98607. I'm going to cut to the chase and I won't bore you with all my little things. So Monday I received a hearing notice in the mail, and I wasn't surprised to receive it because I knew last year that they were going to recontact us again. However, I was shocked by three things, that I had three days to prepare for the hearing. I was only contacted because our property was less than 500 feet from the proposed overlay, which before there was a much bigger radius of contact, and that we had had two weeks before on the last contact, and that this was it before it went to the Commissioners and the Board.

I quickly went into protective mom mode and needed to protect our area. After looking at the proposed map I realized how many homeowners were going to be negatively impacted whether they resided on top of the mountain or down at the bottom part of Livingston Mountain, all the way to 262nd, all the way to the 53rd side. If I only had more time is what I kept thinking.

I contacted Autumn Hills to discover that only one other person to my knowledge had received the letter, and they were actually not as close to the site of other homes that were up there. So I decided it's my job, fliers were printed, they were stapled and I was on a mission. I want you to know that most of these people here are because I went to their house and I dropped fliers off and we got on an e-mail blast, they're not from your letter that went out. So I want to make it very clear that only a handful of people --

(EVERYBODY APPLAUDING)

MCCULLOUGH: I want to make it very clear that they're here because we got together as a community and not because of the letter that was sent out. We need more time. I'm very concerned about the traffic on Livingston Mountain. There are over 142 bus stops each day that there's a school day. There are no sides of the road for buses to pull off if they need to to let these trucks that roar on by that go way too fast.

I need more time to meet with the sheriff to get statistics on accidents that have happened.

There's been fatal accidents on that hill due to brakes going out because of the steep grade. I don't have that information. I want the facts. I need more time, and I know everybody else does. So thank you for hearing from me.

BARCA: So I'm going to ask again, please, can we get through this without the time it takes to do the applause in the middle and at the end. I understand your enthusiasm, but we have a lot of people to get through. Dorothy is it --

ZEVIA: Zeviar.

BARCA: -- Zeviar.

ZEVIA: May I stand, please? I'm about to throw up.

BARCA: If you can stand close to the microphone and state your name and address.

ZEVIA: I will. I am Dorothy Zeviar. I live at 29403 NE 85th Circle, Camas, Washington 98607.

And I agree with everything I've heard, all the testimony we've heard before. Mine's short. We were recently informed of the intent of this petition through a viral e-mail, and of course Ms.

McCullough's hard work, that went out to all of SAHA residents on Livingston Mountain, not through County notification. And to counter what Mr. Mabrey said about the 500-foot requirement only being that which the County is required by whatever to notify us, I counter and say that even though we live within a mile of the proposed area, there is only one road into the development and that same road out, so we are all affected by this mining proposal.

My fellow SAHA residents have provided clear objections to this mining proposal and I would like to emphasize the most serious of these objections, which piggybacks on Ms. McCullough's objection, and that is of safety on the mountain road. We have people who frequently walk, jog, bicycle and

pick up trash along Livingston Mountain Road. As you may know, this road is replete with numerous S-curves, the road has no safety shoulders whatsoever and frequently no ditch area to go into for safety.

So as one who walks, jogs and picks up trash along this road, I'm appalled at the increase in heavy logging truck activity on that road and the lack of safety precautions available to others who use that road. The mountain road was not built to handle heavy truck traffic, including logging trucks and quarry trucks. And I wonder, who paid to have 262 resurfaced two weeks ago, was it the County or the granite company?

At almost, as Ms. McCullough mentioned, at almost every driveway along the mountain road all the way down to 53rd and all the way out to 500 there is a school bus stop, because almost every driveway has school-age kids. The buses run three times a day, morning, noon for the Ks and afternoons. We also have garbage trucks and recycle trucks every Thursday.

The logging trucks run all day long, and if you add quarry trucks to the mix, there are heavy-duty trucks going up and down the mountain road all day long. Additionally, because there is no enforcement of the stop signs at the Y and no speed enforcement, the speed is 20 miles an hour on that road, rarely do any drivers obey either requirement on that road.

Final paragraph. I'm not a physics major so I wasn't able to calculate the stopping distance required for a heavy-duty truck on a six-percent grade, and added to the accelerating difference with a rainy surface as we have nine months of the year up here and with the blind S-curves, but I estimate that it would greatly exceed whatever the circumstances would require if, God forbid, a garbage truck or school bus were stopped just ahead of a logging truck or a quarry truck that was barreling down the road and suddenly came upon a halted school bus.

Does the County really want to place its trash and recycle contractors and our precious school children in jeopardy over some potential or putative income benefit to the County? This probably scenario is too horrible and frightening to imagine. For the sake of the safety of all who use this road and our precious school children, please reconsider the request for quarry mining adjacent to SAHA, it is just not worth the risk.

BARCA: Thank you. Fiorin Zeviar. Fiorin.

ZEVUAR: Here.

BARCA: Do you wish to testify?

ZEVUAR: No, I do not, my wife has done a pretty good job.

BARCA: I think so too. Lori Bock.

BOCK: No, I'm going to decline right now.

BARCA: Thank you. Jamie Koenig. We are at John and Sandra Carner. Did I get that right?

CARNER: You did.

BARCA: Do you wish to testify?

CARNER: No.

BARCA: John and Dianne Earnest.

EARNEST: Decline.

BARCA: Thank you. Hunter Decker.

DECKER: Yeah. Hunter Decker, 27219 NE 64th Street, Camas, Washington 98607. I've already sent you guys my testimony, so I'm not going to bore you with that again --

BARCA: Thank you.

DECKER: -- but I do have some extra information that I would like to share with you guys. And it was about a year ago when the surface mining overlay district gave this purpose, and the purpose was to intent -- it's Clark County Code 40.250.020, and it is the intent of this overlay district to ensure the continued use of rock, stone, gravel, sand, earth and minerals without disrupting or endangering adjacent uses, while safeguarding life, property and the public welfare.

Well, my father up there has a brick mason house, which I have a map here highlighted in blue here and it's pretty much right at that bottom parcel in green, and it's a block house and everything's been documented on record. It's anchored to the bedrock there, and we were told that there was the bedrock -- there's no possible way that the bedrock could connect down that far. And, well, anyway, we've had shaking every time the blasts go off. And if you were to expand that mine just closer to the house, I mean what's going to happen, it's just going to shake more, more, more

and we're going to get more damage and more damage. So I agree with everyone to remove this overlay from Livingston Mountain. Thank you.

BARCA: Thank you. We have Lois Weihl.

WEIHL: I decline.

BARCA: Thank you. Kenneth. By the way, that was our first page.

WEIHL: Seven more to go.

BARCA: Five.

WEIHL: Good evening. My name is Kenneth Weihl, that was my son of course. I live at 27219 NE 64th Street.

BARCA: Move closer to the microphone, please.

WEIHL: NE 64th Street, Camas, Washington 98607. This new mining overlay encompasses land between the existing mine and my property. I was issued a building permit in '98 and to build a masonry home. I'm a 35-year brick mason, I built this thing like a fortress. They've had massive blasts over there that are documented, and I have extensive damage to my walls already. Now you're proposing -- I'd like to show you where exactly where my land is up there. Can I come over there and use your little -- it's right, I'm right here. Move your little cursor there. Right there is my house.

MCCALL: Can you see that?

GIZZI: Yep, we can.

BARCA: Yes.

WEIHL: Right there. I'm 2500 feet from the existing mine, and if you bring the mine into that area right there, all you're going to do is destroy my home even further. It's already been documented, I've had inspectors out there, I mean we've gone round and round with Tapani, this is a big issue here for my home.

I was permitted first there before this mine was there - excuse me - before this mine was ever there, and I think it's up to Clark County to enforce these permits that have -- I've been permitted to already be there. Anyway, I won't bore you with what he just said there.

My property has not been safeguarded, damage has been done and this is wrong and not acceptable. I mean you're tearing my house apart, or Tapani is, and the County will continue to when they start their blasting. And if you continue to come closer and closer, it's just going to get worse and worse.

Also this existing surface mine that you've got overlay that you've had over here at Camp Bonneville, I don't understand why you're deleting it, because I also have a map that -- my son works for DNR, he's got this Olympic soil thing and it shows that there's adequate bedrock over there where that is where there's no homes. I propose that you move it to the west so you're not impacting all these residents that are over there. I mean there's numerous residents all around where you're proposing this new overlay. Can you explain to me why you're deleting this existing?

MABREY: Two reasons. One is that it doesn't show up as having identified bedrock in the Department of Geology study. I'm sorry. You can submit that if you like to, but I'm not going to debate it with you. And the second reason is that there's unexploded ordnance in there and the deed that transferred it to the County prohibits us from doing excavation or mining.

WEIHL: And it's better to destroy my home?

MABREY: Nobody's debating whether one is better than the other, that's why it's not on the map. You asked a question and I answered it.

BARCA: So, Mr. Weihl, I'm going to ask that you and Hunter go ahead and submit your map as to putting it into the record so we'll have additional information. Thank you.

WEIHL: Yes, I will. Thank you.

BARCA: Robert Lowther.

LOWTHER: I decline at this point.

BARCA: He declined? I'm sorry, I missed it. Gordon Fabeck. Gordon Fabeck. Okay, thank you.

FABECK: My name is Gordon Fabeck. I live at 26044 NE Berry Road, Battle Ground, Washington. And I just got this notice the other day. I agree with everybody, but nobody said anything about Berry Road and the notice I got is supposed to have been like with 500 feet. And I'm concerned

with the narrow road up there I had to put up with when they logged up there.

I go to work at 4:00 in the morning and I'd meet five, six log trucks coming up there in the morning, and they got stuck in the snow and I had to go around them and there's no ditches up there. So I'm just concerned about all the traffic, it's a dead-end road, and I'm not clarified if it's, if I'm even in that category. That's all I have to say.

BARCA: So for the record, I believe we need to find which particular overlay component is affecting Berry Road.

MABREY: Yeah, I need to get your name. Do you own other property in the county?

FABECK: No.

BARCA: So we will look into that and we'll find out which parcel is affecting your particular property.

FABECK: I appreciate that.

BARCA: Thank you. And for the audience, once again, if you are interested in a continuance or postponement, please say that at the time that you come up. Even if you decline to speak, if you're wishing a continuance, please speak that out. So Sue and Ken Baker. Oh, so you were signed up.

BAKER: I went back there and signed up. My name is Sue Baker. I live at 8710 NE 244th Street in Battle Ground, and our property is adjacent to the Tebo pit which has been mined by Storedahl recently. I would like to have a continuance. It was such short notice, and your website was down, I wasn't able to access information to prepare properly, but I have a few points that I'd like to bring up.

Our area is zoned R-5. The rest of the Tebo pit has already been mined out and I don't see why they should be extending this into a residential area which is what ours is, it's a narrow dead-end road, it's not suitable for heavy truck traffic.

And also the last point I would like to make is that our water has not been protected. When Storedahl was mining, they mined down deep enough at the back of our property that they cut through the aquifer and our well went dry. I had to fight them to get Storedahl to redevelop our

well, and they reluctantly did and they wanted me to pay for half of it, and I said, no, we had had fine water until then, so they finally relented. But we now have a water level that's about 20-feet lower than what it had been before they started mining, and the water quantity is not nearly what it had been before, and I just don't feel that the County is taking proper steps to protect people from that sort of thing. Thank you.

BARCA: Thank you.

MABREY: Could you clarify which parcel is yours here?

BAKER: Which parcel is ours?

MABREY: Yeah.

BAKER: We are at 8710 NE 244th, and I believe we are just to the right on this map of your green area there.

MABREY: So right in here somewhere. All right. The reason these three parcels were added was because the property owners requested it so...

BAKER: I understand that. Thank you.

BARCA: Theresa Springer.

SPRINGER: I have pictures, is there a way to show them up there?

BARCA: I think that's going to be difficult for us. Can you submit them in the record, please?

SPRINGER: Yes. Theresa Springer. I live at 30114 NE Spud Mountain Road in Camas, and I specifically am addressing the Livingston Mountain, Spud Mountain adjacent area.

BARCA: Thank you.

SPRINGER: I agree with what Jayne Siroshon said and most of the other people. What I'm here to really address - along with Dorothy Zeviar - is the safety of the roads. The roads up where we live once you get off of 292nd and 53rd are actually really old country roads, they're very narrow, there's many blind turns. The school buses can barely stay in their own lanes as they go around the corners, and there's many corners where you're going uphill, turning right or turning left and you have no idea what's around the corner from you.

To have a regular dump truck with a pup trailer up there as long as these trucks are that Storedahl

runs to the other quarry, they just simply will not be workable on our roads, and it's going to create a huge safety issue. As Dorothy said, we have cyclists and we have people who walk those roads continually. There are no way -- there's no way to get off the road even if you're a walker unless you walk off into the brush or you go down a hill because there's nothing for anyone to move off the road on.

The other issue is - excuse me - when we have these narrow roads, and we do have the bus stops on them, as you come around these corners there is absolutely no way to see what is ahead of you more than sometimes 10 or 15 feet. And these trucks, as I've seen them, come up from 53rd and they just haul their little trucks around and they don't stay on their own sides of the road, it creates a huge safety issue for us. When we're coming downhill or when we're coming down through these things, we have to go very slow just to make sure that we don't run into somebody who is in the road or trying to get off of it maybe into the ditch or up the hill because there is nowhere to go. I think that the whole issue of not giving us enough time to address this was poorly managed, and I do believe we do need a continuance because there are so many issues here that have not even been addressed. And I do understand that this is an overlay hearing; however, my experience is that once an overlay has been granted, that ball will be taken and it will be run with and we will have no recourse at that point. Thank you.

BARCA: Thank you. Keith Christensen. Keith Christensen. Robert is it Colquhoun.

COLQUHOUN: Yes. My name is Robert Colquhoun, and I am the landowner and reside at 26600 NE Bradford Road. My five-acre property is situated just below the quarry. I am very much opposed to any increase in the overlay. What we experience already in the neighborhood from morning till evening within the hours of operation are heavy tandem trucks going up and down the road, plus the rock quarry crushing, backup beeping and blasting.

In particular, the blasting is a nuisance and a hazard. There are numerous instances where my house has shaken on its foundation. The last one which occurred a few weeks ago I thought we were having an earthquake, I looked on the USGS site, and sure enough there was a 1.0 registered; however, it was not an earthquake, it was labeled an explosion. I do not appreciate having to

completely redo all my siding and have my well damaged from the blasting from these quarry operations.

There are also a number of endangered species that live in the area, the Raptors in particular and Golden Eagles and such. On top of that, the road approaching the quarry is a very steep grade with very limited visual for the drivers that come up and down. It's a really dangerous situation, especially with a tandem truck full of rocks coming down that if there's any issue with ice or mud on the road, they're going to have trouble negotiating the stop sign.

Anyway, I bought my property to be out in the country and get some peace and quiet. I realize when I purchased the property there was a quarry, I did not anticipate that it would be expanded and I would like to please suggest that the overlay be removed. Thank you.

BARCA: Thank you. This looks like Joseph LaFleur.

LAFLEUR: Better than most people do. Good evening. My name is Joseph LaFleur. I first and foremost you got a room full of people here who didn't get notice, this should tell you something. We've got to have the continuance. Imagine what would be the representation then. I know that bothers the people who are in favor, you know, their business being expanded, but I'm real sorry.

HOLLEY: I need you to slow down a little bit.

LAFLEUR: I'm sorry.

BARCA: Start with your address.

LAFLEUR: Oh, I'm sorry. I'm actually 26600, I'm his housemate, so I'm Vancouver.

BARCA: Just give us the whole thing.

LAFLEUR: 26600 NE Bradford Road, Vancouver, just underneath the, see that S-curve there with like four or five accidents that have almost taken place over the last three or four weeks from 53rd to Bradford, just right up above that a little bit.

And, like I say, I hear truck traffic out at 4:00 in the morning, sometimes even 3:30. That would be cool if it was only eight hours, but it goes well into the dark hours of the night too with the unmuffled brake (inaudible sound), you know, whatever, no, that's not peaceful. If I wanted that,

we could have stayed down on 164th and, you know, I-14 where we could have had the railroad traffic, you know, because that's, you know, almost the same thing, just a different time of the day. Continuance time. We have these hearings because you're supposed to hear and listen, and since you didn't get enough notice out, continuance. Thank you for your time.

BARCA: Thank you. It looks like Steve Barber.

BARBER: I'm Steve Barber, 27300 NE 61st Street, Camas, 98607. Well, hey, Jayne, I agree with you, I agree with the noisy lady, I agree with Dorothy and the slippery slope, and, Wendy, the lack of notice, and most of all also Ken Weihl who was here earlier. As all these other folks have said too, I think we should postpone this. I think we should have more time to evaluate this proposal. I'm not a proponent in it. I believe that Ken has a really good thought in feeling that we should look at the Bonneville flat area, the lower topography, the lower area where we don't have these steep roads, we don't have the safety issues.

I live directly south of Mr. Weihl. I got the pink property there. I'm down in the lower part of the green, and I built in 1992 I built my house. It's not as structurally sound as Mr. Weihl's is, but it's a wood frame, and I'm just last year I've got several cracked casings and plaster that's splitting. So the burst blasting is tremendous, and it feels just like an earthquake, it really does, and I can't imagine them being right next to me on my property there. Presently I'm about 2800 feet from the existing mine and all of our neighbors are affected in that whole area.

We all have wells, some very deep, anywhere from 150 to 600-feet deep, and I just think that geologically we're going to have surface water problems getting into the aquifers and all kinds of problems here. I just don't think they've thought this out well enough. So I would propose that you reconsider moving quickly on this and consider everybody else's testimony here tonight.

Thank you.

BARCA: Thank you, Mr. Barber. Mark Martin.

MARTIN: Good evening. Either one?

BARCA: That's fine.

MARTIN: Hi. My name is Mark Martin. I live at 26520 NE 52nd Way, I'm about a mile below the

mine. I didn't receive any notice from the County, I heard about this meeting yesterday. And I want to commend the organizational effort that went into gaining this tremendous turnout tonight. I'd also like to say just a few things. Everybody covered everything beautifully I might add from the first person to the last person. And I think the Commission here should be put on notice that these people are going to be continuing this process, even if you choose not to, they will.

The trucks that are careening up and down the mountain are already not following the law, they're not following safety procedures. There's something I hadn't heard of before, they're Jake stopping or they're not doing compression stopping as they're supposed to as is required by the law here in Clark County. I'd also like to request a continuance.

I grew up in California, but I thought I was in earthquake country when after I moved here and I started hearing some of the blasts. In fact, I would Google to make sure that we didn't just have an earthquake, that's happened three or four times to me already just in the last several weeks. I agree with the groundwater contamination piece that we've heard from many, many speakers tonight. Again, the safety issues are paramount down little country mountain roads. I think Livingston Mountain is inappropriate for this kind of mining, period.

I'd also just like to at least rhetorically ask the Commission to consider, are we really suggesting the possibility of mining tons and tons of rocks, pebbles and aggregate this close to a high-risk area and also an affluent area such as Livingston Mountain, and is that really worth the real estate downgrade to the area which is going to cost far more money to Clark County than you possibly could be making from the mining concession that you're threatening us with expansion of.

And let me just say this last thing. I'm not against the notion of mining, but it should be done away from high-risk homeowner intensive areas like Livingston Mountain. I believe that expansion such as the one envisioned here should be properly noticed to all homeowners within five miles, not 500 feet. I for one did not receive any notice as I've already said. Please, do the right thing and vote against an expansion of this quarry on Livingston Mountain. Thank you very much.

BARCA: Thank you. Karen Pickering. Karen Pickering.

PICKERING: I'll decline.

BARCA: Thank you. Debby Bailen.

BAILEN: I decline.

BARCA: Thank you. And it looks like David Demello.

DEMELLO: I decline.

BARCA: You decline. Thank you.

PUBLIC: Continuance.

BARCA: Continuance. So that gets us through the second sheet. We're going to give the court reporter a very valid break. We're going to take ten minutes and then we will reconvene, and we will be starting with Kristen Clark.

(Pause in proceedings.)

BARCA: Please, take your seats so you can be on TV with us. All right. And we left off at Kristen Clark.

CLARK: Hi. My name is Kristen Clark. I live at 5700 NE 280th Avenue, Camas, Washington. I am barely on the map. I'm down here, oh, I'm like a line right there at the bottom of the map. Just to let you know that there have been times where my house, even though I'm significantly away from the quarry, my house has shook from their blasting. I agree with everything that is said before me, so I'm not going to go over that.

One of the things I do want to clarify with, for some of these overlays it does look like there are property that's already owned by people. If this passes, are those property lots going to be taken through eminent domain, or do the people have the option of not having it mined?

MABREY: No. In short no. Basically the overlay means that in addition to the uses that are permitted under the underlying zone, which typically includes building a house, surface mining is also a permitted use, that's what the overlay means.

CLARK: But if somebody owns the house and owns the property already, and they don't want to do that --

MABREY: If they don't want to do that, then nothing happens.

CLARK: -- they don't have to?

MABREY: Right.

CLARK: I just want to talk quickly about the application permit that was currently put in for the current mine. Under their permit they are talking about reclamation when they are finished, they are not talking about getting the mountain to look anywhere close to what it used to look like when they're done with the quarrying, and that's something I would like to talk about quickly.

They are only putting in in some places two feet of soil and in other places anywhere between zero to one foot of soil. They are also talking about putting in vegetation but then turning it back into forestry. How can you grow trees in two feet of soil? How can you maintain a forestry or sustainable tree forestry services where there is not enough either topsoil, slope, to get this mountain to look even similar to what it used to look like?

And if these permits are that we can just completely barrel it down, because when they go back through here, what built up the mountain and what kept it looking like it was is no longer there, it's not going to look the same. Even if they put in trees, it's going to take decades before those trees cover it to get it to look similar to what it used to be, and that was the point I wanted to make.

Thank you.

BARCA: Thank you very much. Conrad Clark.

CLARK: Yes. My name is Conrad Clark. I live at 5700 NE 280th Avenue in Camas, Washington. I agree with everyone from Jayne to my wife on their comments. I would also like to request a continuance to review the matter, and I think that everyone has made some very good points. One of the concerns that I have has been safety, property values and things like that. But if the overlay expands, then the chance for the, there's a chance that the quarry will expand into a larger eyesore, because everybody seems to have been talking about what it looks like from the ground. I do a lot of traveling, and at least three times a week I fly over it and it's getting worse. So I think we should address how it looks and not pass the overlay. Thank you.

BARCA: Thank you. Kevin Tapani.

TAPANI: No comment.

BARCA: Alan Dragon. Ron Bright. Judy Zimmerly. Steve Sonderen. Am I just saying these

wrong or is people gone? That is you.

SONDEREN: I didn't write down to testify, but...

BARCA: It's certainly your option.

SONDEREN: I'll decline, but I'd like a continuance.

BARCA: Thank you. And this is Larry Lindland.

LINDLAND: That's okay.

BARCA: You know it. Okay, Larry.

LINDLAND: How are you guys doing?

BARCA: So you will say your whole name and the address for us, please.

LINDLAND: I will.

BARCA: Thank you.

LINDLAND: Yeah. My name is Larry Lindland. I live at 28101 NE 66th Street, alias, The Estates of Livingston Mountain, okay. First of all, I got to say, I don't envy you guys your task, okay. My grandfather used to have a saying, he says, you know, if you're between a dog and a fire hydrant, you don't stand a chance, well, I think you guys are so... The first thing is I agree with everything that has been said so far. I think the short notice is a little bit small, so I think we could have done maybe had a little more time to work with things, okay. By way of trade, I'm a business owner in Clark County slash Camas and I might like to have you address and think about a couple of things. Now I don't have time to -- I don't want to go over these with you, but these are three surveys on groundwater contamination. And I never really paid a lot of attention to groundwater until I was unfortunately elected water commissioner for our community, but this summation of these reports I think you'd be very interested in and I think you should think a lot about. Because unlike copper mines and other open pit mines that you hear all the horror stories about, it would behoove you to engage some professional people and understand what the composition of the runoff is even from a gravel and sand operation.

Once water contacts rock that has been opened up, you would be amazed if you look at the data as to what the constituents coming off are, some of them might include arsenic, vanadium, cadmium,

all heavy metals. Now there is at best an overwhelming amount of information as to aquifer contamination. You know, and operators will tell you, well, there's ways to abate all this. Well, you know, if you throw an anionic surfactant on something to keep the doggone dust down, you lower the surface tension of water from about 70 dynes down to, you know, anywhere's from 33 to 28 dynes. What that means in just plain old English is it will go like hell through water, I mean excuse me, through soil.

That means you're going to take a lot of sediment and you're going to put it in the underground aquifers, you're going to put it in the streams, and if you talk to aquatic toxicity people, they're going to tell you it kills fish, it kills the hell out of them in a great big hurry, okay. So I think that that's probably something you ought to maybe kind of think about a little bit, because it's just straight up bad news, you know.

If you take chlorinated solvents, which nobody's supposed to have, but if you go onto these sites, you'll find people that are using degreasers with chlorinated solvents in them still. It's amazing to me.

Two grams of chlorinated solvent can contaminate a cubic foot of dirt in less than 30 seconds if it's mixed with water and that means liver failure. And it's just you need to look and think and be -- I shouldn't say that, that's very rude. You probably want to be a little more informed about what you're asking an environment to take a look at.

The last thing I want to tell you is I'm the one that made an ass out of myself at the pit last Saturday. I got run off the road by a white dump truck with a pup on it just right there on the S-curve by 53rd Street. When I got out of the ditch, I went back up to visit with whoever was driving, there were two boys there that were driving those trucks and neither one of them knew anything about it, but when I came around the corner, all I saw was a headlight.

And I have a very, very good friend from many years ago that took a dump truck head-on at the ripe old age of 38, Fred has been incontinent and in a wheelchair since, not a fun thing to think about. So those roads just don't support big trucks. Sometimes they don't support some people coming down them in cars, okay. Thank you. And I would like a continuance.

BARCA: Let's please hold the applause for the very end of the night when we're all happy that it's over. Okay. I need Helen Wormser.

WORMSER: I decline. I do want a continuance.

BARCA: Got it. Sigrund Shoemaker. Steve Polimeni.

POLIMENI: I decline.

BARCA: Thank you. Carole Heermann.

HEERMANN: Here. And I want a continuance, please.

BARCA: Thank you. Dana Samples. Third sheet. Tammy Sonderen.

SONDEREN: I request a continuance.

BARCA: Thank you. Deborah Kellett Lindland.

LINDLAND: Continuance, please.

BARCA: Thank you. Blaine Graff. Mike Bell. Now we have Len Polimeni.

POLIMENI: I'd like a continuance and I decline.

BARCA: Thank you. John Horne.

HORNE: Decline and request a continuance, please.

BARCA: Thank you. Sherry Kam. Dan it looks like Spyker. David Rogers. Are you wishing to speak, Mr. Rogers?

ROGERS: Yes, I am.

QUIRING: While he comes up, Mr. Chairman, may I make a comment?

BARCA: Certainly.

QUIRING: Often in some of this testimony you're speaking to us as if we actually proposed this, and we went through and looked at whether the water quality would be good or whatever, we're actually just a body that's listening to you. A task force came up with this map. And so we're here to hear you, and it's not you guys as us that actually have proposed this, we're here listening to you. So I just want to clarify that in case you think it's us who is doing this.

PUBLIC: But aren't you giving a recommendation at the end of this?

QUIRING: Yes.

PUBLIC: Yes, it is you.

QUIRING: No, it isn't. We're giving a recommendation and we're listening to you, and it will probably affect our recommendation, but I just want to be clear that we, you know, we weren't the ones that actually drew the map.

BARCA: Mr. Rogers, please.

ROGERS: I'm David Rogers, 18114 NE 317th Street, Yacolt, Washington 98675. I'm here to speak tonight about the expansion on that quarry. We're looking at -- first, when the Yacolt Mountain Quarry was put in, there was nothing ever written up or done, anything about it sitting right on top of a critical aquifer area. It is a recharge area for the Troutdale sole aquifer. There's not enough water to quarry the Mountain Top Quarry. They're always out of water, they're taking water out of hydrants without permission, they're pulling into ponds without permission and filling up their trucks. To trust them to go ahead and do the right thing with this quarry up here is overlooking everything that they do presently and allowing it.

The hills are too steep to have any infiltration ponds. The ponds cannot be put in on more than a 15-percent slope, this all lays more than 15 percent. There's no way of cleaning the water once they're done and it runs off except for it to run down. You could see on the map how many tributaries dump into the East Fork of the Lewis River.

The road has an accident rate that should prohibit trucks from using it. It is not constructed heavy enough for trucks, and we should not have to pay for making it possible for the trucks to sell rock. There are too many blind corners with very little sight distance. The speed limit according to AASHTO would have to be 25 miles per hour because of the sight distance. The State of Washington was asked to speak up and tell them what they thought of the roads coming up, going up to Yacolt Mountain, when they done that, they said that you have to provide 481 feet of sight distance. Now anybody that has traveled Lucia Falls Road knows that there's an awful lot of blind corners and there's a lot of people trying to come out of their driveways in the morning, that's a very busy street.

The East Fork was named for restoration. Quarrying will make the restoration impossible. All the

silt that's going to come down off from there, and it isn't just silt, it's silica and it has mordenite in it. Mordenite is a heavy concentrate, the same as asbestos. Once it gets in your lungs, it doesn't come out, it causes cancer, and Storedahl is refusing to tarp his trucks. He's been in here and met with the Commissioners and walks out of this room and goes as far as to say I don't care about Clark County, I don't have to do what they tell me to do. And it wasn't telling, it was asking him to, please, tarp the trucks, keep the silica from coming into houses 150 feet off from the road.

Reports from Cowlitz County says it takes 16,000 gallons of water to keep the dust under control per mile of gravel road. To come from up there down to Lucia Falls Road is well over one mile from the top. That being the case, where are they going to get the water to keep the road dusted, or is that portion of the county going to look at what we look at, trucks going down the hill, dust flying off, cars don't have enough room to hardly get past them, school buses parking on corners where they can't see them. We've had Storedahl's trucks have to go completely off from the road and into the grass in order to avoid hitting the mailman.

In the case with one mile of road, that would be four to five truckloads of water per day, at Mountain Top they still have trouble with the dust and it's not being taken care of. If you go up on that road anytime, you'll see that the trees hang, the leaves on the trees are loaded with that dust. When it rains, it comes down into the tributaries, it comes down into the wetlands. We have two sets of wetlands that lay along there that was overlooked when they did their approval for the Yacolt Mountain Quarry, and I would like a continuance of this issue.

And I would respectfully ask you people to go ahead and erase this. This is a bad idea. Yacolt Mountain was a bad idea, and yet still it wasn't erased at this stage and it got to a point where it was taken out of our hands and out of the committee's hands, they just went ahead and permitted it.

So I'm asking you to go ahead and erase it, get it off the books, it's not a good thing. Thank you.

BARCA: Thank you. Richard Dyrland.

DYRLAND: My name is Richard Dyrland. I live at 27511 NE 29th Avenue, Ridgefield, Washington 98642. The specific thing I'd like to talk about - and I am for a continuation - is that when we did the work on the Yacolt Mountain area, there was a lot of discussion. I was on the committee and

there was questionable information that wasn't clear at what kind of rock material was up there, and one way of finding that out was to look at the well information.

I went back here just recently - and it's in the addendum that I just had passed out to you - and I looked at that well information. I got the information from the Department of Ecology, and a number of things came out very clear to us that we should have had that information when we made our initial recommendation, because what that's showing is that there's several problems. And earlier information I gave you showed that it's the whole area is very steep, it's over the 40 percent, it's in a high-hazard area, there's the 40.430 standards that it does not appear that that area could meet, there's a number of things.

But specifically on the well information, we know we've got high nitrate levels and they're increasing, and as the gentleman before spoke, these are very serious warnings of things to come. But what I want to really nail down here is that as I went through the wells - and again there's over 60 wells in the immediate vicinity around the area that are in and associated or affected by that proposed overlay - I went through and sampled the logs on area Sections 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9. The well depth varied from 74 feet to 620 feet. The average depth of the wells was 249 feet. The overburden depth ranged from 1 foot to 89 feet with an average of 36 feet, that starts raising questions.

And the next layer below the overburden was primarily a soft gray rock made up of clay and quartz mix, and we know that there's carcinogenics in that, and also shale layers that were generally found above the hard basalt and had an average thickness of 60 feet.

Then you get to the basalt, the hard rock that they want to mine. The depth to the hard basalt surface range from 25 feet to 455 feet with an average depth of 158 feet to the first hard layer. That sets up, sends out warning signals that that probably isn't even feasible to mine that area, and that we need to look at that well data and other information a lot more closely just from that aspect alone, as well as considering the fact that it's a high-hazard area which is spelled out again as I mentioned in the 40.430.020 standards.

So hopefully in the continuation we'll have a chance to look at that and maybe we can provide you

with some other information or the staff can follow up on some of those needs. But, again, I stress that the initial recommendation I think all the members of the committee would have liked to have had more information on that. And now that it's -- we've looked -- and I've looked into the well information, it certainly verifies in my mind at least that additional work needs to be done, because as pointed out here recently by Dave Rogers, we've got well problems, we've got road problems, there's a lot of things going on up there.

In the old geologic report that was originally made or geophysical report specifically said that is not the area to go in and mine because of a whole range of problems, of the way that rock would shatter and the quality of the rock. At that time several years ago they chose to ignore that, now it looks like we're either going to pay a high social and economic price and a health-wise price, or we need to make some different decisions and carefully think through this before we go any farther.

Thank you for the time.

BARCA: Mr. Dyrland, before you go, for the record, can you state what committee you were on and you're speaking of?

DYRLAND: I was on the minerals overlay committee, and I felt there was a responsibility to help you folks and the County Commissioners to make the best decision possible, and so I felt it was important to bring this information forward. And, again, I want to state that Michael Mabrey had a very challenging job and he managed things well, and time pressure was very difficult. And I hope we can continue to move ahead on this and get the results that are going to do something positive for all the people in Clark County.

And just as an additional thought, it's no secret that 50 to 60 percent of the gravel and rock mined in Clark County is exported out of the county. We don't have a shortage, we certainly want to have reserves of hard rock and gravel. But when we're exporting that much material, that argument that we're running out isn't going to hold the kind of water one would expect it to hold, not that we don't have to prepare for the future, but things need to be put in careful perspective. Thank you.

BARCA: Thank you. Gayle Rundstrom.

RUNDSTROM: Hi. My name is Gayle Rundstrom. I live at 31101 NE Spud Mountain Road,

Camas, 98607. I'm in the Autumn Hills development on Livingston Mountain, and there are just a couple of points that I want to expand upon what's already been said.

One person mentioned that they didn't know about accidents happening on Livingston Road, and I do know that a few years ago a logging truck failed to was not able to stop at the stop sign at the base of Livingston Road and 53rd Street and ran into the trees on the opposite side, turned the truck over and he was killed. So those are definite, you know, accident issues in that neighborhood.

There are also issues with emergency vehicles getting up and down the hill because the road is so tight, narrow and windy.

We also have a lot of clouds and fog on the road even during the day. It can be clear down here in Vancouver in the lower elevation, but Livingston Mountain goes up to over 1900 feet and we'll get a lot of fog where you can't see more than five or ten feet in front of the vehicle, and with heavy trucks and vehicles on the road, it makes it all that more likely that accidents will happen.

I personally would like to not have a continuation because I would like the Planning Commission to recommend that the expansion of the mining overlay not occur. Thank you.

BARCA: Tom and Linda Tompkin.

TOMPKIN: I didn't sign up to speak.

BARCA: That's fine. William, I'm having trouble with this, is it Cocks?

COCKS: Cocks, yes. I decline to speak, but I would request a continuance.

BARCA: Thank you. Fred and Rose Neumann.

NEUMANN: Fred Neumann here. At a minimum continuance or just throw out the whole idea.

BARCA: Thank you, Fred. Stan Greene.

GREENE: Ladies and gentlemen, my name is Stan Greene. I'm speaking on behalf of my son Alan Greene who's unable to attend tonight. He's the property of record --

PUBLIC: We can't hear.

GREENE: This mic?

BARCA: That's good.

GREENE: Sorry. My name is Stan Greene. I'm speaking for my son Alan Greene who's unable to

attend tonight, and he's the property owner of record. His address is P.O. Box 2844, Battle Ground, 98604. Our family - if you could put up Yacolt Mountain - has owned property there since 1955. Part of my life and growing up in another state, I had a neighbor that I was -- I have direct firsthand knowledge of living in a mining area next to mines, and I know exactly the hazards and the adverse things that we had to put up with.

I would respectfully request the -- well, let me address this. I'm going to refer to WAC 365-190-070, mineral resource lands, part 2, classification data or criteria. Areas shall be classified - and I'm going to try to quote - as mineral resource lands based on geological, environmental and economic factors, existing land uses and landownership. Well, the staff has addressed the geological and the environmental and the economic factors. I'm going to mention some things that I respectfully wish that you would pass on for consideration concerning existing land uses and landownership.

Yacolt Mountain, I'm talking about the north side, northwest side, there's more than 20 homes there. And I would respectfully request that you consider that the parcels with homes should be excluded from the mining overlay just as R-5 is excluded, and also to please exclude parcels with severe erosion hazard areas.

And the previous gentleman spoke about that, and I could give you direct firsthand knowledge. And if any of you want to meet with me or staff does, I'll take you out and I'll show you the stream that I grew up around and I've observed since 1955. It changed after Storedahl came in, the water volume reduced, silt became present, the fish have disappeared, the beaver are gone, there's a beaver dam there. This is on the south side across from us. If you want the parcel number, it's 230281, and it's our neighbor across the road. And he told me and my son when we met with him last year, that since the mining has occurred that his well has decreased in volume and it goes dry, and there's cracks on his house that he showed us.

And I was told by staff today that these parcels that have the homes on them, as I said there's about 20 homes, some of them are classed as resource lands but they have homes and there's families there raising children. Could you please give consideration to the resource lands if it's classified as

forestry or timberland. It seems to me that it would be more proper to give that type of resource precedence over mining. Growing trees is less damaging, in fact, to the environment, it contributes to the environment, it helps it. Also if it would be possible to please give the landowner the option to be excluded from the mineral resource lands map overlay. We should have a choice on these issues.

I should say that where the previous gentleman stated about the severe erosion hazard areas, the Clark County property information on the website if you look up several of these parcels, which lie south of Yacolt Mountain Road, it says and this is from the Clark County Environmental Services, severe erosion hazard areas, and that's geological hazards. And I think for that reason, they should not be added to this mining overlay.

I guess finally what I'd like to please that you consider the expansion of the mining overlay not occur in the Yacolt Mountain area. And as I previously stated, these issues would also apply the land, existing land uses and landownership that also applies to the other people that were being affected in the Livingston Mountain area, and those are important issues for all of us. Thank you very much.

BARCA: Thank you. DeAnna Woolston.

WOOLSTON: DeAnna Woolston. I live at 8816 NE 244th Street in Battle Ground, Washington, so right by Sue Baker's place, I'm hoping you can pull that up. And thank you for your time and thank you for listening to us, I do appreciate that.

So I realize gravel mining is necessary. We've lived by a gravel pit now for eight years. My brother works for a road building company which uses gravel heavily. I'm not a NIMBY because it is in my backyard, it really directly is in my backyard currently. I know exactly what it looks like, sounds like and feels like to live next to a gravel pit.

We bought our property because it was on a quiet dead-end street and it was great for kids, and we now have three kids, 7 and under, and most of our neighbors' kids are grown up. And I think this current proposed gravel area overlay is being proposed by two neighbors who would like to sell and get out and get the maximum amount for their property, but we still have children to raise there

and we'd like to continue raising them.

We bought our property under the understanding that Storedahl would be done mining in a few years and return ownership and convert that area into a natural area, so we figured we could put in the time, and we have put in the time. We've seen the mining, they've mined all into the night I think with County approval at 2:00 and 3:00 in the morning. I have twins, if you can imagine what one kid is like waking up in the middle of the night and just double that, and their huge lights, they're constantly beeping.

A few years before we bought our property our water well was affected too, and I believe it was redrilled. They were supposed to come out and check our well every six months to make sure the levels were fine, since we've lived on the property they've checked it once.

I ride my bike around a lot and I almost became a hood ornament to Storedahl's trucks just a week ago, so you could have used me as an example of how gravel trucks are dangerous because I would have been splatted between those two trucks, it was a truck and trailer. They race up and down our street, they're loud. Our property values will be impacted too. We live in a rural area, and most of our neighbors on our street are fabulous people. I believe we're really close to the urban growth boundary as you can see from that map there, we're on 244th and you can see we're just down the way from that, and Battle Ground is ever growing and we are in R-5. So both of those reasons I think this is done.

We put in our time.

Storedahl has been a bad neighbor, they've polluted the Lewis River, they have a record of violating the law and have even gotten fined for that. And gravel is an important resource, but so is open space, agricultural land. Most of our neighbors have lived there for 50-plus years. The guy across the street, his family homesteaded the property. So I think it's time that we consider our other good resources such as open space, agricultural land and good families in our county. Thank you.

BARCA: Thank you. George Kinsey. George. Thank you.

KINSEY: I'm George Kinsey. I live at 8811 NE 312th Avenue in Camas, and I agree with Jayne and Angela and all the others. I ask for a continuance. And the question I have is in the former

Bonneville Camp area on the eastern edge next to The Summit At Autumn Hills, is that area being considered? I think the gentleman over here said it was maybe it wasn't being considered, and the reason why I'm asking is because that area has unexploded ordnance in it.

MABREY: Here?

KINSEY: On the eastern edge, yes, right next to the very eastern edge of what was Bonneville, Camp Bonneville.

BARCA: So, Mike, for the record, why don't you clarify again the existing agreement with Bonneville.

MABREY: Let me just move over here. So the agreement with Bonneville is that in transferring the land to the County, the Army said part of the deed was no excavation, no mining, nothing that would, you know, disturb a significant amount of land.

There are also provisions in there that said these restrictions can be changed with the agreement of the Department of Defense and the Army, et cetera. So there are two large parcels, the very northern part that's green is part of Bonneville. And in my introductory comments, I noted to the Planning Commission that it's certainly within their purview to recommend removing the overlay. This is the mineral lands task force work that is before you, they didn't spend a lot of time focusing on that issue.

KINSEY: So you recommend that they remove the --

MABREY: I'm not recommending anything. I'm saying the Planning Commission could make that recommendation to the Board.

KINSEY: Oh, the Planning Commission, okay, to remove the overlay of what was formerly Camp Bonneville?

MABREY: Right.

KINSEY: Okay, thank you very much.

BARCA: Thank you. Laurie Kinsey.

KINSEY: I decline to speak and request a continuance.

BARCA: Thank you. Alan Kabel.

KABEL: I live at 8415 NE Livingston Mountain Road, it's a little bit to the east, that small piece is a really good illustration. When I look at the overlay map --

HOLLEY: What's your name?

KABEL: Alan Kabel, 8415 NE Livingston Mountain Road. When I look at the overlay map, and I look at the small piece to the east that you have marked, if you move the map to the left, you'll see it.

MABREY: It's not on this map, but I'll bring up the one it's on.

KABEL: I saw it before. Oh, okay. Yeah. It's just that little piece that's very strange just because there's a road called L-1000, the DNR road, and to the left of that road is just a little piece that's marked in the overlay. And if you were there, you would see those two lots that we're looking at that you can see with the what looks like a stream leading up to one of them, those lots are actually, it's actually a big hill.

So what you have is these two lots are probably about 1700 feet, and then you go down to the road that leads to the subdivision, that's probably 1500 feet, and the DNR road is about 1200 feet, and there's just about, I don't know, 100 yards of space on the overlay map between the DNR road and the subdivision road, and you can tell that the road was built up so that it would be able to be there, and the bus stop is there.

So I can't imagine blasting of any kind taking place in that little 150-yard buffer or area between the DNR road and the entrance to the subdivision, because it would be like it would all fall apart, the entire bus stop would fall apart and the entire road would fall off the side of the mountain. I mean if you've ever seen it, you'd know what I was talking about, and unfortunately he doesn't have it on the map now, the area that's marked.

So I just wonder if folks were actually up there when they laid out the overlay map and the areas being considered, if they were actually up there and visually saw the topography itself. It's just a tiny little area if he gets it up.

MABREY: Is this the triangular parcel that's owned by Joshua Barnwell?

KABEL: Yeah, it backs up to those lots you just had there, it's a little tiny little --

MABREY: Yeah. Right at the V there's a lot there with a house on it, and that's not included in the overlay because it's zoned for residential use.

KABEL: But the overlay backs right up to that house, yeah, and then there's a house on the corner there too, that's where I live. So actually if they were to mine there, they'd be less than 100 yards from my house. And it's interesting because it's just a giant hole if you saw it, if there was any blasting to take place there, the entire entrance to that subdivision would probably fall right off the mountain. So that's my point, that's the only point I wanted to make. Next time I'll have pictures. And I want to request a continuance as well. Thank you.

BARCA: Thank you. Tom McConathy. Mark is it Bonther?

BOYTER: Boyter.

BARCA: Boyter, sorry.

BOYTER: So Mark Boyter, B-o-y-t-e-r, at 26906 NE Highland Meadows Drive in Vancouver. A couple of things. The two large lots for that were part of Camp Bonneville, if nobody's got an issue with removing them, and there's no plans to mine in those areas, can we just get them removed or what's the process to get those taken out of the overlay?

BARCA: You say that would be your preference and then it goes on the record and we will deliberate that.

BOYTER: So then that was the other second question I had is to me there -- it would help if there was a little more clarity as far as the step-by-step process. If there's a property or an area that someone wants to have removed from the overlay, if you guys could maybe send an e-mail or make a real clear set of instructions on what's the process to get something removed, because there seems to be a little bit of confusion, a little uncertainty on that sort of thing, so I would ask that.

BARCA: The overlay is a recommended area that potentially holds minerals that make it valuable enough to consider the mining based on the task force recommendation and the survey that we got, geological survey. What is it?

MABREY: That's aggregate inventory.

BARCA: So some authoritative figure that says this is where they believe minerals are. So the

overlay is just that, a potential zone. It hasn't been ground-truthed, as we heard previously, that it may not be the right place to mine because of topography, it isn't a permitting process for any particular mine or quarry to start working, it is just the idea that says this is an area.

When you talk about getting your specific parcel out of it, I think the bigger consideration for all of the public here is still the concept of the impacts adjacent to you whether your parcel is actually in the overlay or not. So certainly you as a homeowner, as a resident owner have the right to say you would like your parcel out. You have the right to come forward and say you would prefer the Bonneville area not to be included.

But the deliberation about the overlay in that particular boundary is more a conceptual zone than it is rather than whether they're going to put a mine on your property which would be your decision once the overlay is in place.

BOYTER: Well, I guess the reason I'm asking is the rectangular shape in the middle, that's the neighborhood I live in and that was removed somehow. My understanding at one time that was part of the overlay and my neighborhood got removed and that's why it's a big white rectangular space in the middle. So there was some process, and I wasn't a part of it, but there was some process to get that area taken out of the overlay.

And I just want to know what that process is for the other, my neighbors, so if they want to do the same, I'd like for them to have kind of a step-by-step list of things they need to do to get their properties taken out of that overlay, and so if you guys could share that information. There's got to be some process to how they did that and what you do to make that happen; right?

GIZZI: So it would be my guess, and, Mike, you might have to back me up on this, but I would guess that those parcels are residential parcels, and the task force didn't include any residential parcels in their decision-making process. Now it's possible that's wrong, I'm guessing, I wasn't on the task force either, but we did hear Mike say earlier that residential parcels were excluded from consideration.

BOYTER: We're zoned I think it's forest, forest resource or something like that.

GIZZI: I don't know that. I couldn't say.

BARCA: Can you speak, Mike, to the block in the middle that has been removed.

MABREY: I'm not sure I could give you a definitive answer right now. It is clearly occupied by single-family residences on fairly large lots, but I don't recall the exact deliberation that led to it not being included in the overlay or --

BARCA: So back to the mineral task force and their recommendation?

MABREY: Right.

BARCA: So at this point in time we haven't done anything to try and exclude any parcels, so we're working basically off of the task force recommendation based on where they believe the aggregate was, and you got lucky somehow and were early in the process.

BOYTER: Well, see, okay. That's the kind of answer that makes people cynical about showing up to meetings like this.

BARCA: Sure.

GIZZI: Understood.

BARCA: And if we were able to give you an answer, that would mean that we already had done the deliberation and had some logical thought process behind it, but we are just being presented with this information just like you guys are, and so we are listening and we're trying to take it all in. We don't have boundary distinction for the overlay already decided.

BOYTER: So for someone who lives in the property right next to our neighborhood that's in green and they want to have their property taken off that overlay, other than coming here and giving a speech to you guys and begging and pleading and hoping you guys will make good decisions regarding our properties, there's no written out process, there's no step-by-step if you want to get your property removed, here are the steps you need to take, there's nothing like that?

MABREY: Right now we're in the process of adopting not only the overlay, but the rules for adding and removing the overlay. So until it's in place, there's no action to be taken to remove it. You're looking for a formal method --

BOYTER: Yeah.

MABREY: -- that to change something that doesn't exist yet except as a proposal on paper so...

BLOM: I think to answer your question, though, if we do adopt this, one of the actions proposed is to adopt a formal policy so that it can be changed later. Is that a fair assessment of --

MABREY: Yeah.

BLOM: Say if we just approved everything tonight?

MABREY: But there will be a procedure, correct.

BLOM: Then one of the things that's on here is a proposed action, and we have five pages of it here, that lays out what you need to do to take your particular property out of the overlay.

BOYTER: Okay. All right. Fair enough. Thank you.

BARCA: Steve Erickson. Scott is it Schnuck. Desmond Caravella.

CARAVELLA: I decline.

BARCA: Robert Grotter.

GROTTER: Decline.

BARCA: Jenny Howd.

HOWD: I'd like to speak. Sorry about the outfit, I haven't had time, I worked the last three days. And so I happened to see this a couple of nights ago, and haven't had the research so I don't have the facts, and the next meeting I will have lots of them. I'm Jenny Howd. My address is 5600 NE 292nd Court, Camas, Washington 98607. I agree with everybody and also ask for a continuance. I happen to live at the corner of Livingston Road and 53rd Avenue. There was a gentleman in a log truck of several years ago that his brakes went out, he crashed, he died. Last year where the mining is on 262nd and Bradford, there was another gentleman that could not make the turn, crashed in one of those big dump trucks, he severed his arm, bled to death and that was just last year in one of those big trucks.

I have been run off the road twice within the last month. These big huge trucks going down 53rd on the curves, cutting over into my lane and me having to get off the road. I've had to replace my windshield because at passing these gravel trucks, not following behind, passing beside, they've cracked my windshield and I'm not getting any reimbursement from that.

The corner of Livingston Road and 53rd is at the snow line. Camas School District has deemed it

too dangerous to bring the school buses up during snow. And we get a lot more snow, a lot more days than what you do down here in the valley, and if they deem it's too dangerous for school buses to get up there, you're expecting dump trucks loaded with tons of gravel and rocks to go up and down that road. Last year I happened to, sorry, last year I was coming back and a cement truck, we happened to have a freak little snow storm, and it took me two hours to get home because the cement truck tried to go up Livingston Road off of 53rd, slid, blocked the whole road, they had to get special tow trucks in, it's just, you know, not worth it.

I moved out there for quiet. This morning at 6:44 one of the dump trucks going to the Bradford, that new gravel pit, was using its air brakes (inaudible sound) and we hear that with the logging trucks. And two weeks ago, if you go down at the corner of 53rd and Livingston, there's like 10 to 12 fresh skid marks where these trucks are, you know, trying to stop and they're having a hard time. And you put any ice, snow or rain on it, you're going to kill a lot of people, and, you know, it's going to be on your guys' hands. You have the chance right now to say no, this is a stupid idea, it's a residential area, it's not wilderness.

You know, you guys have permitted lot after lot after lot to be built up there. It's a community. And when we moved up there ten years ago, we didn't have this threat going on and there were a lot less people, and now there's traffic jams sometimes going up there. It's not a rural community anymore, it's a suburb, it's a part of Camas. We paid extra to live in the Camas School District and have our children be educated. We wanted something that is nice and quiet, and this is not it. We didn't buy into this. We've been here longer than what they're proposing this, so it should be a no. Thank you.

BARCA: Thank you. David Hill. David Hill. Sue Baker.

BAKER: Decline. I already testified.

BARCA: Oh, that's right. Linda Rectanus.

RECTANUS: I decline. Thank you.

BARCA: Greg and Tami McKee.

MCKEE: I'm Greg McKee.

BARCA: Come on up.

MCKEE: Yeah. I'm Greg McKee, 5718 NE Livingston Road, Camas, 98607. And she just talked about the area, I live on Livingston Road just off of 53rd and that's a very dangerous area. I don't know if there will be gravel trucks coming down there, but right now it, you know, it's steep. There was outside -- I wasn't familiar with the logging trucks, but we had a cement truck, the one with the big tube on the top that, you know, is used for pouring foundations, he lost his brakes and went from Hancock all the way down Livingston Road, across 53rd, through two trees, was killed when he hit a boulder and stopped right in front of that mobile home, you know, which had a family in it. Anyway, my concern is, you know, like everybody else, all the issues I've heard tonight. But I ride a motorcycle almost daily, it's my transportation, and we've lived up on that mountain for about 22 years. The gravel that the trucks when they leave the existing gravel pit down the mountain, there's a couple of things happening.

The trucks have been really aggressive lately, and I'm in clear sight, I've got my headlight on, I even I keep it on brights, you know, just to inform cars, and these trucks will pull out right in front of me. And if it wasn't for my defensive driving, like I'm invisible, I would have been taken out a number of times just in the last couple of months.

The other thing is when the gravel trucks leave going up or down, especially up, up the hill from the existing pit, a lot of times, especially on the older trucks their tailgates aren't completely closed, so what they'll do is they'll leave gravel on the roadway, and on a motorcycle that can kill you, you know, it's not like having four wheels, especially if you're going down. So it's just very dangerous. And I know a motorcycle is just a small portion of the vehicles out there, but, boy, I'll tell you, when you ride, I ride all winter, I don't ride in the ice or snow, you know, so that limits me down to I probably miss about four weeks, but it's really dangerous, you know, and I can't imagine, there's kids on bicycles there. The truck drivers are very aggressive, you know, they must be on a real time schedule. Anyway, I just wanted to mention that. Thank you.

BARCA: Thank you. Tami McKee.

MCKEE: I decline, but want it continued.

BARCA: Thank you very much. Tony Martin. Cynthia Frankel. It looks like Jerald Earl.

EARL: Jerald Earl. I live at 31410 NE 90th Circle there in Camas, 98607. I just take just a minute because I sat here for three hours and I didn't want to pass up at least addressing and saying thank you for taking your time out of your busy schedules to hear this, and hopefully you take to heart everything that people have been saying. And I agree with everything that everybody has said, so I won't go over any of that.

I just want to -- if you guys get time, I would request, you know, if you get a little time, just take a drive up Livingston Mountain Road. I know everybody has talked about it, but until you actually see it and drive it, you don't fully understand what they're talking about. And, again, thank you very much, and that's all I had to say. Thanks.

BARCA: Thank you. Danielle McFarland.

MCFARLAND: My name is Danielle McFarland. My address is 27400 NE 64th Street, Camas, Washington. Kenny Weihl is my neighbor, and so he's the gentleman with the foundation house so that kind of gives you some perspective. Yep, exactly right there, I'm next to the triangles. So a couple of things, I agree with everyone else that has spoken, so great little summary there.

A couple of things that concern me of course is the death of the drivers, the accidents that have happened. My son required emergency support a couple of years ago, it took 15 to 20 minutes for an ambulance to get there. The paramedic looked at me and said, I'm not comfortable with the response time. If your husband were ever to have a heart attack, please ask for a helicopter.

That is coming from a Camas paramedic who's not comfortable with the response time. So with the amount of accidents that can happen from these quarries, the fact that they can be deadly or very bad, bleeding to death, I didn't even know about that, that's really sad, chances of a fatality are higher, so I ask that you consider that.

I recommend that the resource land be used for timber, maybe a lesser of two evils. Timber grows quietly and it does produce income, so I'd like that to be considered. I am concerned that it would be easier for you guys to make the decision to let this pass now and for that future application process to be on someone else's shoulders, so I'd ask that you take that upon yourselves to stop the

ball before it starts rolling.

As far as damage to houses, I do have damage to my own home. I live pretty close to the quarries as they are now. I'm at home all day, my husband and I both work from home, and the blasts they're pretty terrifying. I personally invite you out, come on out for a day when you know there's going to be a blast, come see and feel what it's like, feel what the explosion is like. I'll make it worth your while, I've got a trout pond, you can come fishing, you're more than welcome to come out, it's worth it, it's worth it for you guys to know what it's like to be out there. So before you make the decision, maybe come out, take a drive, look at what the roads are like, so that's all.

Thanks.

BARCA: Any questions? Thank you. Vic Drury.

DRURY: Yeah, I decline, but I'd like a continuance.

BARCA: Thank you. Peter Quinn.

QUINN: Request a continuance, please.

BARCA: Thank you. Sally Gifford.

GIFFORD: Good evening. My name is Sally Gifford. I'm at 8201 NE 297th Court. And our property is the little triangle, if you scoot this down, the little triangle right there that borders the Bonneville corner --

MABREY: This one?

GIFFORD: Yes. -- and when we moved up there, you know, it was very rural, a lot of property. We knew that Bonneville was being transferred, and there was a lot of promise of a big park and trails and expanded systems, then that changed not too long ago. And then there was this fear of when they found unexploded ordnances in that corner area up there, and so they spent a lot of time and they repaired all the fences, they put up placed all the signage, no trespassing for the danger. And so again, I'd just like you to reconsider probably, you know, excluding that from the mining overlay.

There's also from our land there we were one of the lucky homeowners that had, we have a well that went down 48 feet through 10 feet of bedrock and we have 27 gallons a minute, so we hit a

very nice aquifer, the water is wonderful, and, you know, again as others, people said the concern of the water and the impact to the environment. So, again, like you to reconsider. And I concur with a lot of the statements on the safety and the quality of life that we would experience if this was approved. Thank you.

BARCA: Thank you. Well, that's the last on the sign-up sheet. Before we get all giddy, is there anybody else that wants to come up and testify, because there always is? All right. I see a hand back there. I'm going to ask that people that have testified already don't come up for a second time, but anybody that hasn't had a chance is able to come forward.

SHAFER: My name is Lauren Shafer. I am at 29311 NE 70th Circle, Camas, Washington. I'm on the right side of the paper at the corner of the green right here, the bottom, the first corner is my neighbor and I'm the one below him. And I agree with what everyone else is saying.

The one thing I do want to point out that I haven't heard too much is that the Lookout Road development called Diamond Ridge which comes off of Hancock was put in there probably a couple of years before I moved in, so it's been about nine or ten years, and that development hasn't done that well because the homes were or the lots were 3, \$400,000 on the top of a blowy hill and all the trees were cut down. So I believe that possibly, and I could be completely wrong, that maybe the person who owns that development would like to unload that.

It's not so much just the little white circle because there are a few homes right there, but down below Lookout Road is the very crest of Livingston Mountain where it goes down the whole backside, and you can see it's a nice sloping area and there's tons of lots for homes that were supposed to be built at one time there, and it's a very pretty area.

And I can see that if this goes through and that mining happens, that they will mine all the way up to that road and it will be the whole backside of the hill. And not only will we all be affected with all the stuff that everyone has said, but anyone who's in the outer parts of the area that's not even included in this conversation or knows about it will be looking at a huge quarry. It's completely visible from down below. So anyone who's, you know, likes looking at the mountain or something in those areas will be affected also in terms of view and all that. And the other thing I want to say

is that I think the idea for growing trees or whatever, doing that instead is a good idea.

I just am so kind of upset with the fact that it seems that people nowadays will just do anything for money, and the only thing I can think of is that this is all about money in the end since we don't need the rocks and they're being exported out, that takes that off the table. So I guess that property up there just looks like it could be a good money maker for some future quarry owner. And if you want to drive down 214 and look at the quarry off of 192nd, you can see how that's completely blown up that area. That hillside used to have waterfalls going down underneath where the freeway is now and it was really beautiful at one time, and it's now just a complete -- they've mined all the way up to the edge of the houses, and that's what I see what would happen here if this were to all go through and my property would be completely ruined. I would not -- my water would be ruined. Literally on the backside like through my house it would reverberate through the hill. And I think there would be a lot of people whose property values would go way down, and I think the taxes from the assessments on the property values would cost the County quite a bit of money because I think no one's going to buy a house next to a quarry really so... That's all I'd like to say.

BARCA: So before you go since you didn't sign up, and for anybody else that did sign up but they didn't get their e-mail address here on the sign-up sheets, to get continued information the best way to do it is to include your e-mail address. So do we still have sign-up sheets back there that --

MCCALL: No, but they can come and see me and I'll make sure I get them.

BARCA: So, please, come and see Marilee and --

SHAFER: There's sheets going around, is that what it is?

BARCA: Well, I have all the sign-up sheets right now. But, please, make sure you give her your e-mail address so we'll be able to continue to be in contact with you. Is there anybody else that would like to come forward and testify? Okay. Then I am going to close public testimony and we are going to bring it into deliberation of the Commission. So who would like to start?

QUIRING: I'd like to start by saying that I think that we should continue this and deal with it the next time, next month.

BARCA: Jim.

GIZZI: I would second that.

BARCA: So I see that we have a lot of boundary issues, we have a lot of questions about the overlay, the size, the scope of it, and obviously a lot of information has come forward about existing practices and the concerns with those are needed to be dealt with, but they are still issues that would be separate from the idea of the overlay. So just dealing with the boundary of the overlay and the potential impacts of that, I believe that we need to do a lot more work on the overlay before we bring it forward.

BLOM: I would go along with that. I think based on what we've heard tonight, I just kind of want to go through my thought process on this. The WAC 365-190-040 talks about the process that says we may revise it if needed. Based on testimony that one gentleman shared, it sounds like we have a large amount of rocks being exported, so it may not necessarily be needed to include this land. It says in Paragraph (6) that the designation is designed to allow that to be developed at some future point and that changes in the zoning laws around it won't preclude that. Looking at what's around there, it's all forest land or R-5. I don't see any future development happening in that area that would preclude that area from being mined at some point down the road if it did become necessary at some point.

On the next portion of the WAC code that we have talking about the designation of land, in Paragraph (3)(a), (b) and (d), general land use patterns in the area, from everything we've heard tonight it sounds like it does not conform with the general land use of the area. I've driven the area, I know it, I agree with that.

It sounds like there is potential issues with water supply as well as availability of public roads and other public services. I'm not sure if we're going to hear anything next month in three more hours of this that would make me change my mind that the Livingston Mountain area should just be taken out of the overlay, that would be my opinion.

BARCA: And that's very valid for Livingston, although the overlay consideration is multiple parcels as well. Karl.

JOHNSON: I, just about everybody, I've got notes on everybody, you know, the notification process was clunky, it seems to be that maybe there's other people that would want to speak to this issue, but just kind of take another look at this. You know, lots of traffic issues, potential water issues, and I'm talking specifically about Livingston. And so I, again I am very much for getting more information and I want a clearer picture of what's happening up there.

Just kind of a side note here, you know, our job is to listen to you and make a recommendation, and that's what we do. I'm a school teacher, so I taught 7th and 8th graders and I'm standing here, and so a lot of the information -- I think some of the people don't understand the role of the Planning Commissioners. We're you, I get pizza on the work nights, that's my great reward, but we're trying to figure out what is best, and so there is this balance. And I live in a rural area and I understand that, but at the same time we are here also - and please don't read into this, just think about this - we are in this to balance, to protect the resources, and at the same time I would have a hard time if my house was falling apart from blasting.

So I still want you to understand that the goal of the overlay, one of them that keeps coming back to me is that the County must designate known mineral deposits so that access to the mineral resources of the long-term commercial significance is not precluded. So whether you like that it's shipped out of this area or not, that's to me we're looking at our resources, I'm not looking at what it does.

I understand traffic mitigation, I understand all these things, but for me I still am looking at what's the best, and so I would like more information, I would like to hear from more people. I hope the leaders of this would when you come here that it's the goal of you to, especially the associations to say, hey, look, you know, we're reasonable people, but we are not -- I heard a lot of you guys, and that's frankly what's wrong with this process is I'm not you guys, I'm Karl Johnson, I have ten kids, I teach school and I come here and I think this is really cool and I want to make the right decision.

So I want to really encourage you to kind of look at how we're doing this process. So for me I would, for the motion I would, not the motion, but kind of where I'm leaning to is obviously let's get some more information, some more data.

I do want to say, look, if Camp Bonneville, it seems like that is a -- when I mean done deal, Mike, you know, I mean we're not digging up bombs over there or whatever -- it is, we're not, the Department of Army that's not a movable force or Department of Defense. So I mean if that's something that can be done, hey, let's just take care of that because I understand what they did. They just said, hey, look, this is where the minerals are and we're not really looking at what's in there including neighborhoods and people.

So I would ask that we get some more information, educate me some more nicely, communicate me, what that community is doing up there. I grew up in Camas years ago and right next to Bonneville on the other side, so I am sympathetic to that.

GIZZI: So I, Ron, I'd like to say something because I was only seconding, I thought that Eileen had made a motion to continue and I was going to second that, but I'd like to express my feelings as well. Yacolt Mountain actually hasn't gotten talked about too much, but I did pull up the County's GIS sheets and do have some very strong concerns about the County identifying the area as being erosion prone and unstable, and why we would -- I understand how the task force went about making their recommendations, but, you know, we heard from Mr. Dyrland that maybe we should reconsider that. So I agree that we need to continue this process.

And I'd like to talk a little bit about Livingston Mountain, because if I look at Livingston Mountain after hearing everyone here, and Mike talk as well, it seems to me that Camp Bonneville ought to be out of there, and then anything east of the existing mine probably ought to be considered for exclusion as well. It seems like an overreach to believe that we would want to designate folks' homes and neighborhoods as resource lands. And, you know, I went through this myself and completely understand the concerns that people have and the stress and the lack of sleep and the just the thought processes and discussions that you go through when you're talking about your home.

MOTION

So I, you know, I guess I'd like to formally make a motion that we continue this discussion at a later date to be determined by the schedule and Marilee.

MCCALL: Your next hearing date would be Thursday, October 16th was what would have been a hearing date. Oh, October 17th. Whatever the Thursday is, it's October 16th or 17th --

GIZZI: That's why I said up to Marilee because I don't know when the date is.

MCCALL: -- and that what was scheduled for that date has been canceled. So that date is open if you would like to continue to that date and schedule the continuance of this to that date.

BARCA: And does that give us adequate time for noticing?

QUIRING: That's a month away.

COOK: Yeah, that's a month away. Chris Cook, Deputy Prosecuting Attorney. The procedure that we're going through right now is a proposal to amend the comprehensive plan, that's a Type IV legislative decision. Type IV legislative decisions require 15-calendar days of notice. So if people did not get 15-calendar days of notice prior to this hearing, then that needs to be cured; however, scheduling it for October 17th is certainly adequate.

BARCA: So we have a motion on the table. Is there a second?

QUIRING: I second the motion.

BARCA: So we have a motion with a second to continue this to October 17th --

MCCALL: It is the 17th.

BARCA: -- at 6:30 in this room. So we have a motion and we have a second. Can I get roll call, please.

MCCALL: Who was the motion, who was the first and second?

QUIRING: I did, Quiring.

BARCA: Jim's motion and Eileen --

QUIRING: She asked about the second.

BARCA: -- yeah, second.

MCCALL: Thank you.

ROLL CALL VOTE

BLOM: YES

GIZZI: YES

QUIRING: AYE

JOHNSON: AYE

BARCA: AYE

MCCALL: 5 in favor, 0 against for a continuance.

BARCA: We will have time to get more information and more feedback.

GIZZI: More feedback?

BARCA: More feedback. Everybody out there is going to talk to somebody else. So that concludes the agenda for the evening.

V. OLD BUSINESS

BARCA: Is there any old business from staff? No?

VI. NEW BUSINESS

BARCA: Any new business?

VII. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting's adjourned.

The record of tonight's hearing, as well as the supporting documents and presentations can be viewed on the Clark County Web Page at: <http://www.clark.wa.gov/planning/PCmeetings.html>.

Proceedings can be viewed on CTV on the following web page link:

<http://old.cityofvancouver.us/cvtv/cvtvindex.ask?section=25437&catID=13>.

*Minutes Transcribed by: Cindy Holley, Court Reporter/Rider & Associates, Inc.
Marilee McCall, Administrative Assistant/Clark County Community Planning*