

**Three Creeks Advisory Council
February 10, 2011
Clark Regional Wastewater District
10:00 am to 12:00 pm**

Members Present: Jim Carlson, Ron Lauser, Vaughn Lein, James Spinelli, Ila Stanek, Lynn Valenter, Bud Van Cleve,

Alternates: Laura Hudson

Absent: John Peterson, Denny Kiggins, Dave Taylor, David P. Taylor, Beth Holmes, Mike Harris, Ron Wilson, John Caton

Staff Present: Colete Anderson, Oliver Orjiako, Jose Alvarez, Gordy Euler, Laurie Lebowsky, Mary Beth O'Donnell

Vaughn Lein opened the meeting at 10:05. He called for any changes or comments on the meeting minutes from December. A quorum was not present to approve the minutes so it will have to wait until the next meeting.

Oliver Orjiako began with an update on the Aging Readiness plan. A summary of the three workshops held to date was distributed. The Commissioners appointed a task force to prepare an action plan focusing on the projection that in the coming years the majority of county residents will be 60+, and to look at the built environment and address the concerns of those that want to age in place. The workshops have focused on the key areas: housing, transportation, and healthy communities. The next one in March will focus on support services and the final one in May on volunteering and continuing education which is related to support services.

Housing workshop summary:

There is a need to continue the focus on affordable housing, different home design for aging in place in the future that incorporates universal design standards and guidelines adaptable to aging needs, provide for variety of housing choices, and provide information on what is available. A quick inventory shows that the majority of housing stock in Clark County is single family.

Transportation workshop summary:

A key finding was lack of sidewalks based on inventory in built-out areas. Also, there is a need to look at options for mobility other than sidewalks alone. Laurie has worked on the Bike and Ped plan which was adopted last year with good recommendations. She will be leading the charge to implement that plan.

A task force member introduced the concept of "Neighborhood Electric Vehicles (NEV)". We are beginning to look at some areas in the county, particularly the urban areas, where that type of vehicle may be used. The NEV'S look like a golf cart and travel at 35 MPH. Most neighborhood speeds are 30 MPH so they will be permitted on those streets. All it will take is striping of the local streets to make that a reality.

There are also some issues relating to transportation needs of the elderly and the role of C-Tran that was identified. Can one continue to travel on the regular bus system or use C-Van? Another alternative might be a volunteer system of drivers that could take folks where they need to go.

Healthy Communities workshop summary:

How do we build communities to make them healthier for aging? Signage, signals (regulating amount of time it takes to cross major arterials), lighting schemes, affordable housing, etc.

Subcommittees have been working on these ideas and formulating recommendations on each of the subjects. There is huge interest in the community to see the final report of this task force. We will keep you updated.

Jim C. attended one of the workshops. Something he found interesting was that in Amsterdam, at roughly the age of 75, 50% of the people walked or biked and live about 10 years longer than in the USA. What he heard resoundingly was the need for sidewalks and multi-modal forms of transportation within our urban environment to have the ability to walk, bike, or develop the street system to accommodate smaller types of vehicles. Creating mobility options is huge and is what will increase our lifespan. Bud commented that sidewalks were probably in the top two most important needs for improvement, especially in the unincorporated areas.

Oliver stated that as we begin to map out UGB areas we'll be coordinating the work effort with the city of Vancouver and other communities to identify where NEV's might be an option. It is difficult to take drivers licenses away from elderly folks, but if this alternative is available it can work for them. There are some dealers locally (Salem and Beaverton) that we may invite to come and show you what they look like. Pete Capell, the Public Works director, has agreed to champion the NEV effort. There are some safety issues of course, such as sharing routes with the bike lanes. On streets where the speed limit is 35 they can be used the same way as cars. Potentially the option is there for folks that want to give up their driver's license. The county is looking into the possibility of adding a few of these to the county fleet in an effort to lead by example.

Bud said the latest development to be aware of is motorized vehicles are now being allowed on trails. It's vague at this point whether that means motorized wheelchairs or just what it entails. A lot of the trails are not adaptable to motorized vehicles and it will present a new set of problems. If anyone is interested in learning more about this, contact Tim McVicker at the county.

As formal recommendations from these subcommittees become available they will be shared with you. Also as we move forward on NEV's, we will report back to you where we're going conceptually. It could become a guideline in the form of universal design as an option to developers in the future. Some may not be applicable to the rural area. We're focusing mostly on the urban area now. The infrastructure is not out in the rural areas now where the road speeds are too high to allow NEV's.

Laurie from Community Planning gave an update on the equestrian plan. The advisory committee has come up with a draft comp plan and development code language but no adoption hearings are scheduled yet. Handouts were provided on rural kennels and stables, proposed language for an equestrian overlay zone to be adopted into the Title 40 development code, proposed comp plan language regarding equestrian issues, and rural districts proposed equestrian cluster also for the development code.

Why are we doing an equestrian plan? The equestrian community represents a significant component of the county (4.8%). Information was gathered from the Executive Horse Council. In the audience today is Butch Reynolds who is the president of the council and is also on the Equestrian Advisory Council. The BOCC identified the need for a plan due to many people here who own horses or are involved in equestrian activities. Also this plan is a component of the rural lands update.

Key planning issues identified were gaps in the trail system, creation of an overlay district, best management practices for care of horses, and economic development opportunities generally and in relation to the fairgrounds.

Vaughn asked how many horses people have on average. Butch replied about 3-4 but some properties further out have larger groups of horses. A survey conducted by the executive horse council answers those kinds of questions. A copy of that survey was passed around.

Jim C. asked, referring to best management practices, how do we handle storm water runoff in an urban equestrian facility? The group recommendation is to follow the urban livestock ordinances for care of horses. Storm water run off is a separate issue and we have the storm water ordinance to address that. Best management practices go further than waste removal. It's how the pastures are managed. Overgrazing in a pasture creates puddles among other things. Mud management is important too. We're trying to increase awareness of how to manage property that's good for the horses and the owners. Oliver added that what we've tried not to do is write an ordinance that addresses each thing, but is on a case by case basis. A compromise was reached when we drafted the urban livestock ordinance to utilize the conservation district where a property owner would submit a best management plan to the county for review and approval. Rather than create recommendations for new regulations, the equestrian group decided to support what is already in place with the urban livestock ordinance as well as education of best management practices.

Products of the planning process:

Comprehensive plan language regarding equestrian uses in the county and support and promotion of them, proposed overlay zone to go into Title 40, and recognizing and protecting equestrian areas in the urban portion of the county. The group has been struggling with just how we go about protecting those areas.

Equestrian cluster development code: development of communities that are focused around horses similar to the rural cluster code language only with a component where there'd be a stable.

The Rural Lands task force (RLTF) made recommendations as far as equestrian facilities. The advisory committee did not develop the code language, however reviewed and approved it with some reservations. Butch explained the largest cut to homeowners in the equestrian community is to those on small acreage. The RLTF recommendation of reducing 20 acres to 10 acres won't fly. In 1995, a lot of the lands were restructured under the new urban growth and were subdivided down to 5 acres. So in the rural area you'll find a lot of homes with horses on 5 acres not 10 acres. We should be at the 5 acre level not 10 acre level for special permit issues, etc.

Jose said currently if you're going to put in a riding stable it requires a conditional use permit. The suggestion from the RLTF was if you're at 10 acres or above you should be permitted outright and under 10 acres a conditional use permit would apply. If you needed to go through the review and approval process, we've created a Type 2A process to get through it with a visual permit in order to reduce the amount of review and cost.

The code didn't have a clear definition for what a riding stable was. There were different terms used throughout the code. So we defined an equestrian facility, both commercial and private. We define commercial as any facility where you charge for use of the facility; private is for your own personal use. The assumption is if it's for your personal use it's considered an AG structure. Riding arenas are the gray area and the building official has some concerns and will require a permit if it's covered. Existing people who might have a stall to rent out, does that make it commercial? Should that kick you up to a higher level? That's where there's tension.

Ila asked, there's a difference in how they're permitted whether it has a roof over it or not? It's not the roof itself, but whether the horses are yours or someone else's. It's no longer AG then, it becomes recreational and the county is constrained by state code that defines what AG is. Butch added that you don't even have to charge anybody for using the facility. It's the fact that someone else's horses are on that property and that constitutes commercial. He feels this is extreme and there needs to be some other condition given all the equestrian groups and numerous high school equestrian drill teams in the county. Where do they go if we start limiting availability?

There was discussion about the current code and as stated you can have a horse on any five acre lot in an urban area. The best management practice addresses issues of odor, noise, waste, etc. If the owner is not adhering to those conditions, it does constitute a nuisance and violation. There is no minimum space requirement to accommodate a horse. It's really about how you manage the

horses, not how big the property is. The urban livestock ordinance governs practices of keeping animals in an urban area.

The ordinance adoption hearing is Tuesday, February 15 at 10:00 AM in the PSC, 6th floor Hearing room and is open to public testimony.

In summary, the equestrian advisory group met eleven times. The final meeting will be Tuesday, March 8 from 6-8:00 PM at Dollars Corner. To be addressed is the process and adopting the proposed code language, whether we do it now or as part of the 2014 comprehensive plan update. The equestrian community plays an important part of the economy in the county. People in the Three Creeks area want to continue to have horses as they did before they were brought into the UGB. It is an issue that people want the county to address. As this moves forward, we will continue to share it with you.

Gordy from Community Planning gave a rural lands review update. The rural lands task force (RLTF) had about sixteen meetings in 2009-2010. They were given five charges by the BOCC which Gordy presented to this group last summer. Since then, the "Retooling Our Code, or ROC" project is underway in an attempt to streamline the code and make it more efficient. The RLTF made some recommendations that were also code changes, so we put them into one of the ROC batches. Part of them will be in Batch 2B. The hearing is next Tuesday evening as Laurie stated.

Gordy provided handouts of the recommendations and reviewed the items; kennels and stables, right to farm and right to log, and the overlay zone. Batch 4 will also include some recommendations from the task force. Those include making roadside stands larger, set back issues and making county code with regards to farm work and housing consistent with state code.

Transfer of development rights, or TDR: we've had a TDR program as an implementation strategy in the comp plan since 1994 and have never done anything with it. The concept of rural reserve asks are there lands you want to identify that you would never want to develop. From a rural perspective, every time you move the UGB you're moving into rural land. There's nothing on the rural side that would push back. This would be an effort to say maybe there are places that we shouldn't go next time we expand the UGB.

Shoreline Master Program update: This is not a new program, it was adopted by the Legislature in 1971 and voted in by the people in 1972.

Policy goals of the act: Foster appropriate uses of shoreline, protect natural resources and promote public access (both visual and physical). This does not mean people with private property will have to allow public access to their property.

Countywide update: Clark County's plan dates back to 1974 so was in need of updating. We have a December 1st deadline for completion and it will go to the state Department of Ecology (DOE) for final approval.

What is a shoreline master program? It is a planning document, a set of regulations including a chapter on administration.

GMA and SMA connection? SMA is the 14th goal of the GMA, is part of the comp plan and when complete will go into Title 40. The policies will go into the comp plan.

Where does SMA apply? Wherever the ordinary high-water mark lies, the shoreline jurisdiction is 200 feet on either side plus associated wetlands if they can be shown to be connected hydrologically (maximum jurisdiction to include the floodway). FEMA is also working on updates of the flood maps for the county and we won't know until the end of the year when they adopt the maps the full extent of what will be subject to shoreline jurisdiction.

Countywide update: We have a grant from DOE and decided to pool the money with other local jurisdictions and drafted an inter-local agreement. The city of Vancouver is the project manager and accepted the grant on behalf of the coalition. We are working for a single set of regulations for consistency across the jurisdictions. Each city and county will manage their own program locally which makes better sense in terms of annexations, etc.

Six steps: jurisdiction determination; inventory analysis characterization; goals, policies and regulations; restoration plan and no net loss (two new policies); local adoption (hearing probably in the fall); submit to DOE for approval by December 1st. We hope to have a draft for public review by March 1st.

Study Areas: There are approximately 370 miles of shoreline in the county that this program applies to. (map areas in blue show areas of study; includes Salmon Creek, Burnt Bridge Creek)

Phase 2: Inventory and Characterization report; draft published in June 2010; information for document gathered through GIS, state, and federal sources; divided into county and urban areas.

Shoreline designations: The current program has four, the new ecology guidelines have seven. One of them is "marine" which does not affect us here but is mainly for areas like Puget Sound. They will basically be overlays which don't change the zoning of the properties.

Proposed designations: aquatic, natural, rural conservancy, urban conservancy, medium intensity, high intensity. Proposed split: rural conservancy-residential; rural conservancy-resource; adding a third rural conservancy designation of national wildlife refuge. In the current plan, the only natural shoreline designation we have in the county is the west side of Battle Ground Lake and is proposed to stay that way.

What's next? We're continuing on policies and regulations, administrative procedures, and restoration plan.

Outcome of a successful SMP:

No net loss of ecological function; predictability and maintaining quality of life; reference other programs (needs to fit with the comprehensive plan and the Parks plan, etc.); public involvement including dedicated phone line, website, open houses, email box; TAC and stakeholders meetings, meetings with the Planning Commission, BOCC, city council, and about 40 project team meetings (now meeting weekly).

For Clark County the first joint work session will be March 3 with subsequent sessions on Thursdays (as many as needed); three open houses March 15 Battle Ground, March 16 County building, March 17 Camas; comments on the first draft due April 1st; local adoption by late summer or fall; send to DOE by December 1st.

Website: www.cityofvancouver.us/shoreline for schedules, documents, project team, general information.

There was no public comment.

Oliver provided an updated copy of the 2011 work program. At the next meeting there will be an update on the Aging Readiness Plan. Our group is proceeding with electric vehicle infrastructure. It's somewhat different than the Neighborhood Electric Vehicle project. This project is more about identifying where charging stations will be throughout the county. It's required by the Legislature to get on our books by July 1st. We're working with some utilities such as CPU and the city to see what changes need to be made to the code to allow these charging stations. Legacy and WSU have shown some interest. Vaughn commented that it will be a challenge to locate those.

The next meeting will be here on April 14. The meeting was adjourned 11:30 AM.