

**BEFORE THE WESTERN WASHINGTON GROWTH
MANAGEMENT HEARINGS BOARD**

DANIEL SMITH, et al., VINCE PANESKO, and)	
JOHN T. MUDGE,)	No. 98-2-0011c
Petitioners,)	
)		ORDER RE:
)		MOTIONS
		v.
)	
)	
LEWIS COUNTY,)	
)	
Respondent.)	
<hr style="width:60%; margin-left:0;"/>		

On December 3, 1998, we held a telephonic motions hearing on Lewis County’s motion to strike Issue 6, regarding affordable housing as well as several motions to add to or supplement the record. Petitioners Panesko, Mudge, and Smith, Alexander Mackie representing Lewis County, and Board Members Les Eldridge and William Nielsen were present.

Motion to Strike

The County argued that affordable housing is a specific requirement of the comprehensive plan (CP) and that the designation of an interim urban growth area (IUGA) does not require that affordable housing goals be addressed in the pre-CP process. Therefore, the matter of affordable housing should be dismissed as premature.

Petitioner Mudge responded that the Department of Community, Trade, and Economic Development’s guidelines for designating UGAs call for planners to hypothesize the number of multi-family and manufactured homes in arriving at a desired density for the UGA. Petitioner Mudge argued that multi-family and manufactured housing are usual sources of affordable housing and that due consideration of these sources at the earliest stages of the UGA process is essential to establishment of an IUGA. Smith and Panesko joined in Mudge’s argument.

Conclusion

The language of RCW 36.70A.110 precludes our granting the motion to strike Issue 6. Section .110(2) states that “an urban growth area determination may include a reasonable land market supply factor and shall permit a range of urban densities and uses.” The requirement for a range of urban densities and uses lends strong support to the contention of Petitioners that Issue 6 should be fully heard at the hearing on the merits. Nothing in RCW 36.70A.110(5) suggests that the requirements for an IUGA are different than those for an UGA.

The motion to strike Issue 6 is denied.

Board member Henriksen had previously been assigned as Settlement Conference Officer in this case. Petitioners and the County agreed that she should take her place as a member of the Board during the hearing on the merits January 28, 1999.

Motions Regarding Adding to or Supplementing the Record

We received motions to add to or supplement the index from Petitioners Mudge, Smith, and Panesko on November 25, 30, and 30, 1998, respectively. The parties agreed that more specificity regarding motions to supplement would aid in the orderly and prompt conduct of the proceeding. We extended the opportunity to petitioners to move to supplement the record until December 10, 1998, and to the County to respond until December 17, 1998.

We deny petitioner Panesko’s motion requesting us to allow filing of additions to the index until December 30, 1998.

So ORDERED this 11th day of December, 1998.

WESTERN WASHINGTON GROWTH MANAGEMENT HEARINGS BOARD

Les Eldridge
Board Member

William H. Nielsen
Board Member