OCT 13 2023

10:35 Scott G. Weber, Clark, Clark Co.

1

2

4

56

7

8

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2223

24

25

2627

28

29

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON FOR CLARK COUNTY

ZP#5, LLC; GERALD "JERRY" NUTTER; and NUTTER CORPORATION,)) No. 23-2-02161-06
Petitioners,) Clark County Nos. SLR-2020-00009, WHR-2020-0040, OLR-2021-00038,
vs.	OLR-2021-00039, OLR-2021-00073, OLR-2021-00078, OLR-2023-00077,
CLARK COUNTY, WASHINGTON,	OLR-2023-00079, & OLR-2023-00080
Respondent,	ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO DISMISS CASE
and	
FRIENDS OF THE COLUMBIA GORGE, KAREN STREETER, SEAN STREETER, JODY AKERS, PAUL AKERS, RACHEL GRICE, and ZACHARY GRICE,))))
Additional Parties.)

THIS MATTER, having come before the Court on the Motion of Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Jody Akers, Paul Akers, Rachel Grice, Zachary Grice, Karen Streeter, and Sean Streeter to Dismiss Case Pursuant to CR 12(b)(1) ("Motion to Dismiss"), and the Court having reviewed and considered the pleadings, records, and files herein, including the following:

- 1. Motion to Dismiss;
- 2. Declaration of Nathan J. Baker in Support of Motion to Dismiss;
- 3. Declaration of Bryan J. Telegin in Support of Motion to Dismiss;
- 4. Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Jody Akers, Paul Akers, Rachel Grice, Zachary Grice, Karen Streeter, and Sean Streeter's Reply in Support of Motion to Dismiss Case Pursuant to CR 12(b)(1) and Motion to Strike Petitioners' Response;

Telegin Law PLLC 175 Parfitt Way SW, Ste. N270 Bainbridge, Island WA 98110 bryan@teleginlaw.com (206) 453-2884

ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO DISMISS CASE – 1

5.	Second Declaration of Nathan J. Baker in Support of Motion to Dismiss;		
6.	Second Declaration of Bryan J. Telegin in Support of Motion to Dismiss;		
7.		;	
8.		<u>;</u>	
9.		;	
and the Cou	art being otherwise fully advised in the premises, NOW THEREFORE,	IT	IS
HEREBY O	RDERED as follows:		

- Petitioners filed this case pursuant to the Land Use Petition Act ("LUPA"), Chapter 1. 36.70C RCW, to challenge a final land use decision ("County Decision") issued by the Clark County Land Use Hearing Examiner ("Hearing Examiner"). Petitioners raise four Assignments of Error ("claims") in their Petition for Judicial Review ("Petition").
- 2. Petitioners lack statutory standing to bring this action as defined by LUPA because they did not first appeal the County Decision to the Columbia River Gorge Commission ("Gorge Commission") and thereby failed to exhaust their administrative remedies as required by RCW 36.70C.060(2)(d). Under LUPA, failure to exhaust administrative remedies is a jurisdictional bar to judicial review. This case must therefore be dismissed.
- Because Petitioners' first three claims are related to the implementation of the 3. Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, the Gorge Commission has jurisdiction over these claims pursuant to 16 U.S.C. § 544m(a)(2). This Court, in turn, lacks subject matter jurisdiction over these three claims under LUPA, which excepts from this Court's jurisdiction "[1] and use decisions of a local jurisdiction that are subject to review by a quasi-judicial body created by state law," RCW 36.70C.030(1)(a)(ii), including the Gorge Commission, Zimmerly v. Columbia River Gorge Commission, 26 Wn. App. 2d 265, 286, 527 P.3d 84 (2023), rev. den., Wn.2d , 534 P.3d 793 (Sept. 6, 2023). The first three claims must be dismissed.
- 4. This Court also lacks jurisdiction over Petitioners' fourth claim given the contingent nature of the State Environmental Policy Act ("SEPA") findings and conclusions in the County Decision combined with Petitioners' failure to exhaust their administrative remedies by appealing the County Decision to the Gorge Commission to challenge the Hearing Examiner's

rulings that the land use application was incomplete under the National Scenic Area ("NSA") rules. Other than the Hearing Examiner's holdings under National Scenic Area law reversing the County Staff's SEPA Mitigated Determinations of Non-Significance, the Hearing Examiner expressly made all of his SEPA findings and conclusions ineffective unless his NSA incompleteness rulings are reversed on appeal. Because Petitioners failed to challenge these NSA rulings by timely appealing to the Gorge Commission, the contingent SEPA findings and conclusions are not in effect and are null and void by their own terms. Accordingly, Petitioners' fourth claim is moot, Petitioners failed to exhaust their administrative remedies for all four claims because they did not bring their first three claims to the Gorge Commission, and Petitioners Gerald "Jerry" Nutter and Nutter Corporation are not prejudiced by the SEPA findings and conclusions (which are not in effect) and they therefore lack statutory standing to bring the fourth claim. The fourth claim must be dismissed.

- 5. The Court lacks statutory subject matter jurisdiction over this case because Petitioners failed to timely make the Applicant, James D. Howsley, a party to the case, as required by RCW 36.70C.040. Under LUPA, failure to timely name and include statutorily required parties is a jurisdictional bar to judicial review. The case must be dismissed.
- 6. The Court lacks statutory subject matter jurisdiction over this case because Petitioners failed to timely serve parties Jody Akers, Paul Akers, Rachel Grice, Zachary Grice, Karen Streeter, and Sean Streeter (collectively, "Neighbors") by personal service, as required by RCW 36.70C.040(5), CR 4(d)(2), and RCW 4.28.080(16), given that these parties did not state their addresses in their SEPA administrative appeals filed to the Hearing Examiner. Under LUPA, failure to timely serve all required parties is a jurisdictional bar to judicial review. The case must be dismissed.
- 7. Petitioners failed to timely serve their Response and accompanying declaration on counsel for Friends of the Columbia Gorge ("Friends") and Neighbors in accordance with the deadline established by LCR 6(d) and CR 6(e). Accordingly, the Court hereby STRIKES Petitioners' Response and the accompanying declaration.

- 8. For the reasons outlined above, this Court lacks jurisdiction over the Petition and each of its four claims. Accordingly, Court hereby GRANTS the Motion to Dismiss and DISMISSES this action.
- 9. Respondents Neighbors and Friends are the prevailing parties for purposes of an award of costs and disbursements under Chapter 4.84 RCW. Each of these prevailing parties may file a bill of costs and disbursements incurred in this action consistent with applicable rules. Petitioners shall be jointly and severally liable for any awarded costs and disbursements.

DATED this 13th day of October, 2023.

HONORABLE NANCY N. RETSINAS Clark County Superior Court

PRESENTED BY:

TELEGIN LAW PLLC

Bryan Telegin, WSBA No. 46686

175 Parfitt Way SW, Suite N270

Bainbridge Island, WA 98110-4910

(206) 453-2884 x101

bryan@teleginlaw.com

Attorney for Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Jody and Paul Akers, Rachel and Zachary

Grice, and Karen and Sean Streeter

FRIENDS OF THE COLUMBIA GORGE

Nathan J. Baker, WSBA No. 35195

123 NE 3rd Ave., Suite 108

Portland, OR 97232-2975

(503) 241-3762 x101

nathan@gorgefriends.org

Senior Staff Attorney, Friends of the

Columbia Gorge

By Jordan Ramis Pc D. Ams By: Banes Howsly wsBA No. 32442 1211 Sw5th Aur 27/th Flour Portland, OR 97701