

**CLARK COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF PUBLIC HEARING  
THURSDAY, MARCH 20, 2008**

Public Services Building  
BOCC Hearing Room  
1300 Franklin Street, 6<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Vancouver, WA 98666

6:30 p.m.

**CALL TO ORDER**

DELEISSEGUES: The Clark County Planning Commission is called to order for Thursday, March 20th, 2008. We'll have roll call, please.

MORASCH: HERE  
BARCA: HERE  
ALLEN: HERE  
WRISTON: ABSENT  
RUPLEY: HERE  
VARTANIAN: HERE  
DELEISSEGUES: HERE

Staff Present: Marty Snell, Community Planning Director; Oliver Orjiako, Senior Planner; and Sonja Wisner, Administrative Assistant.

Other: Cindy Holley, Court Reporter.

**GENERAL & NEW BUSINESS**

**A. Approval of Agenda for March 20, 2008**

The agenda for March 20, 2008, was approved as distributed.

**B. Approval of Minutes for October 18 & November 15, 2007**

DELEISSEGUES: Approval of the minutes for October 18th and November 15th are in the report that was given you. Are there any corrections, changes or omissions to the minutes?

VARTANIAN: I have a very informal adjustment on Page 24 and 25 toward the bottom of the page, 24 and 25, the minutes, oh, I'm sorry, October 18th.

DELEISSEGUES: Okay, George, what is it?

VARTANIAN: Where I was saying did I, we've got shield in there, it's still, s-h-i-l-l which is also a couple of lines down on the top of the next page too, it's not a big deal.

DELEISSEGUES: Okay, with that correction is there a motion?

VARTANIAN: I move we accept the minutes as amended.

BARCA: Second.

DELEISSEGUES: All in favor.

EVERYBODY: AYE

**C. Communications from the Public**

None.

**PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS & PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION:**

**A. Proposed amendments to Clark County Code, Section 40.230.030 (A)**

Proposed amendment to the Clark County Code Section 40.230.030 (A), item 2, to clarify the purpose statement section by deleting "not oriented to the general public", and to consider amending Table 40.230.030-1 to provide for certain uses in the Business Park (BP) District.

**Contact: Oliver Orjiako (360) 397-2280, Ext. 4098 or e-mail at:  
Oliver.orjiako@clark.wa.gov**

DELEISSEGUES: Then moving on to the public hearing items for the Planning Commission tonight is a proposed amendment to Clark County Code Section 40.230.030(A), it's to clarify the purpose statement section by deleting "not oriented to the general public" and to consider amending Table 40.230.030 to provide for certain uses in a business park or BP district. Oliver, do we have a staff report?

ORJIAKO: Yes, we do. And as you indicated, the purpose of the proposed change before you is to provide some clarification to what we mean by "not oriented to the public," that's the first section that we are proposing for amendment. And the second area is to add certain uses that we think were inadvertently omitted from the business park district.

I must also add that this is a very minor change. We will be coming to the Planning Commission in the future to look at the overhaul of the entire county employment center or employment lands. Staff started that work during the update of the comprehensive plan last year, but we ran out of time, we felt that we needed adequate time and public process, if you will, to review what we currently allow in our employment center and come back with some recommendation that met -- tilt towards the uses we currently allow or tilt towards design standard what will employment lands or business park, office campus, light manufacturing, what will it look like in the future.

So this is a very minor change that we're proposing. You may ask why the urgent, well, as I said, there is some interpretational issues. If you look at the current uses that are allowed in a business district, I can give you some example, be it a bank, you know, when you said "not oriented to the general public" it's left for interpretation and it's very difficult for the bank

to fund some of the development if you're saying that is not going to be used by the general public. So let me get quickly into what we are proposing, that's the first item that you will see on Page 2 of the staff report. I must also say that the way that the staff report is structured we have photoed what is currently in our code, so the number in sequencing will not line up as part of the changes that we will do at a later time so that we can look at the entire code to make sure that if we change the way we number things that it is done properly and in a sequence.

If you go to Page 2 of the staff report that's Item 2 is the current proposed statement and you can read it, it says "the business park zone provides for the development of uses including," and it goes on to list "light manufacturing, business and professional services, research, business, and corporate offices and other similar compatible or supporting enterprises not oriented to the general public," staff is recommending that we delete that and we've provided you the rationale for doing so. Again, we think that most of the uses currently allow in the district oriented to the general public and the phrase have left some ambiguity, both in the bank finances some of the development and staff interpretation too.

The second change that we are recommending is in the footnote of the entire business park district. The red and stripe out section is the current language. What we are proposing is what is underlined on Page 2 what's the difference. The current language says that you can develop retail, commercial or retail services shall not be or shall, where not allow shall not extend exceed ten percent of the gross floor area of the development of building within which they are located. We are returning that but saying why must you look at the entire development site, that it makes more sense. In addition, the current language says that you don't have free commercial standard are not allowed, so we also are recommending that free-standing commercial retail buildings be permitted.

There is some provision in the code that gives you some bonuses. If you do certain things you get additional bonus. We also believing that that's what you see on Page 3 so that's also going to be left alone for the time being. So this change further defines what you can do within the ten percent perimeter. The only big difference here is that while we are allowing free-standing retail building we're excluding fast-food restaurant, but you can have a drive-through bank within a business park complex for example.

On Page 4 are some of the uses that we are recommending to be permitted. Now if you take example professional offices are allowed in the business park, if you take R vehicles, RSV Construction for example, the way that the code is written now they will not be permitted in the business park. So a good example, too, may be say New Tradition Homes, they may not really be storing their equipment on-site but it could be an enclosed structure, but the business park should be able to allow them to have an office as well as be able to store there. They're not going to store their heavy equipment and things like that, but they can store their trucks or whatever within their premises.

So some of the changes that you will see here that are underlined from Line 236 all the way to 27, 2379 are some of the uses that we're recommending that offices be included if we were to permit this, those uses. The other uses here are those that we believe are aware mistakenly excluded and part of this is that we use the National Industrial Classification System when we wrote the code or rewrite the code in 2000 and the way that the code is

structured you can have a three or five digit that talks about what the use is but it omits what is permitted. So if you've written a code and using before when it doesn't say permitted, one would say that the intent is to not to allow that use, so we are making this a little bit clearer that some of these uses should be permitted in the BP, and when we come back in the future some of the discussion will be should we continue to use the National Industrial Classification System using the five and the six digit or should we go back to three digit SIC code or just look at other form of the way you write the code and what type of uses you allow in your light manufacturing, heavy manufacturing or whatever, but that's work that will be coming to you in the future.

And that concludes what we are recommending or proposing for the Planning Commission to consider. We are recommending that you forward an approval to the Board of County Commissioners for their consideration. And I will stop there and listen to whatever question you may have.

DELEISSEGUES: Okay, thank you, Oliver. Is there any questions of staff? Anybody have any questions? Ron.

BARCA: I've got a question. On the component with the modification where you are talking about commercial retail buildings shall be permitted as free-standing with the exception of drive-through retail businesses such as fast-food restaurants, do you have a more specific list because you said drive-through banks okay, fast-food not, somewhere there's a spectrum and there's things in the middle, so what else, drive-through, what, dry cleaning?

RUPLEY: Pharmacy.

BARCA: Pharmacy.

ALLEN: Coffee shops.

ORJIAKO: You know, when I talk about such as fast-food restaurant I'm talking about McDonald's or Burger King, I just used that as an example.

BARCA: And I think I understand the very parochial aspect of when you say "fast-food" we all kind of see golden arches and things of that nature in front of us, but not fast-food is other --

ORJIAKO: You can have a sit-down restaurant, it will be permitted, that doesn't, that feels, fall within the ten percent threshold whether it's 10,000-square foot. Look for example on Mill Plain One where you have a Sweet Tomatoes, that's in a business park district, you have the fish place also within Mill Plain One, then there you have Phoenix Hotel, you have apartment there, you have Class A office, that's a typical what you may find in a business park campus, and the Sweet Tomatoes is not a drive-through but it is a sit-down restaurant for example. I'm using that as an example. Marty can share.

SNELL: I'm maybe going to ask would it be the Planning Commission's discussion point to look at excluding drive-through fast-food restaurants because there I think we have our code structured such that a drive-through fast-food restaurant could be you name the chain.

BARCA: Right.

SNELL: But if you're going to get a family-style restaurant or a quality restaurant, it's not likely to have a drive-through component to it.

BARCA: Well, all right. So fast-food restaurant without a drive-through component, I'm hung up on I guess the aspect of the words such as "fast-food restaurants." If we want to eliminate drive-through is it because of volume, because of congestion, a mixture of both, what's an acceptable amount of either of those. If we're going to say that we're segregating it, I think as often as we talk about this let's give the people who are going to come in and ask for something, give them some form of predictable and reliable means of knowing that their development is in or out of bound.

ORJIAKO: Right.

BARCA: I don't think the words such as "fast-food" necessarily gives the clarity that we're hoping for.

SNELL: We can be more clear if from your discussion and ultimately deliberation and recommendation to the Board I think that drive-through restaurants, fast-food restaurants typically generate quite a bit of traffic and the traffic is spread throughout the day, not just in any kind of a.m. or p.m. peak. You might have an alternative would be a drive-through bank or a credit union or something like that where it's a kind of a professional service or personal service and they're going to generate fewer trips and they're going to be more concentrated around the peaks, not necessarily throughout the day, so it's entirely up to the Planning Commission as to what you'd like to see either included or excluded.

BARCA: I guess for me to help make that determination it would be nice to know what the motivation was.

ORJIAKO: I think that Marty articulated that we've looked at other business park campuses in other jurisdictions and it doesn't include fast-food drive-through restaurants per se and again I use the example of Mill Plain One, you can find very similar campuses that doesn't have the type of fast-food restaurant that I pointed out, but most of it has to do with traffic volume, what street you are on and the intent of the campus, so that's really why we're making the recommendation.

VARTANIAN: I guess I thought I understood it and now I guess I don't. I'm not quite sure if you're trying to exclude drive-through businesses or just fast-food restaurants because you said banks are okay, and I think maybe what the problem was with Ron is that he's not understanding are we just talking about restaurants or are we talking about any drive-through business. If we're going to allow banks, okay, that's a financial thing, are we going to allow like was said before pharmacies, dry cleaners, you know, all of which have drive-through capacity. I guess the question is what's the intent, are we just trying to minimize traffic and we're picking on fast-food restaurants to do that with.

ORJIAKO: Not really, but because you have to also look at the entire use list that are in the

BP you don't see those type of uses allowed in the entire BP. So in restructuring this change that was also a consideration.

The other issue we're raising is that of traffic, but in terms of the purpose you have to look at the entire uses that are allowed in the district. It excludes fast-food restaurant, if you will, but you can do a dry cleaning if it's a drive-through that will be permitted, but you have to look at the entire use list that are in the district, it excludes fast-food restaurants.

VARTANIAN: I understand that and I guess I'm just not understanding the rationale behind the table. That's okay. That's okay.

DELEISSEGUES: It seems like it would help if there were drive-throughs that would produce X number of average daily traffic or something, trips per day. Or I don't know how you could measure that exactly, but if that's what you're trying to do is to keep the congestion out of the area, traffic congestion.

ORJIAKO: Right. In addition to that I think when you look at a business campus or we're calling it business campus or light manufacturing or office campus, the type of uses you want there are not typically the type of uses you find in your commercial district or in a mixed use district so there have to be some distinction. It's not that we are picking on fast-food restaurants, but you have to look at traditionally what type of uses you allow in a business campus setting and fast-food restaurant doesn't lend itself to that type of use. And if you also are focusing on jobs per se, depending on job type or whatever not necessarily in your business park district that you want your typical fast-food restaurant to be located, there are other district where that is more appropriate, you want more high-end jobs in your business and industrial district.

MORASCH: Well, then I might suggest a change to the language, and just to kind of get at Ron's point, if we deleted the words "retail business such as," then it would just read "with the exception of drive-through fast-food restaurants" and then that would make it clear that if you're a bank or a dry cleaner or one of these other uses that's generally acceptable in BP, then you can have a drive-through and you're not excluded by this.

SNELL: I was just looking at the current code we have for business park and in the category which is Other Uses not listed in the North American Classification System we have branch banks and those are permitted use in both office campus and business park. Oftentimes a branch bank will have a drive-through if it's convenient for them. Looking at dry cleaning services, those that are non-coin operated so a drop through, you know, a drop off dry cleaner, that's permitted in the business park so it is in keeping with what we allow in the current code.

RUPLEY: So if we just make the change that Steve suggested that reads better. Do you think so?

BARCA: Yeah. I guess that was my point, I just felt like the way it was worded there was some ambiguity about what else was an accepted practice and what wasn't going to be accepted and either we gave it to them in the aspect of performance standards or we give it to them in the aspect of a straight up yes or no based on function, so that works for me.

DELEISSEGUES: Yeah, that works for me too.

ORJIAKO: We'll take the recommendation.

DELEISSEGUES: Any other questions of staff? I have just one clarification and I'm guessing that the 10,000-square foot limitation is only for office park or business park, that zone BP?

ORJIAKO: It is applicable in a light industrial district, there is a ten percent limitation.

DELEISSEGUES: What about wholesale, it just says retail, commercial retail, but what if it were commercial wholesale, would that be included in the 10,000 or not? It wouldn't be by what's written --

ORJIAKO: I'm not sure that --

DELEISSEGUES: -- or does that matter?

ORJIAKO: I'm not sure.

SNELL: Can you ask the question again, sir.

ORJIAKO: I'm not sure wholesale is permitted.

SNELL: I don't think wholesale is permitted in a business park zone.

DELEISSEGUES: At all?

SNELL: (Shakes head negatively.) Are you thinking of like a Costco or a --

DELEISSEGUES: I'm not sure those are wholesale. Somebody that --

VARTANIAN: That's a wholesale business.

DELEISSEGUES: Are they? I thought they were retail. Well, okay, I just clarification, it's the BP zone and there are some others that are limited to the 10,000-square feet --

ORJIAKO: Right.

DELEISSEGUES: -- retail.

ORJIAKO: Right.

DELEISSEGUES: Okay. The other question I had was are these exclusive or are these just examples? Like for example the uses on Table 40.230.030, that one, on Page 4 it says developers, engineers, consultants, contractors, if they're not listed they're not approved or they're conditional or what? Like surveyors is what I was thinking.

SNELL: Well, and that's part of the problem we have with this particular code structure, it's just for the office campus and business park code we've got on the order of 15 pages of listed uses and it is kind of an exhaustive and if you fall outside you get into an interpretation, so that's one of the things that Oliver mentioned earlier is that we're going to be kind of looking at this for collapsing some of the -- so where you have a two or three digit if it's permitted, when you get down to a five digit under that for example manufacturing is 31 through 33 and you have printing and related support services 323, so if those are permitted, if that's permitted, then all the four or five and six digit list uses should be permitted as well unless you want to exclude something particularly. So that's kind of the way we're thinking about structuring a code differently.

DELEISSEGUES: Okay.

ALLEN: Or even if you have a caveat that says and as permitted by --

SNELL: Well, yeah, you'd have a, I'm trying to think of the term, similar use, so whether you're a surveyor or an engineer similar use, so a similar use would be permitted if that's what you were looking at.

DELEISSEGUES: I just didn't see that anywhere in here that clarifies it if it were in there somewhere. Any other questions of staff?

BARCA: No.

DELEISSEGUES: Comments? If not, we'll open it up to the public comment. And I've got a sign-up sheet and Rich Young, do you want to come up and testify. Come up to the microphone there and give us your name and address.

YOUNG: Thank you for having me. I'm Rich Young. Would you like my home address or my business address?

BARCA: Speak into the microphone and --

DELEISSEGUES: And you can sit down too. Hopefully there's a chair there.

YOUNG: I stand better to talk. I'll try to sit down.

DELEISSEGUES: Either one.

YOUNG: Our business address is 9120 NE Vancouver Mall Loop, Suite 220, here in Vancouver, Washington, it's over in the mall. We're a general contractor or builder, our company, we are one of the landowners of the Padden Parkway Business Park that we've been working on for approximately four years now to get it off the ground. We've been site plan approved on this site since March 13th I believe of last year and we have not been able to move forward due to the assumed ambiguities and lack of clarification of the BP zone. We started out in this project as an ML zone, I'll give you a little history on it.

We're almost through our design phase to come forward with an ML when we got flopped into a BP zone by emergency ordinance and we said, well, wait a minute, we can't do that, and so we went through the hearings, and I'm sure you are aware of those here several years ago, and elected from what we were reading to stay with the BP. So in staying with the BP we went through the process of approval. Getting through that process of approval was wonderful, but what we didn't realize is how much strain there was in the BP code that wasn't allowing for development. It still read as if it were an ML zone due to one specific phrase, "not oriented to the general public."

When you go through and you look at the code, if you look at it, over 61 percent of the applicable businesses, and I say applicable businesses because if you read the first two pages of the approved uses and when you go through the code are farming and we're understanding that all those farming uses are there for those sites that are grandfathered in so they could actually do work or continue to work their farms or whatever in the BP zone, so if you take those out, still over 61 percent are just oriented to the general public.

And when you get to reading the code and you start looking at it, you've got hotels, you've got schools, secondary schools, you've got colleges, you've got social service businesses, government businesses that can be in there that are all oriented to the general public, it's a comment that appraisers and lenders can't wrap their arms around. Well, you know --

DELEISSEGUES: But if that were taken out would that solve the problem?

YOUNG: That solves the problem.

DELEISSEGUES: Well, that's what we're doing tonight.

YOUNG: Right. So I just I'm supporting what staff has done --

ALLEN: He's supporting it.

DELEISSEGUES: Yeah, I see.

YOUNG: We have spent an inordinate amount of time over the last year with staff in special meetings and going through all of these things just in support of that. One of the comments that was made was about the wholesale element of this, well, to give you an idea that originally the code when it was first adopted had the words "and wholesale trade" in it and somewhere in that year we were in the process of getting everything developed to do a design those words were eliminated the next time we looked, somehow that happened. So wholesale trade is not part of the current code and we happen to be in agreement with it because it's not wholesale trade isn't really relevant to a business park.

The uses, we're a commercial general contractor, I heard Oliver mention RSV Construction, RSV is our competitor, we're friendly competitors, there's many other select construction team -- construction -- other construction companies here in the community. Our office is located in the old theater by the mall, it used to be the old Regal Cinemas, that's our project, we purchased it, we remodeled it, it's now a Class A office building, our offices are in there, yet we're excluded from the code because all of the twos, and that's what if you go to this

and look at it are not included, none of the two designations are included in the code.

What is ironic in that is if you go to the current code and look at it and you get way back to the back of it under E, other uses not listed in the NAICS storage yards, and I'm going to read directly, "storage yards for building materials, contractors' equipment and vehicles, house movers, delivery vehicles, transit, storage, used equipment in operable condition and related materials subject to the provisions of this section" are approved under conditional permit in here but I can't have my general offices in the business park, but I can have my storage yard. These are just some of the clarifications that we're running into that they're in conflict of, you know, what a business park is supposed to be.

In talking with staff and going through it it's apparent, we've talked with Rich Lowry extensively about this, many others with staff, it was put together quickly the BP and to everyone it's been apparent that certain applications haven't or business opportunities have not been placed in here that are reasonable to a business park and should have been placed in there. One thing that I know that staff had concern with previous Planning Commissions and other Commissioners had concerns with with the business park was the fact that if we allowed for retail to be joined in here, we might have a Costco or a Safeway or a Fred Meyer's or somebody that could come into a business park and that wasn't the intent of it.

But also the way it was laid out it in the current code it says you have the ten percent retail is for the development or buildings, well, there's where the conflict arises because some people were seeing that as if you move a business in there and it's 3,000 feet, you can have 300 feet for your retail operation, that was just for the business, that wasn't in the building or in the development. A business doesn't operate that way, it just doesn't function that way, if any of you are in business or understand that a retail proponent doesn't operate that way, a business park doesn't operate that way, and as Oliver laid out the business parks that we know today over on Mill Plain that are very successful your retail is put together in an area and your, any, you know, manufacturing or your hotel or your office buildings are all placed like a planned unit development so you have synergy within each other so you can gain some operations out of there and success within the businesses and you don't end up with white elephants and areas that are going to die within the community.

The plan we have up here demonstrates what a business park looks like. This is our plan to go forward, this is our vision. And if, may I stand up, am I loud enough?

DELEISSEGUES: Sure, go ahead.

YOUNG: Thanks, Tom. The drive-through portion we lobby for highly because with the banks, the banks are approved but no banks were willing to look at the site to make it a business park without a drive-through facility. That was taken care of in a clarification via the bank building on the corner where the new streetlights are going in that we're putting in, the retail component is located in a very central area where it's warm and friendly to, you know, people to come in and they're not all the retail is put into an area, the manufacturing is laid over here into an area behind everything where it can operate efficiently with amongst themselves and the businesses, the businesses, the doctors, the lawyers, the dentists, the architects, all these other businesses that are oriented to the general public, by the way,

they have a facility that they can operate out of and their customers can come and go as a normal business park would operate.

So this, this is the element that changing this code will allow for, without that basically you have a light manufacturing park and you'll never -- there's no other use so we might as well go back to an ML use because you can't function in that without doing a plan like this in a business park with the current code the way it's written.

DELEISSEGUES: So if I'm hearing you correctly you're here to support the change?

YOUNG: Yes, sir.

DELEISSEGUES: Okay. Great. Is there any questions of the proponent?

BARCA: With the changes that have been put forward does it meet the requirements that you had hoped it would rise to?

YOUNG: It does. It does. We're, you know, and the limitations for the 10,000-square feet, we had worked with staff on this, you can get up in size larger than that but you're going to invite Walgreen's is that size, Bi-Mart stores, you know, other commercial applications that really aren't giving you the business park notion, yet 10,000 feet you can still put in a nice restaurant. The Commissioners have said we need some more restaurants in this area, I mean, because there isn't places for them to go in nice facilities and in areas that are built in a conducive place for them. Mill Plain is a wonderful place where the business parks are out there because the code at the time they were built allowed for that, the current code just needs to have some upgrades here to it to complete it so we can do the same things as they've done out in the other end of the county.

DELEISSEGUES: And the changes that are proposed here would accommodate that?

YOUNG: They will.

DELEISSEGUES: Okay. Great.

YOUNG: Thank you.

DELEISSEGUES: Well, thank you.

MORASCH: Thank you.

VARTANIAN: I kind of have a question.

DELEISSEGUES: Yes. Go.

VARTANIAN: I'm interested to find what you consider a "wholesale operation." Would you consider like a plumbing supply place where plumbers go and get their faucets and pipes and all that stuff --

YOUNG: No.

VARTANIAN: -- a wholesale?

YOUNG: No. No. A wholesale operation, I would consider a wholesale operation would be with loading docks, four-foot high loading docks, warehouse facility where maybe let's say shippers brought their carpet goods in and the different carpet retail outlets came and picked up their materials and their carpet and went to their stores, or the mechanical contractor goes and picks up his HVAC units and they're typically facilities of 60,000 or 50,000-square feet to a 150,000-square feet, that's a real wholesale operation.

VARTANIAN: So basically you're saying the difference is --

DELEISSEGUES: It wouldn't fit.

VARTANIAN: -- volume or size as opposed to function?

YOUNG: Yes.

ALLEN: And multiple users as well?

YOUNG: Yes.

VARTANIAN: Okay, thank you.

DELEISSEGUES: Yes, thank you. Mr. Platfoot, did you have anything to add to that?

PLATFOOT: Actually no, I don't.

DELEISSEGUES: Okay. Well, thank you.

MORASCH: Thank you.

VARTANIAN: Thanks for stopping by.

DELEISSEGUES: Okay, if no further questions we'll return to the Planning Commission for deliberation, comment, **motion**.

MORASCH: Well, I guess I'll start. I'm excited to wait for you guys to bring back the more detailed look because I think it does need a detailed look, but I'm comfortable with moving forward with this component today so I would support it with the one change that we recommended earlier.

VARTANIAN: Is that a **motion**?

MORASCH: Sure. I'll make a **MOTION** to adopt the staff proposal with the minor amendment referred to earlier deleting the four words from Footnote 1, the four words being "retail businesses such as."

ALLEN: **Second.**

DELEISSEGUES: Okay, we have a motion and second to recommend to the Board of Commissioners the changes that were made tonight with the change that Steve proposed. Could I have roll call then.

**ROLL CALL VOTE**

BARCA: AYE  
RUPLEY: AYE  
ALLEN: AYE  
VARTANIAN: AYE  
MORASCH: AYE  
DELEISSEGUES: AYE

DELEISSEGUES: Okay, motion carries. Is there anything else tonight?

**OLD BUSINESS**

None.

**NEW BUSINESS**

BARCA: Election.

RUPLEY: Elections.

DELEISSEGUES: I want to know if there's anything else from staff tonight?

SNELL: Nothing more tonight, sir.

DELEISSEGUES: Our next meeting, workshop, all that, dates?

SNELL: Sonja, do you have that?

WISER: Not in front of me but I'll E-mail you.

DELEISSEGUES: Okay.

SNELL: I'd tell you now but it will change tomorrow.

WISER: It will change and it will confuse you so I'll E-mail you guys.

BARCA: We have an audience that's waiting to hear with baited breath.

DELEISSEGUES: All right. Any old business? Under new business we have election of chair and vice chair so, Sonja, do you want to conduct the election.

WISER: We need to do nominations first.

BARCA: Yeah, it has to go that way.

DELEISSEGUES: Let's do the nominations for chair and then follow that with a nomination for vice chair after the election.

RUPLEY: I nominate Dick Deleissegues as chair.

ALLEN: I nominate Ron Barca as vice chair.

BARCA: Is there such a thing?

DELEISSEGUES: Well, we'll do them one at a time.

WISER: Oh, one at a time. Okay. So are there any other nominations for chair?

BARCA: Oh, you don't want to run out of tickets?

WISER: Any other nominations for chair? Then we'll close it.

VARTANIAN: I move we close the nominations for the chair. I don't, do we need it, do we need to vote, it's one nomination.

BARCA: It's got to be private.

VARTANIAN: Can I ask for a unanimous vote in favor of Mr. Deleissegues to be the Commissioner?

MORASCH: I'd second that motion.

RUPLEY: I second that. We cast a unanimous vote for Dick Deleissegues as chair.

DELEISSEGUES: Okay. And we'll thank you, thank you, and we'll move on to vice chair, is there any nominations for vice chair?

VARTANIAN: Condolences.

ALLEN: Ron Barca.

RUPLEY: Steve Morasch.

BARCA: Very good.

RUPLEY: Now we have a runoff.

WISER: Move nominations be closed.

VARTANIAN: Do you want not to do it?

BARCA: Just vote, yeah.

ALLEN: Everybody issued just one ballot. Put that ballot back.

SNELL: I didn't hear a motion to close the --

RUPLEY: Move to close nomination.

VARTANIAN: Second.

ALLEN: Second.

SNELL: I heard from, Sonja, the last time I checked she wasn't a voting member of the Planning Commission.

WISER: I'm just helping ease the process.

RUPLEY: I don't know, there could be some code in here.

SNELL: Ex-officio.

DELEISSEGUES: You can't stuff the ballot box.

RUPLEY: Keep going.

ALLEN: How many?

VARTANIAN: Is there more people? How long can that take?

DELEISSEGUES: That's it.

RUPLEY: I thought we should at least have two.

WISER: There should be six. Can a member vote for them self, I suppose they can.

SNELL: Sure. I think any of these other candidates are voting for themselves.

ALLEN: As long as we don't have more than six votes.

RUPLEY: One of the last Commissioners used to say vote early, vote often.

DELEISSEGUES: Put the sticky side out. They're all stuck together. I think we ought to not use sticky notes, that's kind of a sticky job.

WISER: How about Jeff's vote, he sent an E-mail who he wanted?

BARCA: I don't think the bylaws --

SNELL: He's not present, no proxy by E-mail.

DELEISSEGUES: He can't vote if he's not here.

BARCA: The bylaws don't allow for it.

WISER: Okay. We have a three to three split.

BARCA: Oh, for crying out loud. Steve, how embarrassing.

WISER: Now Jeff did vote.

RUPLEY: Oh, well. So do we then --

MORASCH: We have to do the caucus thing.

VARTANIAN: If elected what is it that you would like to see the Planning Commission do.

DELEISSEGUES: Yeah, let's have a speech, let's hear the -- we might want to vote again here after we listen to the merits of your case.

BARCA: I want to raise taxes and have more regulations.

DELEISSEGUES: I'll vote for that.

VARTANIAN: Done. 5/0.

BARCA: That's not supposed to work that way.

WISER: Shall we vote again?

RUPLEY: I don't think it will be any different. Do you think we should delay the vote until we have the full commission here?

DELEISSEGUES: Yeah, that's a good idea.

SNELL: So we have a chair --

RUPLEY: We do have a chair.

SNELL: -- we could hold off on vice chair at the next Planning Commission so long as the chair makes sure that he's here.

WISER: Well, as long as he shows up.

BARCA: We could open nominations again and put Wriston in there, he couldn't defend himself.

RUPLEY: This time probably not.

SNELL: It's up to the Planning Commission. It's up to you all.

RUPLEY: He's been the vice chair for 20 years, hasn't he?

BARCA: Break the tie.

DELEISSEGUES: What's your pleasure? We could probably ought to wait but, you know, the bad thing if we vote again is that somebody else might be absent or Jeff might be here and we have another 3/3 split. Do you want to draw straws? We could do that.

BARCA: Draw straws.

DELEISSEGUES: Pick a number.

BARCA: That's going to be on the record that we drew straws for vice chair.

VARTANIAN: I think in Rhode Island they had an election and I know somebody flipped a coin. Do you want to flip a coin?

SNELL: We don't have any problems with (inaudible) at least.

VARTANIAN: Do you want to flip a coin?

SNELL: I don't think the bylaws talks about -- I don't think the bylaws really talks about flipping coins.

BARCA: We might as well just go to rock, paper, scissors I'm thinking.

DELEISSEGUES: What do the bylaws say about a 3/3 split?

WISER: Let's get those bylaws out.

RUPLEY: Do we have a first vice chair and a second vice chair.

BARCA: Well, we'd have to vote on that again.

SNELL: I don't know.

VARTANIAN: I don't think there is a provision for a tie vote.

SNELL: I don't believe so.

RUPLEY: I don't think there is provision for --

VARTANIAN: So we can, we're on our own. Call it.

RUPLEY: Heads you're doing --

DELEISSEGUES: No, I don't think we ought to do it that way.

VARTANIAN: Well, somebody's got to call heads or tails.

BARCA: No, let's keep just a modicum of professional decorum. And I know you're serious about flipping the coin but I -- that's not how we're going to do it.

SNELL: Wait for the next Planning Commission?

WISER: And then what if someone's absent?

SNELL: Well, if somebody's absent then maybe the current candidates will submit a candidate narrative of how they're going to make the --

DELEISSEGUES: Well, Jeff did say how he would vote.

WISER: Yes, he did, but he's not here so you can't count that.

BARCA: No, we can't.

RUPLEY: And I don't think we have E-mail authorization in our --

BARCA: No, the bylaws don't allow for that.

DELEISSEGUES: Well, let's wait until the next public hearing and we'll try it again.

RUPLEY: Do you think that in the meantime we should decide and agree upon a if there is a tie vote what we would do next so we have an agreed upon --

ALLEN: How about a rotating vice president or a VP that take turns.

RUPLEY: They move chairs.

WISER: Well, I think the City rotates, don't they?

ALLEN: Yes, they do.

DELEISSEGUES: We'll wait.

SNELL: What, for chair and vice chair?

WISER: Yeah, I think the City rotates people.

SNELL: I don't know what they do.

DELEISSEGUES: We'll wait until the next public hearing and we'll vote again.

SNELL: We have a chair and we'll vote on vice chair the next time.

### **COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION**

DELEISSEGUES: Yeah. So is there comments from members of the Planning Commission?

RUPLEY: I think you were all invited to the RTC lunch today that had the Columbia River Crossing and there is some pretty good information that came out of that in terms of maps that I think would be very relevant for the Highway 99 project and I do have a set of them if anybody wants them or I think probably they can get them.

ORJIAKO: I think we can check with staff, we can make it available to the Planning Commission.

RUPLEY: Pete was there.

SNELL: Okay. Capell?

RUPLEY: Uh-huh.

DELEISSEGUES: Okay. Any other comments?

ALLEN: And was the superintendent; right?

DELEISSEGUES: Any other comment? I just have one, I'd like to express my appreciation for the job that Jeff did while he was the chair of the Planning Commission for the last two or three years, he did a good job, and let the record show that I think we owe him a debt of gratitude for the fine work that he did in leading us.

VARTANIAN: Here here.

RUPLEY: Jeff who.

DELEISSEGUES: If there are no other comments, then we'll be adjourned.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The hearing adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

All proceedings of tonight's hearing can be viewed on the Clark County Web Page at:

**[http:// www.clark.wa.gov/longrangeplan/commission/06-meetings.html](http://www.clark.wa.gov/longrangeplan/commission/06-meetings.html)**

Proceedings can be also be viewed on CVTV on the following web page link:

**<http://www.cityofvancouver.us/cvtv/>**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Chair**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Date**

*Minutes Transcribed by:*

*Cindy Holley, Court Reporter*

*Sonja Wisner, Administrative Assistant*