

**CLARK COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
THURSDAY, JUNE 5, 2008
MINUTES OF PUBLIC HEARING**

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

7:30 p.m.

CALL TO ORDER

DELEISSEGUES: Good evening. I'll call the Clark County Planning Commission to order for Thursday, June 5th, 2008. Can we have roll call, please.

ROLL CALL

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

GENERAL & NEW BUSINESS

A. Approval of Agenda for June 5, 2008

DELEISSEGUES: Is there any changes or deletions, corrections to the agenda for June 5th? If not, can we have approval of the agenda.

VARTANIAN: So moved.

ALLEN: So move.

DELEISSEGUES: All in favor.

EVERYBODY: AYE

B. Communications from the Public

DELEISSEGUES: Any communications from the public that are not on tonight's agenda? Hearing none, we'll move on, then, to the public hearing item for the Planning Commission

which tonight is rezoning properties in portions of the northern Vancouver urban growth area with the urban holding overlay to the underlying zoning districts. And do we have a staff report, Mr. Mabrey?

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS & PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION:

A. Rezoning properties in portions of the northern Vancouver Urban Growth Area with the Urban Holding overlay to the underlying zoning districts:

Pursuant to Clark County Comprehensive Plan and Unified Development Code (UDC) provisions, the Planning Commission will consider rezoning properties in portions of the northern Vancouver Urban Growth Area with the Urban Holding overlay to the underlying zoning districts. The areas under consideration are all urban holding areas between NE 99th Street and NE 119th Street from NE 72nd Avenue to NE 152nd Avenue; and the Community Commercial area northwest of the intersection of NE 119th Street and SR-503; and the General Commercial area at the northeast corner of NE 119th Street and SR-503; and two Urban Low parcels east of and abutting NE 152nd Avenue (#200538-000 & #200539-000).

Staff Contact: Mike Mabrey, (360) 397-2280, Ext. 4343

MABREY: Yes, we do. Thank you, Commissioner, and members of the Planning Commission. We have a very brief staff report. This may seem like deja vu all over again. Frankly, the reason that we're back here is because as you probably recall back in October of 2005 the Planning Commission made a recommendation to release all of the urban holding in the Vancouver UGA which was in existence at that point in time. The focus of our hearing tonight is what I'd call the North Orchards area and the reason that we have to go through a Type IV process again is because there has been additional property added to the urban growth boundary at the end of 2007 in this area. And I'd like to refer you to the maps. Exhibit 1 shows the colored block areas G through M that were under urban holding back in 2005, so your action was to recommend releasing those at that point in time. And then the following map on the backside Exhibit 2 around the Number 5 you'll see a scattering of yellow and orange parcels and a couple of red blocks on the north side of 119th which were part of the urban growth boundary expansion that was approved last year.

Now none of those areas are part of the appeal, none of those areas were previously zoned agriculture, so the Hearings Board decision doesn't have any affect on any of the properties we're talking about tonight. We're not talking about the big blue block labeled Number 4 on this exhibit. Okay?

BARCA: Oh, okay.

MABREY: I handed out a different map, this one is available at the back table and most of you probably got it, I gave it to you back in the work session, this one is maybe useful

because it's easier to see what the underlying zoning is. The area is clearly outlined in blue and the horizontal stripes indicate the areas that currently have the urban holding overlay on them. Over the past two years the Board of County Commissioners has had a number of work sessions and hearings, many of them specifically focused on the transportation issues related to urban holding in this area, they came to the conclusion that with developer agreements it would be possible to fund three critical intersection improvements at 503 and 119th Street, at 503 and 99th Street and at 119th Street and 72nd Avenue. Since that time a number of development agreements have been entered into, I believe there's 12 of them, and developers have been paying half of their traffic impact fees in advance in order to reach this threshold of \$2 million which was the fund which the County required as the terms of those agreements to as the necessary minimum to get those projects in the reasonably funded category. At this point in time we have collected 1.86 million, so we're about 140,000 short.

When I was preparing this staff report the expectation was that there was a development that was going to come in the next week and push us over the \$2 million magic number but that didn't happen, so we're communicating to those that have already been through the preliminary review process that they can come in and pay their second half and we can get these projects going and get past the \$2 million mark. If we don't within a certain period of time, then basically the agreements become void and we return their money and they have to pay the much higher traffic impact fees which are now in effect, so there's substantial motivation for the developers to reach that minimum \$2 million mark.

The approval criteria that are in the currently adopted comp plan for this area are on Page 3. The first one is related to transportation and determination that localized critical links and intersection improvements are reasonably funded. And the second one relates to execution of generic covenants indicating that the owners and subsequent property owners will support annexation to a city that provides urban services. I've kind of outlined where we are in terms of the transportation improvements. I think this, your recommendation, may be contingent on us getting to that \$2 million limit if that's what you'd like to do. The second is really just an administrative procedure that staff needs to be sure is working that makes certain that these annexation agreements are signed as properties come in proposing development in the area. So those are the two essential issues.

The Board did substantial work over the last couple of years in addressing what used to be a much longer list of public facilities findings that needed to be made. In the 2004 plan there were schools and there were sanitary sewer and water and police and fire and kind of the whole laundry list of public facilities and services. And I wasn't too involved in all of those, but there were findings made due to the developers coming in saying, look, this is what we do when we develop, we can't develop without sewer so we bring it obviously, and how the emergency services issues were addressed Oliver may be able to fill in the blanks, I really am not too clear on that, I wasn't aware that that was going to be an issue tonight frankly. The criteria that we have right now are the two that I just spoke to. And so with that I'd be glad to answer any questions.

DELEISSEGUES: Thanks, Mike. Is there any questions of staff?

VARTANIAN: I have maybe a procedural or an administrative type of question. Has the County signed development agreements with all of the areas for all of the areas that we are undertaking at the hearing tonight?

MABREY: No, there's only like I said about 12 developers and certainly not even a majority of the property that we're talking about. What in effect we would be doing by releasing urban holding now would be saying, okay, the development agreement period is over, that window's closed, you're going to pay the new traffic impact fee if you come in, but we have now assurance that the major intersection improvements that couldn't normally be funded by any individual developer will get funded and built.

VARTANIAN: But I guess are we dealing with only the new additions to the urban holding area that wants to come out or are we dealing with that whole area?

MABREY: The whole area because it never really was released from urban holding.

VARTANIAN: Well, I guess, then, my question is if the County has already entered into development agreements on some or a lot of these properties and there's already been subdivisions applied for doesn't it sort of obviate the need for --

MABREY: Yeah. The terms of the developer agreements are long and complicated, but in essence those properties were effectively taken out of urban holding; however, their developments couldn't proceed to final plat or final site plan approval until the \$2 million fund was totally made whole, so they're all still in limbo, but technically they're not in urban holding, those properties that have signed the development agreements are free from the urban holding, they're going through the process right now.

VARTANIAN: No, I'm just wondering if this has already gone ahead and a lot of stuff is done --

MABREY: No, there's a lot of area that, you know, a lot of this area has not come in for a preliminary development approval.

VARTANIAN: Okay, thank you.

DELEISSEGUES: The City of Vancouver is a party to the development agreement, aren't they?

MABREY: No, not technically, it's a development agreement with the County; however, it does require if I understand it the same kind of commitment to annexation that will be required as a result of this process.

DELEISSEGUES: Does the City of Vancouver have any review of the proposed development on these parcels? I mean it is within their urban growth boundary.

MABREY: No. The development is occurring through our staff review process because properties haven't been annexed.

VARTANIAN: There's just a covenant to annex whatever they're ready to do --

MABREY: Correct. Correct.

VARTANIAN: -- I think.

DELEISSEGUES: Any other questions of staff?

ALLEN: But is there like interjurisdictional agreement that these development agreements are consistent and compatible with what would happen once it's annexed?

MABREY: The development agreements are a fairly specific tool to allow individual properties or groups of properties to get out of urban holding and proceed through the development process by providing school impact fee and traffic impact fee dollars at an earlier stage in the process than they normally would have, that's kind of the essence of them. They are not so much focused on development standards or trying to harmonize any difference between development standards with the County and the City, that's sort of happening in a different form as a result of the interlocal agreement that we signed with the City prior to the approval of the comprehensive plan.

ALLEN: So there was an interlocal agreement?

MABREY: Yes. Yes, but it was between the City and the County to get our standards in harmony.

DELEISSEGUES: Ron.

BARCA: So one of the questions that I was looking at is in the context of trying to address this late memo that came in from Fire District 3, now you did mention it but I'm hoping that when Oliver's done with conference that he will be able to address that further.

DELEISSEGUES: Or Bronson will have to.

BARCA: The discussion is the aspect of how emergency services are covered during this interim period of time which we don't know what that means, but during the period of time that the County's responsible, but we're going to be developing out to urban standards, so I would like to address the idea that we no longer cover that, how does the public subsidize that aspect?

MABREY: Could we perhaps have the representative from Fire District 3 testify and then maybe we'd have a better idea of what the issues were and then we could respond to it.

BARCA: Yeah, okay. And so before we go ahead and do that, I'm wondering can you tell me for the areas that have the agreements in place now what amount of square area in relationship to the entire urban holding is affected by these developer agreements? Do we know? Is it ten percent?

ORJIAKO: About 1,000 acres.

MABREY: About 1,000 acres is Oliver's answer. I don't have a map of those frankly. Well, oh, no, but he's asking which ones have signed development agreements what percentage of the total.

ORJIAKO: I don't have that.

DELEISSEGUES: Total area that we're addressing tonight.

MABREY: The total area?

DELEISSEGUES: Yeah.

MABREY: I would estimate that it is about a third.

BARCA: About a third. And I guess my consideration in that regard is the idea that knowing that transportation impact fees have gone up and school impact fees have gone up, I'm wondering about how much revenue like the Battle Ground School District is going to be short from in concern of the aspect of what the impact is genuinely going to be compared to what the impact fee is going to be providing?

MABREY: Well, the development agreements include escalating clauses for the school impact fee so they are tied to two large known steps so there's not any bargain on the school impact fees, they're going to pay the same amount as any development will as they come in if urban holding is released in the next month or so. The difference was there was some requirement for the developer to pay a certain percentage of those at the very beginning of the process when they applied for preliminary review and that mechanism was tied to, well, it was to allow the Battle Ground School Board to identify a future site in this area that would serve this area and it would give them a pot of money to work with. The Battle Ground School Board has not found one, the deadline for those provisions in the development agreements has expired, it was at the end of April I believe, and so really the school impact fee, the fees are the same and the time of collection is now going to be the same. Does that answer your question?

BARCA: It does answer my question, Mike, although perhaps it's a little bit different than the way I'm reading the staff report. The staff report as I'm reading it right now says that a specific amount, let me try and find it again, I'm on Page 2, I am one, two, three paragraphs down, the development agreement provides for early payment of 16 percent of the total school impact fees anticipated for a residential project in the subject area, and I guess that's what I was looking at, it was 16 percent at a lower value than what the impact

fees are now.

MABREY: No, actually it was the same amount, it was just advanced payment by the developer and then they would be able to give those credits to individual lots when they came in to build.

BARCA: Oh, so it's not at the lesser rate?

MABREY: Right. Right.

ORJIAKO: No.

BARCA: Well, that was one of the questions and so then I'm ready to hear from --

DELEISSEGUES: Well, wait, I got one more question and then we'll do that unless you have some more.

VARTANIAN: No. For a change I don't.

DELEISSEGUES: My question is the tax stream doesn't change, does it, to the County or the City or whoever until there's actually annexation; is that true or not true?

HORNE: That's correct.

ORJIAKO: That's correct.

DELEISSEGUES: That's true. If Bronson says it's true, it's true. So usually in these development agreements is there any time frame involved in when the City will actually annex and provide services? I thought they had to agree to provide services before the development occurred? And I don't mean have services provided, I mean the City actually provide the service?

MABREY: Yeah, I think the anticipation is that for portions of this area, particularly the area east of 503 --

DELEISSEGUES: Sorry, Chris.

MABREY: -- that Vancouver will be the sewer provider for the majority of that area and so if the urban holding is lifted that area will develop out on Vancouver's sewer, but probably not the case for the area to the west of 503. But I'm not real clear about whether that's City water would be provided to any of those areas or not.

DELEISSEGUES: Okay.

MABREY: Those would be the two that would be really at issue at the beginning of development until annexation.

DELEISSEGUES: Any other questions of staff?

ALLEN: I did have one quick question. The necessary minimum or the reasonably funded clause, that \$2 million, what's the percentage of the total or what's the total amount?

MABREY: I'm not sure that I have that information. I'll look for it while the gentleman is testifying, but I'll try to answer that in a few minutes.

ALLEN: That would be helpful to know what "reasonably funded" means.

MABREY: Yeah. Well, oh, I mean it's basically a commitment by the County to provide the remainder of the funds that are necessary to finish the projects.

ALLEN: At what ratio?

MABREY: I don't know, I'll let you know.

ALLEN: Okay, thank you.

DELEISSEGUES: Seeing as how the County's the proponent then we'll go to the sign-up sheet and Jeff Stewart, do you want to come up and testify on this matter? Hopefully that mic works there in front of you.

STEWART: My name is Jeff Stewart with Fire District 3, I'm here representing Fire Chief Steve Wrightson and if you wouldn't mind I'd like to read this off.

To whom it may concern: Much of the area proposed for rezoning is located within the boundaries of Clark County Fire District 3. Vancouver Fire Department fire stations and Vancouver fire (sic) precinct officers are located several miles away. The closest emergency response will still be provided to this area by Clark County Fire District 3 and the Clark County Sheriff's Office. The City of Vancouver's identified a possible \$3 million budget deficit for the next budget. The City officials have been quoted in the Columbian stating the large deficit may lead to possible cuts in fire and police services.

Our concern is that the expansion of the Vancouver urban growth boundary to this area and to this proposed rezoning will outpace the City of Vancouver's ability to provide adequate emergency services. The burden and expense of providing emergency services will fall on the closest emergency agencies, Fire District 3 and Clark County Sheriff's Department. Once the area is annexed, none of the City tax revenue will help pay for these rural and County services, the result is existing emergency providers will lose all the revenue while still serving the emergency needs of the area. County taxpayers will in effect be subsidizing the City of Vancouver for services the City cannot afford to provide. The impact of lost revenue without a drop in expenses could be devastating to our budgets and our ability to continue to provide excellent services to our constituents. We request that the Clark County Planning Commission address these issues while considering the

rezoning proposal.

DELEISSEGUES: Anything you want to add to that?

STEWART: In listening to this I think the bottom line is we hope that emergency services is taken into consideration while this planning process is taking place.

DELEISSEGUES: Any question of Jeff?

VARTANIAN: Go ahead.

BARCA: I just want to clarify. So you understand that the area even though we're lifting the holding on it, it remains part of Fire District 3 still in the County, right --

STEWART: Right.

BARCA: -- the City hasn't annexed it yet?

STEWART: Right. We're concerned about once the annexation takes place.

BARCA: So once the annexation takes place?

STEWART: Correct.

BARCA: So you're not concerned about the aspect of it having the density and uses raised to urban uses, you're concerned about after the annexation?

STEWART: Right, providing the services.

BARCA: Okay.

VARTANIAN: If we're not getting paid for the services that we're going to provide, I know this is going to sound terrible, but why are we providing services?

ALLEN: Thank you.

VARTANIAN: Okay.

STEWART: Well, I'm just trying to think about where you're coming from with that question.

VARTANIAN: Well, I guess my point is that if the City annexes this area and cannot provide services and now that we've removed this requirement in order for annex it, in order for it to come out of urban holding and therefore become available for annexation, I'm not quite sure I understand, and I can ask this maybe for staff, why do we remove certain emergency services for the requirements to lift urban holding, and secondly, and

not to sound like too much of a capitalist, why are we providing services we wouldn't be getting paid for if it's inside the city limits?

STEWART: That's why we're here, we're not sure who's going to, there's been no discussion or cooperation amongst the Vancouver Fire Department or Fire District 3, there's been no discussions at all, so we're here ahead of time just voicing our concerns about the future.

VARTANIAN: Okay. Okay.

DELEISSEGUES: Well, and another concern, correct me if I'm wrong, would be mutual aid agreements. I mean when the dispatcher looks at the map, they dispatch the closest fire and rescue to the scene and we're supposed to work it out later, but hopefully we would have some agreement, the fire district would have some agreement with the City of Vancouver to pay for the services provided like Battle Ground and Fire District 11 did, and I think the County and City ought to require those kind of agreements in the development agreement just like they do for schools. Fire districts don't have impact fees, all fire districts have are go to the voters in your fire district and ask for some kind of a LID lift or an override or they get pretty tired of paying more money for providing services to the City of Vancouver I would guess. But does that sound right to you?

ORJIAKO: No, you are absolutely correct, Commissioner. The issues that have been raised are issues that will be discussed during annexation between the Fire District and the City, it isn't something that you will put in front of this proposal before you. Some of the conditions as you raise why the County considered removing fire district, parks, open space, all the criterias that were put in place in '94, is that in some cases those services are not concurrency, doesn't follow under the concurrency requirement as transportation. Sewer is typically what is provided during actual development and some of those criterias were removed and focus on transportation because they fall under the concurrency. But the issue will be what will be discussed during annexation, what type of arrangement will be made between Fire District 3 and the City during annexation. And the City has an annexation blueprint, we don't know where, I can't tell you now where that fall, whether it's in the next five years or ten years, but we have a copy of their annexation blueprint.

BARCA: So I think I would like to voice the concern about the aspect of increasing the density and the urban level-of-services while it remains in the County and putting that burden on Fire District 3. The aspect that we have removed many of these quality of life issues off the table while we're making this decision, although we have the State law which says we do not have to consider them, I think it's very shortsighted public policy to not be looking at the aspect of emergency services, schools, the ability to provide parks for the people that we're going to be adding in there and questioning again if we're doing nothing more but facilitating the growth without worrying about the detrimental impacts of that growth since I happen to be in Fire District 3 and I would have to wonder myself about if the density is all gone to the south for my little fire district station is it getting its fair share of the resources to have that emergency service level that I'm enjoying at this moment or whether is that degraded to some degree.

So I feel more confident about the aspect of what gets worked out when the City annexes it because I think that's on the table from the very beginning, police and fire are a part of the discussion, but I would like the County to start considering the aspects of what happens to more than just water, sewer and traffic impacts when we start making these decisions.

DELEISSEGUES: Is there any other questions of Jeff? Okay. Thanks, Jeff, appreciate it.

STEWART: Thank you.

VARTANIAN: Well, I'm sorry, Jeff, can I ask one more question?

DELEISSEGUES: Sure, you bet.

VARTANIAN: To what degree do you think the service will be degraded before the annexation happens after the development starts in these different places?

STEWART: I think as development starts and the increase in call volume that us being the closest department to that area, we're going to be pulled down more often which will lower our service to the rest of the district as the population increases.

VARTANIAN: Yeah, I understand.

STEWART: Again, we have mutual aid agreements that will help, come into play there, but --

VARTANIAN: But theoretically the increase in revenue because there's an increase in development being taxed is not going to be enough to offset the increase in service requirements?

STEWART: Long-term planning --

VARTANIAN: I don't know if you can answer this.

STEWART: -- possibly, long-term planning, but --

VARTANIAN: But not while it's developing?

STEWART: Right.

VARTANIAN: Okay, thanks again.

DELEISSEGUES: Jeff, with this development occurring pretty much on the southern edge of the fire district, when you're pulled down wouldn't that also degrade, then, Clark County Fire and Rescue might have to move up to cover the apparatus that's gone down there?

STEWART: Correct, it's a trickle effect.

DELEISSEGUES: So you know, it's a widespread problem in the county, it's not just one fire district.

ALLEN: And it's a question of safety in case of emergency as well as natural disaster so I think that is a very important component of the consideration for this particular project.

DELEISSEGUES: Well, thanks for your testimony, I think it was helpful, very helpful.

ALLEN: And very strategic, thank you.

DELEISSEGUES: Any other testimony? Would you like to testify on this matter?

AUDIENCE: No.

DELEISSEGUES: Okay, fine, just wanted to make sure. So we'll return the deliberation to the Planning Commission.

VARTANIAN: I guess I understand that the County's reasoning about taking certain criteria away as requirements because there's no concurrency requirement because of it, what would it take, I mean it may be too late at this juncture for this particular urban holding area to put at least emergency services back in to the requirements, just because we don't have any measurement against what it should be doesn't mean we should reduce the services elsewhere in the system?

MABREY: Well, it would take a comprehensive plan amendment because they're specific to each urban holding area. I was just looking at the findings that were in the resolution, one of the resolutions, that the Board passed with regard to this area, and I'm sure there was a lot more that went into it, but the decision findings state that "fire and law enforcement are regional facilities that must keep pace with the development of an area as a whole and only in very unusual circumstances does the development of an individual parcel create impacts sufficient to alter service levels."

DELEISSEGUES: And who came up with that?

VARTANIAN: Careful.

DELEISSEGUES: It sounds like it was written by somebody that doesn't have the faintest idea about how this works. It sounds good, that's what I would like to believe if I were a citizen out there, and that's not the way it works at all.

BARCA: Well, it's the death by a thousand cuts, right, no one cut, no one development by itself impacts it, but what we're proposing is we're proposing a fairly significant amount of land to lift the urban holding from which makes it all relatively available for it to be

developed and therefore all of it to be impacting Fire District 3 in this specific case or emergency services in a generally generalized discussion.

DELEISSEGUES: In most cases where development has a serious impact on the services, and like East Vancouver for example, they would contract with the Sheriff's Office and actually pay the Sheriff to provide the protection until such time as the Vancouver Police Department was up to speed and could provide the protection themselves, I think we ought to ask, request, that the fire district be satisfied with such agreements, require such agreements to be made, that the fire districts ask all of them are satisfied with the Cities if they're going to annex this property and obviously aren't going to be the first provider, that when services are provided that cost to those services be somehow reimbursed because if you don't do that, then out of jurisdiction taxpayers are actually subsidizing the cost of providing that protection to the city.

ORJIAKO: Right.

DELEISSEGUES: There's got to be some equity in there somewhere because --

MABREY: Sure. Those are the kinds of agreements that are typically adopted prior to annexation between the jurisdictions affected.

DELEISSEGUES: Except for Battle Ground and Fire District 11 I don't believe that I've ever seen any others, I'm not aware of them, if you are kind enough, enlighten me.

MABREY: There's kind of a master agreement between the City and the County that has been pretty much longstanding now. Oliver, do you want to recall more about it.

ORJIAKO: What I'm aware is that in some cases it requires some cooperation and in some cases consolidation of services where appropriate. Again, this is a case where Fire District 3 and the City of Vancouver will look at their boundaries and come to some mutual understanding of who is going to be providing in this case fire services for the area that they're going to be annexing, they may have to adjust their boundaries or whatever the case may be, but it will be done through some mutual agreement.

DELEISSEGUES: But with mutual aid agreements it doesn't matter what the boundaries are, that's the problem, whoever's dispatched to provide that initial response has to go. I mean that's the nature of protection is you worry about the money later and nine times out of ten there isn't any money. Well, it's something I think that ought to be looked into and maybe some thought given to providing some equity to it.

VARTANIAN: And if I could editorialize maybe a little bit on the philosophical basis, whereas it may be true systemwide that as individual developments occur or plats become developed or whatever else out here, if those are fairly reasonably dispersed throughout the county all the fire districts are sort of being impacted rather than one. We have in this case I think it's at least 1400 dwelling units being applied for all of a sudden in this really small area, all of which is inside Fire District 3.

DELEISSEGUES: And that's only a third of it.

VARTANIAN: Yeah. And philosophically I agree, in theory no one development is probably going to overload the system anywhere in particular, that's assuming the development occurs throughout the county here and there, but here we have a substantial concentration of new development in a very small area relatively speaking so we're putting a whole lot of burden on one particular fire district and emergency services. That's an editorial comment.

DELEISSEGUES: Any other comments or discussion on anything other than or including fire protection, but any of the rest of Mike's proposal, the County's proposal?

BARCA: I'm ready to make a motion.

DELEISSEGUES: If there's no other discussion, go ahead.

BARCA: So I would like to recommend that the urban holding be removed from the area known as Orchards slash 119th street as outlined in Attachment Exhibit 3 per staff recommendation. And once again I would just really like us to make sure that what we're doing is not detrimental to emergency services to the surrounding area when we lift this.

DELEISSEGUES: Was that part of the motion?

BARCA: Yes.

DELEISSEGUES: Good.

ALLEN: Second.

DELEISSEGUES: There's a motion and second to approve the staff recommendation also with our recommendation that this situation be looked at for, how did you say it?

ORJIAKO: Emergency services.

MABREY: Not detrimental to emergency services.

BARCA: Not detrimental to emergency services.

DELEISSEGUES: So any discussion on the motion?

VARTANIAN: Yeah. What happens if it's denied, if the Planning Commission decides not to approve it?

ORJIAKO: We'll forward the recommendation to the Board for consideration.

VARTANIAN: Yeah, just curious.

DELEISSEGUES: Any other discussion of the motion? Okay. Roll call, please.

ROLL CALL VOTE

ALLEN: AYE

VARTANIAN: AYE

BARCA: AYE

DELEISSEGUES: AYE

BARCA: That's an interesting question you asked, George.

VARTANIAN: Thank you.

MABREY: Thank you, Commissioners.

ORJIAKO: I want to thank you, Commissioners.

VARTANIAN: I was wondering what kind of juices were --

BARCA: Yeah, look at the sweat on his brow.

DELEISSEGUES: There being no other public hearing items other than that we'll move to old business. Is there any old business?

OLD BUSINESS

VARTANIAN: Do we still have to elect the vice chair?

DELEISSEGUES: We could.

VARTANIAN: No, we've done that four times now.

DELEISSEGUES: He's AWOL.

NEW BUSINESS

DELEISSEGUES: Then we'll move to new business. Any new business? I had some new business that I discussed with Oliver and I'd just like to suggest at least that materials would be sent ahead even for workshop subjects so that we have some chance to review that before the workshop and not be inundated with material at the workshop and you try to read the material you're given and listen to the presentation and it gets confusing.

Another one would be no workshop passed 6:30 when there's a following public hearing just because if you stay in the workshop for so long, you get tired and burnt out and you really don't have the energy that you really ought to have for the public hearing.

Another one is that it's okay for longer workshops if it's not followed by a public hearing, usually the first Thursday public workshop is not followed by a public hearing and if that wants to go on until 7:30 or 8:00, I think that's reasonable.

I would hope that changes to the public hearing schedule would be communicated to the public, to PC, the Planning Commission, as soon as the schedule's changed. I think a lot of people are caught off guard by this one, they weren't planning for it, so obviously they aren't here tonight, it could result in a lack of a quorum. And I think we need to limit the changes to a minimum. I don't want to be held in a workshop just because we're waiting for a Hearing Examiner to vacate the room or something like that. So if we could just minimize the changes to the schedule, I think it would be helpful for all concerned. Other than that.

ORJIAKO: I will only say well said. We will take your comment into consideration and try as much as we can to schedule the work sessions perhaps on the first Thursday and schedule it when you don't have hearings. If it goes longer, well, it goes longer. And we will also accommodate your request that we send the work session materials ahead of time.

DELEISSEGUES: Well, I appreciate it. I know sometimes you're caught with short notice, but appreciate any effort to keep that.

BARCA: I think that is helpful if we have an opportunity to review the material, that way we're not trying to think of questions while the staff person is actually talking to us, we're able to give the staff more attention and have our questions already outlined. So it helps us get more out of the work session as well and if they're unable to prepare the material in advance, then perhaps it's a little premature for a work session.

ORJIAKO: I will agree and I will also if you have questions, you can E-mail it to us, that will help staff prepared and it become a good work session for us either way.

DELEISSEGUES: My thought of a work session is more of an opportunity for give and take, give an opportunity for the Planning Commission to ask questions and to have a discussion, and a lot of times we're so limited with time and it seems like there's so much material that the staff's trying to present that there's hardly any time unless we interrupt their presentation to make sure that we're clear on what's being presented and for the people to ask questions and have those questions answered. And I think that's the value of a workshop is for people to go away knowing more about the subject that was presented rather than being confused about what's going on because of the overload of information. But you just have to do your best, I guess, with the time available, but something to think about.

COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION

DELEISSEGUES: Is there any other comments from members of the Planning Commission?

VARTANIAN: Yeah, if I might. During the work session we talked a little bit about the valuation of economic benefit or whatever it is, justification to change to a commercial area from something else, and how we pretty regularly it seems try to get an approach to convert residential or industrial land to commercial and the argument is always that we need more commercial, well, our company has a plan put together that said we don't need more commercial and now individually we're getting these requests to convert to commercial and a long time ago we started doing and I would like to see some finality or getting some movement toward it about setting up criteria for economic justification.

I mean all we're getting is the developer's side as far as points of view is concerned, do we need something or don't we, and with all due respect I think there may be some tainted statistics or information in there that I would like to see at least a counter to.

ORJIAKO: That is something that we can also review and perhaps come back to the Planning Commission with staff options that you may consider. We don't want to be in a situation where the economists or the consultant that prepared the report is debating with staff what is appropriate, what analysis, what data did they use, we may be able to come to some understanding with the help of the Planning Commission what you would like us to use in reviewing the criterias or reviewing the market studies that are submitted. Often you see when a traffic study is done two engineers not agreeing until they go back to review the same materials that were used and look for consistency. We will try to do that.

When you look at a market study done on a subarea or a particular location, you're always going to find some conclusion that if you look at maybe a two-mile square area or whatever the composition of the income, the demography or whatever the case may be, you will come up with some reason to argue that there is a need for some type of specialized commercial for that geographic area. When you're looking at it on a countywide basis, you may conclude that you don't need commercial because of acreage, that's what you're looking at. So we'll come back to the Planning Commission with some proposal that you may consider.

VARTANIAN: Thank you.

ALLEN: And you had also mentioned that in 2006 there was commercial technological group that was helping staff to draft the criteria and the guidelines, so it would probably be helpful to see what they had done. And also add to that you make it a full package of the criteria and guidelines to evaluate those market analysis as they come in, but if there was some work done in 2006, it would be helpful to see what they did do so far.

ORJIAKO: Okay, we'll do that. There is the current work underway to update our commercial district and we will also bounce this idea to that group to help us formulate what we will bring to the Planning Commission.

ALLEN: Thank you.

DELEISSEGUES: Okay, good. Any other comments? Hearing none, we stand adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

The hearing adjourned at 9:15 p.m.

All proceedings of tonite'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 also be viewed on CTV on the following web page link:

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

Chair

Date

Minutes Transcribed by:

Cindy Holley, Court Reporter

Sonja Wiser, Administrative Assistant

MIN 2008-06-05