

**CLARK COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF PUBLIC HEARING
THURSDAY, OCTOBER 16, 2008**

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

6:30 p.m.

CALL TO ORDER

DELEISSEGUES: Okay. I'll call the Clark County Planning Commission meeting to order for October the 16th. Don't see any guests.

ROLL CALL

RUPLEY: HERE
BARCA: She's new. HERE
ALLEN: HERE
VARTANIAN: HERE
MORASCH: HERE
DELEISSEGUES: HERE
WRISTON: HERE

Other: Chris Horne, Prosecuting Attorney; Christine Cook, Prosecuting Attorney; Jeff Niten, Planner II; and Sonja Wiser, Administrative Assistant.

GENERAL & NEW BUSINESS

A. Approval of Agenda for October 16, 2008

DELEISSEGUES: We found that there's no changes to the agenda, do we have approval of the agenda.

RUPLEY: I move that we approve the agenda as written.

WRISTON: I second.

DELEISSEGUES: Moved and approved. All in favor.

EVERYBODY: AYE

B. Approval of Minutes for September 18, 2008

DELEISSEGUES: Changes to the minutes for September 18th, 2008.

ALLEN: There's just one small change. On Page 12 under ALLEN the first sentence where it says, well, I would suggest some strategic proactive research on this one because this is I believe

that it also applies instead of implies.

DELEISSEGUES: With that change, is there any other changes? Can we have approval of the minutes.

WRISTON: Move to approve.

ALLEN: Second.

DELEISSEGUES: Somebody second. All in favor.

EVERYBODY: AYE

C. Communications from the Public

None.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS & PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION

A. 2008 DOCKETS

1. **CPZ2008-00031 Agricultural Uses Review** Clark County is considering revision of 40.210.010 footnote number 9 to add the underlined language:

9. Commercial uses supporting resource uses, such as packing, first stage processing and processing which provides value added to resource products as well as facilities that repair, maintain or refurbish equipment utilized for agricultural, forest and other resource based industries including wind, hydro and solar generation, but specifically not including the establishment or siting of a wind, hydro or solar generating facility. Chippers, pole yards, log sorting and storage, antique agricultural storage or display, temporary structures for debarking, accessory uses including, but not limited to, scaling and weigh operations temporary crew quarters, storage and maintenance facilities, disposal areas, saw mills producing ten thousand (10,000) board feet per day or less, and other uses involved in the harvesting of forest products.

NITEN: Commissioners, Jeff Niten with Community Planning. What we have before you tonight is a request to change the text of Unified Development Code Section 40.210.010 and it's Footnote Number 9 that we're looking at tonight. The text that you have in front of you, the text there is what is currently existing, the underlined text is what was we're proposing to add.

The footnote reads "commercial uses supporting resource uses, such as packing, first stage processing and processing which provides value added to resource products as well as facilities that repair, maintain or refurbish equipment utilized for and accessory to

agricultural, forest and other resource based industries including wind, hydro and solar generation, but specifically not including the establishment or siting of a wind, hydro or solar generating facility." And then the remaining text except for a provision for antique agricultural storage or display items is what's currently existing today.

The background on this, the Revised Code of Washington 36.70A.170(1) defines "resource lands" as follows and then it gives the definitions (a) (b) (c) and (d) of what those resource lands are. At the time the staff report was written we had not received any comments from members of the public or interested parties; however, we did receive a comment from the Friends of the Columbia Gorge on the SEPA issuance for this project and what the Friends of the Columbia Gorge mentioned was that our SEPA implies that this provision would apply countywide; however, inside the Columbia Gorge section, which is just a very small section of the county, southeast portion of the county, this would actually not apply and that's correct, it would not apply there, but that's I believe four percent of the County's land area and it would not apply in that area.

Other than that staff recommends approval of the language presented in your packet for the following reasons: It provides economic opportunity and flexibility to citizens residing in the resource areas and it allowing these accessory uses in close proximity to resource uses will increase resource production by allowing the repair on-site as opposed to downtime associated with off-site repair. And that concludes the staff report.

DELEISSEGUES: Any questions of Jeff? Anyone in the audience wish to testify on this matter?

PRINTZ: I'll be really slow and really short just like always. Randy Printz, 805 Broadway. I'm here to support these changes. In working with staff at least over the last, and the Board and you guys, over the last year or two talking about ag uses and what can go out there and what can't, there are some uses out there today and there's some question about in terms of the supporting uses what can or can't be put into ag or what comes under this language.

The code already allows commercial uses that support natural resource based industries and there are folks out there who want to who do that even today and do things like fix tractors or combines or farm equipment, wind, solar, logging equipment, those sorts of things, and they do a variety of different things and some of them manufacture little component parts for these pieces of equipment, some of them fix them, some of them refurbish them, they mill them.

So one of the questions came up just what does this section of the code allow and so I sat down with staff and we kind of worked through this, what we didn't want to do was, and the intent of this is not to allow large manufacturing facilities that don't have anything to do with natural resource based industries or and in fact that even would manufacture combines for example because they would have to be -- the only thing you could manufacture is component parts for that.

So, anyway, this was mostly at least started out as sort of a clarification code cleanup issue and was certainly not intended to be any sort of major change to the code. So that's kind of where we started. I know the Board's had a number of questions from some folks, they asked -- they talked to me and said work with staff and so that's what we've done and so we're here.

DELEISSEGUES: Good. Thank you. Any questions of Mr. Printz?

VARTANIAN: What kind of limitation on component parts would you envision? I mean there's some pretty big component parts and you can manufacture all the component parts for a combine, the only thing you're not doing is assembling it and you'd still be within this guideline.

PRINTZ: I suspect that we could craft or come up with a variety of circumstances if we push the envelope to where you'd say that's not something that we want. And I mean you can sort of do that with any code provision, you can't draft for every foreseeable thing; however, one of the things that Oliver and I talked a lot about was making sure that this was limited to natural resource based industries which is basically stuff out of the ag and out in the rural zones and not intended to be certainly something where you're going to put Intel out there, although I suspect that if Intel wanted to come to Clark County on a piece of ag land, we'd figure out a way to make that work, but that isn't the intent of this code provision.

VARTANIAN: No, I realize what the intent is, but then that's you sitting in front of us right now we trust you that's what your intent is, but as you know, once you put it in the code you have to start arguing about what is a component part, how much of a machine's parts are component parts before it becomes the machine itself.

PRINTZ: And if PC wants to go down that path and give me or staff or us direction to when we get to the Board to come up with some further definition for what that is or limitations on that or whatever, I mean that's certainly something that we can do.

VARTANIAN: I'd just be more comfortable to put some sort of limitation on either the size or the percentage of the machinery that's being done, built or a certain piece that represents no more than some percentage of the overall cost of the product or something.

BARCA: Why? Why?

VARTANIAN: Because you could literally make all the component parts for a combine.

BARCA: And even if you did, George, since it's not sales you're still doing repair.

VARTANIAN: No, you --

BARCA: If you roll your tractor down a hill sideways and you have to repair most of the component parts --

VARTANIAN: It says or manufacture component parts.

BARCA: Right.

VARTANIAN: Well, you can manufacture all the component parts and build a brand-new machine.

BARCA: And then did you do that as a repair or did you --

VARTANIAN: You don't have to do it as a repair if I'm reading this right, it says "maintain or refurbish or manufacture component parts."

BARCA: Right.

MORASCH: It doesn't say that.

DELEISSEGUES: I don't see it either.

NITEN: Well, one thing, Commissioners, I should make clear --

VARTANIAN: Well, I've got the latest version.

NITEN: One thing I should make clear here is the version that's in your packet that you have the updated version, it's the piece of paper that you got in the work session, it looks the exact same.

PRINTZ: We started with Oliver and I came up with something that included this. I was gone, Jeff and Oliver sort of worked out the manufacture --

NITEN: It looks the same but it's just got the added manufacture language.

MORASCH: I was confused as all get out as to what we were arguing about and now it makes sense.

PRINTZ: Yeah. I forgot you guys didn't have it. I thought you had given it to them.

NITEN: Yeah. There's a piece of paper up there, but that was the only change from the language that's in your packet.

WRISTON: What's the specific background use, what is this being written for, who are you representing?

ALLEN: Yes.

PRINTZ: Yes.

VARTANIAN: Ford Motors.

WRISTON: I mean what are we dealing with?

BARCA: Not that we don't trust you.

WRISTON: No.

RUPLEY: Full disclosure.

DELEISSEGUES: Who's behind this?

PRINTZ: My clients are the Haughtons which is the Shurman Machine family that have been here for 40 years out south of Ridgefield, in fact one of the Board members asked when we did this to make sure that we put antique agricultural equipment storage because if you've ever been out through some of their shops they have, it's actually a really interesting day to spend going through all of their stuff, and so they have, and there are some other folks around that are like them that have been out in the rural area, do a lot of farm equipment repair, they've got little machine shops where they manufacture bearings or things like that.

In this particular case they're also starting to do some work for some of the wind folks just because of the technology they've got for tractors and things happens to transfer for some of these --

BARCA: Gear boxes, power transmission is power transmission.

PRINTZ: Right.

BARCA: Right.

PRINTZ: So they'd like to continue doing that. They want to invest some money and create some more jobs on the site that they're on, but they can't do that without knowing for sure whether or not they can do it, and so we sat down with staff to work through how could we, recognizing that this is not just for them, that it does apply to ag property in general in the county, and so how do we, you know, if the County says we like what they're doing, we think that's an appropriate use in the ag zone, how do we draft some language that allows for those types of things but doesn't allow for the things that you're concerned about, which I agree.

WRISTON: So this says "accessory to agricultural, forest or other resource" and yet we're putting it in the ag, are we going to do this for forest too as well?

PRINTZ: This language is already in the ag, I mean most of this is in the ag, the ag zone allows commercial uses --

WRISTON: Right.

PRINTZ: -- and then it has a Footnote Number 9 --

WRISTON: Right.

PRINTZ: -- you've got Footnote Number 9 and Number 9 without the underline is what is there today, this language for the most part arguably just clarifies it because the first part of the existing language says "commercial uses supporting resource uses," so what does that mean. So that's kind of where we started this discussion so we tried to draft some fairly simple language that would identify or further clarify what that might be.

WRISTON: I guess what I'm trying to figure out is are we going to allow forest and/or other resource based like mining, forest and mining equipment accessory uses in the agricultural?

PRINTZ: They already are, chippers, pole yards, log sorting and storage --

WRISTON: Are all --

PRINTZ: -- scaling and weigh operations, all of those are allowed outright today in the ag zone.

NITEN: Sawmills producing 10,000 board feet.

PRINTZ: Sawmills, right.

BARCA: The way I read this based on the original staff report was underneath where it said Background it gave the three forms of resource land so my interpretation was that this was applying across the resource land.

VARTANIAN: Well, I guess my biggest concern is I don't know if it's appropriate to put a machine shop in the middle of an ag area if there is no agricultural. I mean are we trying to establish a code here that's going to allow for some guy to fix his tractor that he uses in his farming operation?

PRINTZ: Or somebody else's.

VARTANIAN: So it's possible, so you're saying we could have a machine shop out there?

PRINTZ: Which you already do, right, which you already do.

VARTANIAN: That services all the farms?

PRINTZ: Correct. I mean as you guys know, to support agriculture you need more than just a horse and a plow and some seeds, you've got to have equipment folks who are around who can support the ag industry, you've got to have chemical folks, fertilizer folks, all kinds of equipment and other supporting services that you have to have in order to support the agricultural industry.

VARTANIAN: Well, I understand that, but I mean you can get very far afield from the agricultural industry --

PRINTZ: Right. And this is limited to --

VARTANIAN: -- if you start adding chemical fertilizer manufacturing facilities or, you know. I mean I understand what we're trying to do here, I thought we were trying to just minimize the use of the land to either agriculture or specifically on the guy's farm he's got a broken spoke on his wheel and he's got to fix it.

PRINTZ: The code already allows outright commercial uses supporting resource uses so the question for us was do we fit in that box, I don't know, I can't tell you today, I can't tell my client today, I can't tell the Board today that this expressly provides for that or not. So Oliver and I particularly sat down and started having a discussion about what is this kind of intended to do, what do we want to do, does it fit in the box, how do we make sure if we clarify it for these things that we don't create a broader range of things that we clearly don't want and so this was the language that we came up with.

VARTANIAN: So basically we're saying that you could have a machine shop that produces combine engines but not if it's usable by a car?

PRINTZ: Yeah, I think that would be accurate.

DELEISSEGUES: What if the car was used for agricultural purposes?

VARTANIAN: Unless it was the farmer's car, okay.

DELEISSEGUES: How is this different from a home occupation business?

PRINTZ: Well, one, as you guys know there are substantial limits on the home occ and you've got a Type I home occ and a Type II but there are numbers, you guys have been through this probably more than you care to in terms of number of employees, parking limitations, all of those sorts of things. I mean most of the time the home occ, well, you can have it sort of in the rural area, it's usually an issue in the urban area where somebody lives in a house and wants to be --

RUPLEY: And has four tractors in the driveway.

PRINTZ: Yeah, wants to be a graphic artist or a real estate agent out of there, I mean that's the typical.

DELEISSEGUES: It seems like the home occupation would allow this too.

PRINTZ: No, because they've got 35 employees. Or I mean they've got --

DELEISSEGUES: Gosh, I hope this isn't going to be a shop like George is describing with 35 employees out there but --

PRINTZ: Well, they're on 50 acres or whatever.

VARTANIAN: Well, no, but I mean why would you not say you can have 35 or 100 employees because all you're doing is making tractor parts in an agricultural area?

PRINTZ: Okay. And I guess --

VARTANIAN: Well, wait a minute, you got two guys here from staff here going one's going no, one guy's going yes and --

WRISTON: We don't have the ag to support it.

VARTANIAN: -- they're not, and they're not up yet either.

EULER: Gordy Euler, Community Planning. The home business ordinance as written excludes ag and it doesn't apply to ag uses.

VARTANIAN: No, I'm not talking about home operations, I'm talking about this --

PRINTZ: I guess my first thought about that would be why would you not want that, why would you not want 100 jobs that supported the agricultural industry in the ag zone?

VARTANIAN: Because it's an ag zone.

BARCA: All right. So I --

VARTANIAN: I mean again, I'm not convinced one way or the other.

BARCA: Let's put this back in some perspective here, okay. If you are cranking out diesel engines for tractors, the demand in Clark County for that is like four, okay.

PRINTZ: Thank you.

VARTANIAN: I understand.

BARCA: And so if you are now manufacturing them and you are sending them out of the county, then you're not supporting the ag of the county, you have gone into sales outside of the county. It isn't beneficial for you to be out in the hinterland with transportation to try and support that kind of business, that doesn't make sense. But if we want to look at the idea of keeping people from having to drive to Salem to get their tractor worked on, if we want to look at the aspect of having new small type equipment be able to be serviced in the area and repaired when we need it, let's give them something that allows that.

VARTANIAN: Does this as written prohibit for use outside of that specific agricultural area?

ALLEN: No, it does not and that's why one of the things that I had mentioned that maybe there

should be a limitation as to what scope of agriculture we're talking about, that that should be maybe be either on-site or is it countywide or is it nationwide.

PRINTZ: Again, it's worth at least remembering that the existing code language allows outright commercial uses supporting resource uses, not resource uses in the county, resource uses.

VARTANIAN: Then why do we have this change here?

PRINTZ: I don't know what that means exactly and I've got to be able to tell my client before they go spend a whole bunch of money, and we're at current planning under site plan review saying what do we do with this. So it was everybody's thinking that the best thing to do would be to come and clarify the footnote so that we all knew what we were dealing with.

DELEISSEGUES: My question is are we playing with a full deck here? I mean we've only got the footnote, is there some other verbiage that --

PRINTZ: No, it comes right out of the use table in the code.

DELEISSEGUES: Yeah, but we don't have it in front of us here.

PRINTZ: No, but what I'm going to tell you is all it says is "commercial uses" has a P and then it has Footnote 9.

DELEISSEGUES: Well, maybe there's something someplace else that prohibits sales outside the area, whatever, that we're all worried about.

PRINTZ: No, there isn't. You have everything, that is what the code --

DELEISSEGUES: That's what I was afraid of.

NITEN: Commissioner Deleissegues, the footnote that you have is everything, I made sure that any relevant information you have.

ALLEN: But even the footnote can establish a precedent and so I would like to have County counsel's opinion on this particular proposed language for manufacturing on-site or manufacturing component parts and I know you probably did not see it just like we didn't see it until tonight.

HORNE: Well, first, I actually I saw it earlier in the day, I just saw it today, but I saw it and I think Randy maybe only drafted it today but --

PRINTZ: I didn't know it had been changed from what we had, Oliver and I had worked through before.

HORNE: It depends on what the Planning Commission is trying to accomplish. This ordinance as it was originally drafted by staff would allow for the -- well, there's a couple of things that you probably ought to know. If this was designed to deal with an individual use that's one thing because of course Shurman Machine has historic nonconforming rights, but without getting into that individual use, we shouldn't be writing our code for any use, it should be for a broader picture, and I think that's what Randy would tell you.

So looking forward to industrial or resource uses, this was designed, I think the changes that Jeff described in terms of the repair, maintenance, refurbishment of equipment that was utilized for or

accessory to agriculture, forest and other resource based industries was intended to allow for a small type of machine shop or some kind of a machine shop, it doesn't actually have a size limitation, some kind of a machine shop that would service that kind of equipment. It is not limited to the county and I don't think anybody contemplated it, whether it needs to be or not is a different question, one which this Commission can decide.

The significance of the difference that I think that Randy has proposed is it allows for parts to be constructed, and he used the term "manufacture" which I guess makes me a little nervous, but if you use the term "fabricate" or I don't know what the Commission wants to accomplish, if you want to have a manufacture potentially, and I think staff's concern is you have the potential of a manufacturing plant for the component for brake parts, for diesel engine, for Caterpillar diesel engines that fit in John Deere tractors, and there would be nothing in this ordinance that would prohibit that, and the only questions, that would all fit because it supports commercial or resource industries.

But the question is whether or not that kind of manufacturing or industrial use should be allowed in the resource zones or allowed in the ag zone and that's an issue you have to resolve. If you're only trying to resolve the question of whether or not an individual who has a lathe, which anybody who's pretty proficient with a lathe who's a metal worker can fabricate their own parts, and you want to allow them to manufacture parts, brass bearings for equipment for them or their neighbors, you can write this to accomplish that goal and allow Shurman Machine and any other use that wants to do repair and refurbishment of equipment for supporting industries, you can accomplish that. So I think you can tighten it if you choose to, but ultimately it's a policy call for you.

DELEISSEGUES: I think "incidental fabrication" is a whole lot different in my mind than "manufacturing."

VARTANIAN: Right.

ALLEN: Exactly.

VARTANIAN: Yes. You know, not having been here, I'm not sure the reason for the code originally but I would have anticipated it to be just to support the local farming community, like you said the neighbor and the guy who's got something down the street --

HORNE: In the rural commercial --

VARTANIAN: -- I don't know that.

HORNE: No, in the rural commercial zones in fact actually there are specific limitations that uses be tied to that which is needed by, because we've been through that route before and so you could do that in the zoning portion of the code. Or I mean actually, yeah, you could do that in this provision of the code that which is used by and necessary for the surrounding area or you can tighten it if you want to. But again, all this depends on which way you want to go and how you want to handle it. If you direct staff, then I assume we can work with them to accomplish what you want to accomplish or what you want to do.

VARTANIAN: Well, personally I would rather not see an International Harvest or supplier locate somewhere in one of the ag areas of our county exporting -- well, no, I mean I know he's not going to make engine parts for the county but he's going to make engine parts for Allis-Chalmers someplace else.

HOLLEY: For where?

VARTANIAN: Someplace else.

PRINTZ: Allis-Chalmers, that's what he was saying.

VARTANIAN: It's a --

BARCA: An old girlfriend of his.

VARTANIAN: She wasn't bad either.

BARCA: I know, she knew how to drive a tractor.

VARTANIAN: That's right, she was quite a charmer actually.

WRISTON: But I think if we do that though --

DELEISSEGUES: The farmer's daughter.

WRISTON: -- it defeats the purpose of what you're trying to accomplish though which, and I'm --

PRINTZ: It totally depends on what we're --

WRISTON: Well, I'm assuming that your clients are planning on making whatever for wind or --

PRINTZ: They are today I mean (inaudible).

WRISTON: And they're planning on doing it for maybe support in the Gorge, I don't know.

PRINTZ: Right.

WRISTON: I mean it's not necessarily --

RUPLEY: Clark County.

WRISTON: -- Clark County, but yet it's a good thing.

BARCA: It's a growth industry potential for us.

VARTANIAN: I'm not saying it's not something the County shouldn't have in it but ag land.

DELEISSEGUES: But, Jeff, why would that have to be in the county in the ag land?

PRINTZ: The ag land, I mean the farm products that we produce certainly aren't just consumed in Clark County, I mean we export those all over the country.

VARTANIAN: And I guess my point is nobody is saying that these are not desirable industries, I'm just saying wouldn't that all be better done in an industrial zone before we give it up altogether.

BARCA: We voted all kinds of ag land out in the last review and now you're worried about the last 50 acres on whether they're going to produce a gear on it or not. I --

VARTANIAN: I'm not sure we all gave up the land but --

BARCA: Well, let's put it in these terms, right, you have to be able to repair --

VARTANIAN: Agreed.

BARCA: -- equipment, okay.

VARTANIAN: Agreed.

BARCA: You have to have it be viable if it is your exclusive means of employment. So if it's not you building your own bearings, repairing your own hydraulic cylinders, working on your own engine, then you have to have a means of attracting enough clientele to make it worthwhile to do that, but the service is then available for the surrounding community which supports the aspect of making agriculture viable in the county. Nobody is going to set a large manufacturing facility, and this is from my background, of the type that it takes to fabricate from scratch major pieces of equipment, they're going to be on transportation corridors --

PRINTZ: There's no rail access.

BARCA: Right. -- they're going to want their raw materials readily available. What you're really looking at is the people will need to be able to repair hydraulic cylinders, they'll need to fabricate gears from scratch for time to time.

ALLEN: Then the word "fabricate" would then serve the purpose much better than the word "manufacture."

BARCA: You know what --

PRINTZ: I have no idea of what the --

BARCA: -- that's semantics.

VARTANIAN: Yeah, it's semantics.

BARCA: That semantic means nothing because I can fabricate a gear as easily as I can manufacture a gear, it won't change the ability for somebody to do the work or not.

PRINTZ: I mean I think I'm okay with "fabricate" but probably only because I don't know, I'm not sure that I know what it --

ALLEN: I don't know. "Manufacturing" implies a manufacturing operation, a big scale, large-scale manufacturing.

PRINTZ: Which this is clearly not intended to do.

WRISTON: How big is your client's facility going to be?

PRINTZ: Right now they've got some old buildings out there that they want to rebuild, they've got, I don't know, probably 10 or 15 employees, they want to add maybe twice that.

WRISTON: I'm just wondering if they're worried about some huge manufacturing facility coming out there if there's a way to limit the square footage so that it's reasonable.

PRINTZ: They've got a, and it depends on whether it was, I mean they've got a fair amount of square footage out there now, I mean, in their buildings.

WRISTON: In their mixed use zone, sorry to interrupt, but I mean an idea would be in our mixed use zone for instance, and maybe this could work in ag too, not to get too much language in there, but in the mixed use zone I think we have for five acres to something acres you're allowed to do X and from 20 to 50, I don't know, there's --

PRINTZ: Well, you got a 25 percent commercial requirement --

WRISTON: Right.

PRINTZ: -- which --

NITEN: 20.

WRISTON: Right --

PRINTZ: 20, yeah.

WRISTON: -- 20 percent. And what ag, and I guess what I'm wondering is maybe you could do something like that where you can limit the square footage of a facility or something. I don't even know if that's necessary, but if that addresses some of the concerns we're hearing tonight, then they've got 50 acres, it seems to me --

BARCA: 20 percent of that.

DELEISSEGUES: Maybe we could return it to the Planning Commission and somebody could make a motion with or without that language in it and we can see where we are.

VARTANIAN: Are you done?

DELEISSEGUES: I'm not so sure that it's -- I think I'm agreeing with Ron that semantics, I don't think we're arguing about maybe anything.

PRINTZ: I mean I suppose one way to --

DELEISSEGUES: Maybe we'll just go for it.

PRINTZ: -- look at this is if you want to look at worse case scenario and everything that you envision begins to happen, one, you obviously always have the option to change the code and you're not going to have 15 or 50 major large farm implement manufacturers or something that come to Clark County and --

BARCA: Wouldn't that be horrible.

PRINTZ: Well, right. I mean then you'd have to decide whether you wanted that or not, but I mean if you started to see that trend because of this language, which you're not, but if in the worse case

scenario if you did, you certainly could always amend the code.

VARTANIAN: Not once an application's been filed.

PRINTZ: No, you've got that one, but I mean if you've got tens of thousands of ag acres out there.

DELEISSEGUES: Let's see where we are here.

MORASCH: Then I'll move to adopt as written --

BARCA: Second.

RUPLEY: I'll second.

MORASCH: -- in the recommendation.

ALLEN: As written which?

RUPLEY: Right here.

MORASCH: As written in the latest --

ALLEN: As written by Randy Printz or as written by staff?

DELEISSEGUES: Both.

PRINTZ: Well, actually I helped write the other one, it just --

NITEN: As written with the word "manufacturing."

MORASCH: Yes, the latest version here that was handed to me this evening at the hearing.

DELEISSEGUES: Second?

RUPLEY: Second.

DELEISSEGUES: Moved and seconded that we adopt the language as handed out to us moments ago. Any other discussion on this before we --

MORASCH: Well, I would just add the one other issue that was brought up about, well, should we restrict these farm support businesses to only being able to sell or service other ag uses in Clark County, I'm opposed to that kind of a restriction and here's the reason, these farm support businesses I think are important to the ag businesses left in Clark County and if you make it too difficult for them to do business by saying, well, you can only service this market, you can't also sell to other markets, you're probably going to tend to drive some of these businesses out of business and I don't think that's what we want to do, so that's why I made my motion to adopt the language as written.

DELEISSEGUES: Any other discussion?

RUPLEY: Well, I think I would like to agree with Steve because I can think as we went through the comp plan people would talk to us about how difficult it was to have the ag support and so I can

just hear someone coming back next time and saying, well, I probably could have made the money I needed to but I couldn't get my tractor worked on because I had to take it to Eugene and so I don't want to see that happen either so I support it too.

DELEISSEGUES: Anybody else?

VARTANIAN: Well, okay, but the motion's been made --

DELEISSEGUES: And seconded.

VARTANIAN: -- and seconded. Well, can I comment, I guess I'd like to comment on it of course.

WRISTON: It's a free world.

VARTANIAN: Can we limit the manufacturing operations to only be to repair equipment that's already in existence as opposed to a supplier to an assembly plant?

DELEISSEGUES: Well, we could if it were agreeable with the person that made the motion.

VARTANIAN: Well, that's what I'm asking.

BARCA: The language doesn't allow that now, you can't manufacture finished goods for sale like that.

VARTANIAN: Yes, you can. You can make gears for China.

BARCA: It says component --

VARTANIAN: We should live so long.

BARCA: It says "component parts."

VARTANIAN: Yes, and a component part is a transmission or the gears in a transmission which you could ship to Russia if you're so inclined.

DELEISSEGUES: Let's vote on the motion as it stands unless Steve's willing to make a change.

MORASCH: I'd like to just vote the motion up or down and then if that gets voted down, then we can talk about tinkering with the language.

DELEISSEGUES: Any other discussion then? Okay. Roll call, please.

RUPLEY: AYE

BARCA: AYE

ALLEN: AYE

VARTANIAN: NO

MORASCH: AYE

DELEISSEGUES: AYE

WRISTON: AYE

BARCA: Jeff, a surprise vote from you.

WRISTION: From me?

VARTANIAN: Are you kidding me?

WRISTON: Are you serious?

PRINTZ: Thank you very much.

DELEISSEGUES: Thank you, Randy, it was good discussion. I think it was healthy for us all to understand what we're doing here. Jeff, is there anything else on the agenda tonight that --

NITEN: I have nothing further for you this evening.

OLD BUSINESS

None.

NEW BUSINESS

None.

COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION

None.

ADJOURNMENT

The hearing adjourned at 7:15 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 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