

**PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
THURSDAY, OCTOBER 21, 2010**

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

6:00 p.m.

CALL TO ORDER

DELEISSEGUES: Good evening, everyone. We'll call the Clark County Planning Commission to order for Thursday, October 21st, 2010. May we have roll call, please.

MORASCH: ABSENT
BARCA: ABSENT
ALLEN: PRESENT
WRISTON: ABSENT
USKOSKI: HERE
VARTANIAN: HERE
DELEISSEGUES: HERE

Staff Present: Oliver Orjiako, Community Planning Director; Laurie Lebowski, Planner; Gary Albrecht, Planner; Jose Alvarez, Planner; Colete Anderson, Planner; Chris Cook, Prosecuting Attorney; and Sonja Wiser, Administrative Assistant.

GENERAL & NEW BUSINESS

A. Approval of Agenda for October 21, 2010

DELEISSEGUES: On the approval of the agenda for tonight, Oliver, did you have some changes you wanted to suggest?

ORJIAKO: Good evening, Planning Commission members. For the record Oliver Orjiako with Community Planning. Yes, Mr. Chair, I would like because I believe that you have a full agenda this evening and I'm suggesting that we perhaps take Item C on your agenda and make it the first item. This will be CPZ2010-00027, International Children's Care request as our first item, followed by Item E on Page 4 on your agenda which will be the Transportation CFP Amendment CPZ2010-00013.

And then Item D will be on the same Page 4, the Release of Urban Holding East Fairgrounds, as your number three item, and then return to Page 2 and make the Commercial Code Amendment as your number four item, and then finally the Adoption of the County Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan as your final item just for the interest if you agree with the agenda, that may really accelerate the evening here and because you have a full

agenda.

DELEISSEGUES: So the order, then, would be C, E, D, B, A --

ORJIAKO: Yes.

DELEISSEGUES: -- is that correct?

ORJIAKO: That's correct.

DELEISSEGUES: Any objection to the change?

VARTANIAN: Move we amend the agenda as recommended.

DELEISSEGUES: Is there a second?

USKOSKI: Second.

DELEISSEGUES: All in favor.

EVERYBODY: AYE

B. Approval of Minutes for September 16, 2010

DELEISSEGUES: Has everybody had a chance to take a look at the minutes for September the 16th? Any changes or omissions?

VARTANIAN: Move we accept the minutes as submitted.

ALLEN: Second.

DELEISSEGUES: All in favor signify by saying aye.

EVERYBODY: AYE

C. Communications from the Public

DELEISSEGUES: Are there any communications from anyone in the audience that they would like to bring to our attention that is not on the agenda for tonight? Seeing none, then we'll move on to agenda item number one which in this case tonight will be C, 2010 annual review amending the 20-year growth management comprehensive plan and zoning map, CPZ2010-00027. May we have staff report.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS & PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION

C. 2010 ANNUAL REVIEW AMENDING THE 20-YEAR GROWTH MANAGEMENT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN & ZONING MAP:

CPZ2010-00027 International Children's Care The property owner has requested that the County review the zoning and Comprehensive Plan designation (R-30 and UH) currently applied to their property, as a mapping error, and to amend the Comprehensive Plan and zoning to General Commercial (GC). The property, parcel 186509-000, is located at 2711 NE 134th Way, Vancouver, WA. The County will consider the alleged mapping error and the applicability of the current zoning and comprehensive plan designation.

**Contact: Jose Alvarez (360) 397-2280, Ext. 4898
or e-mail: jose.alvarez@clark.wa.gov**

ALVAREZ: Good evening, Commissioners. Jose Alvarez with Community Planning. Staff recommends approval of CPZ2010-00027, International Children's Care. The request is to change the land use designation of a portion of Parcel 186509-000 from a comp plan urban high density residential to general commercial. The zoning would change from R-30 to general commercial.

The site if you can see on the map includes this area that has the hatch marks, but the portion that's going to change zoning is the area highlighted in red between NE 134th Way and NE 134th Street. And it's approximately three-quarters of an acre and the site's currently developed with a two-story office building.

To the north is a residential subdivision. And just west of that is Legacy Hospital. The zoning designation to the south and to the west are general commercial and to the east is office campus. The transportation impact analysis was done by Mike Mabrey, you should have gotten it in your packet this evening, I apologize for not having it in there before. The conclusion is that there's not likely to be any changes in the potential peak, p.m. peak hour trip generation as a result of the requested change in land use designation.

We also received a letter from the Department of Ecology dated October 20th, it should be in your packet as well today, essentially recognizing that this is a nonproject action and if there were a specific project, it would be subject to its own SEPA application at that time. The criteria for map changes have been met, specifically Criteria D, the plan map amendment corrects an obvious mapping error. That concludes staff's presentation. Do you have any questions?

DELEISSEGUES: Thanks. Any questions of staff?

ALLEN: Can you show where that 134th Way was actually connecting?

ALVAREZ: This is 134th Way.

ALLEN: And that's still the same configuration as it was originally; right?

ALVAREZ: I think the access on 134th on this side is no longer there, there's only access on this side.

ALLEN: On that side only. And then as far as the access on the other side goes?

ALVAREZ: On this side, to the east?

ALLEN: Uh-huh. Was it blocked off or is it --

ALVAREZ: Yes. Essentially there's no access there.

ALLEN: So you cannot use it at all?

ALVAREZ: No.

ALLEN: Thank you.

DELEISSEGUES: Any other questions? If there's none, we'll go to the sign-up sheet. People wishing to testify tonight if you'd come forward and use one of these microphones and state your name and address, please. The first person on the sign-up sheet is Rick Fleck. Would you like to testify?

FLECK: I think everything's clear.

DELEISSEGUES: Thank you. Next is Doug Congleton.

CONGLETON: We're together and everything's clear so far as to what you've said.

DELEISSEGUES: Thank you.

CONGLETON: Thank you.

DELEISSEGUES: Anyone else in the audience wish to testify on this item? Seeing none, then we'll return it to the Commission for deliberation. We did go over this pretty thoroughly in the workshop so I think we're pretty attune to it.

VARTANIAN: I have no questions.

DELEISSEGUES: A motion then.

VARTANIAN: A motion to accept the proposal as submitted.

ALLEN: Second.

DELEISSEGUES: It's moved and seconded that we accept the staff recommendation of approval for this item. Any discussion? Roll call, please.

ROLL CALL VOTE

VARTANIAN: AYE
ALLEN: AYE
USKOSKI: AYE
DELEISSEGUES: AYE

DELEISSEGUES: Thanks, Jose.

ALVAREZ: Thank you.

VARTANIAN: Thanks for stopping by.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS & PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION, continued

E. CPZ2010-00013 Transportation CFP Amendment This Comprehensive Plan amendment would add NE 62nd Ave, NE 87th Street and various improvements to a portion of NE 88th Street between Andresen Road to the Transportation Capital Facilities Plan.

Contact: Michael Mabrey (360) 397-2280, Ext. 4343
or e-mail: michael.mabrey@clark.wa.gov

DELEISSEGUES: The next item on the agenda, then, is E, CPZ2010-00013, transportation capital facilities plan amendment.

ANDERSON: Good evening, Commissioners. Colette Anderson with Community Planning and Steve Schulte with Public Works. We're here this evening to discuss CPZ2010-00013, modification to the transportation capital facilities plan amendment. As you recall the 20-year transportation capital facilities plan is adopted as part of the comprehensive plan, it's actually one of the appendices in the back, and in there there's a list of various projects broken out over a period of time.

This proposal is to amend a one line item in that list which at the time the plan was adopted was for \$52 million for estimated intersection improvements. We would like to split that \$52 million line item into three different line items. Staff has reviewed all the various approval criteria and find that everything is okay and that based on the information and the findings we recommend that Planning Commission forward to the Board of Clark County Commissioners a recommendation of approval of CPZ2010-00013.

DELEISSEGUES: Mr. Schulte, do you have anything to add?

SCHULTE: Good evening, Commissioners, Steve Schulte with County Public Works. No, I don't. I just wanted to indicate the genesis for this is to make for a more flexible capital facilities plan. Right now that \$52 million is earmarked simply for intersection improvements. We do occasionally have a need for roadway improvements to use some of it so this gives staff more flexibility in its use.

DELEISSEGUES: Is there anyone out there that would like to testify on the transportation CFP amendment? Seeing none, we'll return it to the Commission for deliberation. Again, we had this at the workshop and I think it was pretty thoroughly explained to us, but any deliberation? Milada? Anyone?

ALLEN: Nope.

DELEISSEGUES: Motion.

USKOSKI: I'd make a **MOTION** to accept staff recommendation.

VARTANIAN: **Second.**

DELEISSEGUES: Moved and seconded that we accept the staff recommendation for approval for transportation CFP amendment. Roll call, please.

ROLL CALL VOTE

USKOSKI: AYE
ALLEN: AYE
VARTANIAN: AYE
DELEISSEGUES: AYE

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS & PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION, continued

D. CPZ 2010-00029 - RELEASE OF URBAN HOLDING FOR A PORTION OF THE EAST FAIRGROUNDS AREA:

Consider 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 affected area includes the following properties designated Employment Center (EC) with a zoning designation of Business Park (BP) that are east of Interstate 5 between NE 199th Street and NE 209th Street:

West of 10th Avenue, east of Interstate 5 between NE 199th and 209th Streets:
179350-000; 179352-000; 179354-000; 179355-000; 179356-000; 179380-000;
179393-000; 179414-000; 179414-005; 179414-010; 179416-000 & 179416-005

East of 10th Avenue, between NE 199th and 209th Streets:
179094-000; 179100-000; 179143-000; 179146-000; 179147-000; 179151-000;
179152-000; 179153-000; 179157-000; 179165-000; 179166-000; 179168-000;
179174-000; 179178-000; 179183-000; 179184-000 & 179191-000

The affected area also includes the following properties designated Light Industrial (ML) and zoned Light Industrial (ML) that are east of Interstate 5 and west of NE 10th Avenue between NE 194th Street and NE 199th Street:

117440-000; 117441-000; 117442-000; 117450-000; 117451-000; 117460-000;
117461-000; 117461-005; 117470-000; 117720-000; 117730-000; 117740-000;
117741-000; 117750-000; 117751-000; 117760-000; & 117761-000

**Staff Contact: Michael Mabrey, (360) 397-2280, Ext. 4343
or e-mail: michael.mabrey @clark.wa.gov**

DELEISSEGUES: We'll move to Item D, release of urban holding for a portion of the east fairgrounds area. Thanks, Steve, appreciate it.

EULER: Good evening, Commissioners, Gordy Euler, Clark County Community Planning. I'm obviously not Mike Mabrey who is the staff that prepared this so be gentle, I'm filling in for him, he's flying somewhere.

CPZ2010-00029 is a docket item relating to lifting of urban holding in the east fairgrounds area so the proposal as you see on the screen before you this is a large area, it's in the Discovery Corridor referred to in the comprehensive plan as such. Removal of urban holding requires a Type IV process which is why we are here before you tonight as part of that process, it has to go through the Planning Commission.

You've got a staff report in front of you that summarizes the process that we went through to look at the procedural guidelines for amending the comprehensive plan that are both in Chapter 13 of the comprehensive plan and in Title 40, Section 40.560.020(G).

The primary requirement for removal of urban holding is the completion of a traffic study, a traffic analysis, and such analysis has been prepared by County Transportation staff which concludes that there is adequate capacity at the nearby interchanges of Interstate 5 at both 179th Streets and 219th Streets to accommodate traffic for full development of this

area. And unless you have any questions, that's pretty much the staff report.

DELEISSEGUES: Any questions?

VARTANIAN: Not from me.

DELEISSEGUES: If there's none, we'll go to the sign-up sheet. Jim Carlson.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

CARLSON: Good evening, Commissioners, Jim Carlson, 1932 NE 179th Street, Ridgefield, Washington. Part of me is happy to see that you're actually moving forward in removing some urban holding in certain areas, but I do have some issues with it, what I would like to address right now.

On the north side of 179th which is under urban holding right now and it adjoins the south side of 179th is developable property today. Essentially to me this is skipping over a large chunk of land because nobody wants to deal with the 800-pound gorilla which is the 179th Street interchange or the 179th traffic problems that would happen down there. Interchange problem is obviously a problem of the County, the State, there's multiple people who have to interact to solve that issue down there.

There's already developers on the south side of 179th, Killian & Pacific or Killian down there has commercial land on 15th Avenue and the south side of 179th what is proposed development, he already has money invested in it. I would consider that to be an attractor in that type of area in there meaning that the north side of 179th should probably be released to allow some sort of development going on in there.

They're going to need a certain amount of residential in there. There's obviously mixed use, there's a whole blend of uses in there. And when I'm speaking about the "blend of uses," when we're in a soft economy and you're only opening up business park land in there, I would think that you would be better off opening up a multiple type of uses in the area. Even open the whole area up and see what gets traction.

The other big problem that I have with it personally as we use up those trips in the business park land up there, then I'm going to end up on 179th Street kind of like what happened in North Orchards, there's going to be a lot of money of what's going to be, the County will bear some of that cost, the State will bear it, but the developers, if I want to develop that property I'm going to be mitigating a lot of traffic improvement cost down there on my intersection because of inventory that used up traffic counts that threw us into failure down on 179th.

I have issue with that. You shouldn't hop, skip over the top of it, you should move forward. We need to deal with the problems down there at the 179th, we need to deal with the problems completing 10th Avenue down to 134th. The transportation, we just have to work in an orderly manner moving it up. I mean I totally get going to, that's going to reflect

on 219th Street, a lot of that traffic's going to go up there and that's a good thing. I mean that's why you're wanting to do it.

There's a whole group of people that will be testifying after myself who don't even want to be in that type of zoning, but that's a different story. Like I said, bottom line is I think you should release it all, see what gets traction, first in, first out and then the people who are latecomers can pay the extra fees. Thank you very much.

DELEISSEGUES: Thank you. Any questions of --

VARTANIAN: Yeah. I know you're a member of the Three Creeks special planning group, has this ever come before that group?

CARLSON: This has come up in front of the group.

VARTANIAN: And can you share any --

CARLSON: And it wasn't a unanimous thumbs up to move it forward to the Planning Commission, all right, so that's about all I can say on it.

VARTANIAN: Okay.

CARLSON: But it was a majority decision to move forward and recommend this as far as our group is concerned, Three Creeks.

VARTANIAN: Well, this area that is being moved forward, but what about further east along 179th?

CARLSON: There hasn't been any discussion about that.

VARTANIAN: Oh, okay. Thank you.

DELEISSEGUES: Thanks, Mr. Carlson.

CARLSON: You bet.

DELEISSEGUES: Steve Yoshim, Yochim.

YOCHIM: I don't know if this will show up. Will this show up?

WISER: Is this an overhead?

YOCHIM: Yeah. I only did three copies of these because I didn't have time. This is a copy of the petitions that we had signed that I'm sure these gentlemen have seen, but it's copies that they can review again. Good evening. Thanks for having us. Steve Yochim, 20716 NE 10th Avenue, Ridgefield.

First of all I'd like to explain again my unsatisfied practices of the planning people because again we failed in a communication issue and there's been several times when we've been in front of the Board, you gentlemen, also the Commissioners, suggesting that it would be nice to have a little bit better communication between the planning people and the people that live in designated areas that are under contention like this.

And I was informed by the urban holding by mowing my lawn and I was going down my hill on 209th and here's a sign saying that they're going to lift the urban holding. I had not received any communication in the mail whatsoever. So I promptly went in and called Mr. Mabrey and he says it only went out the week before. And I don't know if it was sent by Pony Express, but I did not receive them until like the Tuesday -- the following Friday after I talked to him. So that just doesn't really get it because we got a real situation here.

You people know what the issues are and I'd like to reflect on them again. Back in 2007 the County Commissioners, who there's only one remaining member on the Board Marc Boldt, decided to take our little area in the urban growth boundary and their criteria was, quote, Mr. Mabrey, we only want land that's flat, dry and close to Interstate transportation. Well, guess what, our area only meets one criteria and that is close to the freeway access, it's not flat and it's not dry. And there are portions of the southern area that's -- yeah, that's, that's right, can you drag that down a little bit, no, the other way, a little more. Thank you.

So the top area that everything is basically hash marked out are people who signed petitions and they've been presented to the Commissioners and also the Board members that we originally wanted to get taken out of the urban growth boundary back down to 199th, from 209th down to 199th. So after a lot of communication and people talking back and forth, then we realized that that basically it's almost an impossible task unless we go to court and have a judge basically tell you whether we can be taken out of the urban growth boundary or not is another issue.

DELEISSEGUES: It is.

YOCHIM: So what we're trying to do is come up with some ideas what we can do about zoning and the issues about lifting the urban growth boundary tonight is that it basically takes away any kind of lever we have in any kind of future zoning changes that could possibly happen down the road. And I think that with the signatures, we got about over 60 percent of the people at the north end of that on small portions of property that would like to remain in some kind of a residential zoning. So if you do put through and take off the urban holding tonight at least in our area, that will put us in kind of a really bad position.

The other issue was I think there was probably something misconstrued at one of the Commissioners' meetings or at one of the meetings that Mr. Mielke had said, well, if you guys want, you know, if you want to come out of the urban growth boundary, his idea was to take us out of the urban growth boundary because we wanted a change, well, that wasn't the change we wanted. We would like it to stay within an urban growth boundary.

If you have to do something below 199th, that's something you have to do, but at this point what I would like to suggest is to give us a year, keep us in urban holding for a year, let us talk to some of the, you know, like Laurie Lebowsky and talk to her about possibilities of putting bike paths through the wetlands through there. The other possibility is there's some talk about equestrian-type zoning now that's available and even down to some kind of residential zoning.

I think at this point the best thing to do for us is to really suggest to try to put us in urban holding, leave us in there for at least another year so we can have time to do a little bit more planning instead of basically salvage or salvaging what's left after you lift the urban holding because I'm sure that there's a couple of flat pieces along 199th if you can see along there the ones that aren't hashed out, they're fairly large pieces that would be possibility for campus or office campus park zoning, but anywhere north of that I mean we're restricted with the Gee Creek wetlands and I'm just, you know, really hope that you guys decide not to lift that urban holding from that area tonight.

Like I said I just want to make that clear again, below 199th is not an issue with us. Anything north of 199th, for now we'd like to keep it in there for a year. And if we can't do that, then I'd like to set a line between -- if you see the property lines there that are not hashed marked, hashed out, anything below that to keep us in urban holding there until at least we can figure out what's going on.

There has been a letter surfaced by the State Transportation Department where they're looking at buying some portions of that property through there to mitigate wetlands for some issues that are in Battle Ground and to mitigate the wetlands that they destroyed over in towards where Costco is, and I did talk to the lady out there and she said it would be a year before they even had any decisions about what they were going to do there and at this point it's in the real estate appropriation department with that.

Anyway, so I'd appreciate if you can take that into consideration, either keep us in urban holding for a year, or I mean if it's six months, anything, a little bit longer to hope that we can decipher what we want to do for planning because if it does get down to that type of zoning, there's big pieces there that could be gated communities with one-acre parcels, there's people in there that could do equestrian stuff with horse paths and so on and so forth. So that's it. Any questions?

VARTANIAN: Yeah. Could you sort of orient me a little bit, what's that blue line that diagonally goes --

YOCHIM: That's Gee Creek. You can't tell that's Gee Creek? That's the way Gee Creek wanders through and bisects --

VARTANIAN: Well, yeah, I know, but okay.

YOCHIM: Yeah. I should have put a mark on there but I was in a hurry to do that, but that's basically the way that Gee Creek runs through there. And so if you really look at that

there's only two, three pieces there that are really anywhere near possibility to put an office campus park in and that would be property number 2, 23 and what is that, 26 right next to it, 25. So those three because --

VARTANIAN: I can't read those, Steve. We can't read those. Or I can't anyway.

YOCHIM: Oh, you can't see it, okay.

VARTANIAN: That's all right, we'll take your word for it.

YOCHIM: Here's a copy of it.

VARTANIAN: Oh, yeah, I see that. No. No.

YOCHIM: Anyway, so along 199th basically there's one, two, three, four pieces of property that could potentially be office campus park material at this point and those people are noncommunicative to us about what they want. But as for the petition, again, the people above that line, which I will leave a copy of this with you, want to stay in urban holding for at least a year until we can figure out what we want. All right.

DELEISSEGUES: Any other questions?

USKOSKI: I have one quick one. With the black hatching, what's that? Is it the same thing as the red?

YOCHIM: Oh, I just did that.

USKOSKI: Oh, okay.

YOCHIM: I didn't have a red pen.

USKOSKI: Oh, okay.

YOCHIM: Those are people who basically have just signed on. The gentleman, Mr. Hayes, which is the lower piece along 199th, he's kind of in a real bad situation there because -- actually he's in a pretty good situation because he's got flat ground that they could actually put office campus park material on. And I highly recommend if you guys can possibly put it in urban holding, you need to come out and look at that land because it's not flat and it's not wet. I mean it's not dry. Thank you.

DELEISSEGUES: Okay, thank you. Next on the sign-up sheet is Karen Levens.

LEVENS: No, I don't want to testify tonight.

DELEISSEGUES: Okay, thank you. Jerrene Murray.

MURRAY: My name is Jerrene Murray. I live at 20716 NE 10th Avenue. A couple of points will be repetitious, you can hear it again I guess. I believe mistakes have been made regarding Clark County designations of land north of 199th Street. Inclusion in 2007 of these properties into the urban growth boundary was not based upon the advice of the Planning Department according to Mike Mabrey, but upon the opinion of the Clark County Commissioners at that time.

The only Commissioner left in office from that time commented at a fairgrounds neighborhood meeting that this inclusion may have been a mistake. Mr. Mabrey says that when looking for land to develop planners look for land that is flat, dry and near a major road. Land north of 199th fits only one of these criteria. Our lands are neither flat nor dry. The small parcels along the northern edge of the urban growth boundary with their hills and water issues have already been developed, they should be properly zoned residential, they're much smaller pieces.

I'm not in favor of lifting the urban growth holding at this time. Services are not complete, there is no sewer. At \$400,000 per pumping station for each of the multiple pumping stations planned for the 10th Avenue area, how can this county afford to proceed in this economic period especially after giving developers a 14 month fee holiday. What are the benefits to the property owners in all of this.

Mr. Mabrey tells us that this is not a takings issue, but under these zoning restrictions associated with office campus and business park am I allowed to add on to my kitchen. Not according to what we're being told. We're not allowed to change the footprint of our homes. If it burns down we can rebuild but it has to maintain that footprint.

Is this not a taking of my property rights. There are empty properties with this designation in Clark County now. Are you so sure that Clark County needs my 1.3 acre hill more than I do. This is an improper zoning for our area at this time. Thank you.

DELEISSEGUES: Thank you. Any questions?

VARTANIAN: None from me.

DELEISSEGUES: Thank you very much. The next one is George Espinosa. Whoa, that happens all the time.

ESPINOSA: I thought I just got lucky. George Espinosa, 20801 NE 10th Avenue, Ridgefield. And talking about the land being dry, my neighbor's map failed to reveal on there there's two major tributaries to Gee Creek also dissect that area. In fact one of them dissects our property and according to your rules I guess we have a worthless piece of property if nothing can be built within 200 feet of that high water mark. The whole two and a quarter acres is wiped out.

But one of my main thrusts in this whole thing is that currently in Clark County about 53 percent of properties that would be considered office park or office campuses are vacant

and I think it's a tremendous disservice to the people who have already invested in Clark County to offer incentives for someone to come in and develop more of the same or similar properties at their expense and at the expense of we as residents.

It makes absolutely no sense to create a new urban growth area and leave behind -- of sprawl, urban sprawl is what you're doing, and leaving behind what is going to become urban blight. And all you have to do is go out there and drive around that portion of the county and the blight is already obvious. Thank you.

DELEISSEGUES: Okay, Mr. Espinosa. Any questions? Thank you for your testimony. Next on the sign-up sheet, then, would be Dennis Johnson.

JOHNSON: No, thank you.

DELEISSEGUES: Do you want to testify?

JOHNSON: No, I don't.

DELEISSEGUES: Okay, thank you. Next would be Glen Slaydon.

SLAYDON: I have a question for this gentleman here. He was saying that your studies on the highways, are you saying that the traffic studies they did would be just fine through here?

DELEISSEGUES: Just for the record could you state your name and address.

SLAYDON: Glen Slaydon, 1719 209th Street. But I just went to a meeting last week that they were trying to figure out how they were going to divvy up \$25 million to fix 179th Street overpass to be able to handle the traffic and now his traffic study says that this is fine for urban development when we already have a problem.

DELEISSEGUES: So, Gordy, would you want to respond to that? Our traffic guy is not here tonight but --

EULER: Yeah, we got somebody.

DELEISSEGUES: -- maybe we got a pinch hitter for Michael.

EULER: Two.

DELEISSEGUES: I know Steve's an expert but we'll save him for later when things get really bad.

JARDIN: Good evening, Commissioners. I'm David Jardin, I work in transportation concurrency. And this gentleman is correct, there is some work that is being done to look at possibilities of what can happen down on 179th Street to fix some capacity issues for

future conditions. A lot of the work that was done here was looking out into our concurrency test year. So we look out at growths in 2013, so three years out, and then we look at six years out so 2016 was the out year that we evaluated.

Looking at those years with the build-out of the area that's shaded there it's estimated that the transportation infrastructure that exists today at 179th and 10th at the interchange could accommodate a full build-out of this area with a two percent per year background growth of areas that are outside of that shaded area and that would include, so in process development, developments that are already approved and that are building out over that same period.

So at this time looking six years out with 100 percent build-out of that area the transportation facilities that currently exist today at the interchange of 179th and 10th would be able to accommodate the traffic.

DELEISSEGUES: When would that be?

JARDIN: I'm sorry?

DELEISSEGUES: When would that infrastructure be in place so that it would accommodate the traffic? What time frame are we talking about?

JARDIN: Actually the infrastructure that exists today is how we evaluated this area that's in question. The future work that our department is looking at I don't know if there's a time frame for when that would actually come to fruition.

DELEISSEGUES: So you're saying the existing infrastructure would accommodate the --

JARDIN: That's correct.

DELEISSEGUES: -- plan to change here?

JARDIN: That's correct.

DELEISSEGUES: That's what I wanted to make clear.

SLAYDON: How is that possible? They want to start rework and the overpass at 179th in 2014 and they only want to put a Band-Aid on them because they only have \$25 million. How can this support this business park when it won't support what's already there at this point?

SCHULTE: Good evening, Commissioners. Steve Schulte with County Public Works Transportation. You're really talking about two different things here. The analysis that David performed was looking at just this shaded area only, time horizons of 2013 and 2016, and frankly the amount of trip generation out of this area is relatively small, a lot of it goes to the north to the new 219th Street interchange, so a relatively small amount of

traffic goes down to 179th and I-5.

The second issue is a much broader issue and that is how well does that 179th/I-5 interchange perform in the long-term with the entire greater 179th Street/I-5 area building out, all of the urban holding being lifted, both east and west of I-5, both north and south of I-5, that's an analysis we ran about three years ago if I remember correctly, at full build-out of the entire urban holding area I think the interchange is surcharged by 160 percent so the interchange was operating at 160 percent over capacity.

So, again, two different evaluations we're doing. It's a very narrow focused evaluation on the shaded area and the other one is a longer term much larger area build-out.

DELEISSEGUES: That we're not talking about tonight.

SCHULTE: We're not talking about. And just to follow up on the testimony of this gentleman, we are looking at improvements to remedy that 160 percent over capacity situation. We've got three or four concepts that we're looking at in great detail, we're developing some preliminary costs, the issue now is not the concept but more the funding question, where is the dollars going to come from to fund that.

DELEISSEGUES: Questions?

VARTANIAN: Yeah.

DELEISSEGUES: I'm going to get back to you.

VARTANIAN: Yeah. That was --

DELEISSEGUES: While Steve's here and if there's any questions --

SLAYDON: No, that's fine.

DELEISSEGUES: -- of Steve or of the County people, let's go through that.

VARTANIAN: Do we have things in place to monitor the traffic load on released lands and potential development so that we don't overload the new 179th Street interchange capacity at this point? I mean I realize what we're saying with this particular proposal, but you're saying that the 179th Street interchange proposition has to do with full build-out of the whole area. Are we watching how much gets built out in this area so that we're not overloading the 179th Street interchange area?

SCHULTE: Well, every 12 to 18 months we upgrade our concurrency models, our congestion models, on the 179th Street corridor and oftentimes that includes current traffic counts. So we can tell you traffic levels pretty much at any point in time on 179th and we know when the failure of the intersection will be occurring.

VARTANIAN: That's how moratoriums go into place.

SCHULTE: This is informational for the Commission and the audience tonight, per State law we cannot test concurrency or use our congestion standards on a State interchange like the one at 179th and I-5, we're precluded from testing concurrency. So what we will be testing is the backup or the delay time outside of the State right-of-way.

VARTANIAN: That's really what I meant.

SCHULTE: So if the spillback would occur off of State right-of-way, we would somehow measure the delay time there and judge our failure or success criteria based on that.

VARTANIAN: Thank you.

DELEISSEGUES: Back to Mr. --

ALLEN: So that would also answer the question that the City of Vancouver had brought up about the 2006 circulation plan adopted as well as facilities that are needed for nonconcurrency as well as concurrency purposes? So that would be the answer to them as well, it's the State highway that you cannot test concurrency on?

SCHULTE: Well, I haven't read the City of Vancouver letter. I know the criteria. I believe the criteria in the comp plan for lifting urban holding is if there's a circulation plan has been completed and also we need to ensure there are no critical intersections and roadway links not there and David's study has validated that the infrastructure is there. And I think a circulation plan has been done in the last couple of years. So I think the criteria are met for lifting urban holding.

ALLEN: Thank you very much.

DELEISSEGUES: Anything else of staff? We'll get back to Mr. Johnson. Do you have anything to add now that you've heard the --

VARTANIAN: That's Slaydon.

SLAYDON: So basically just to be clear we're saying that 219 will handle anything that happens in that because you're basically excluding 179th because it's already running over capacity? Is that basically what you're saying?

SCHULTE: No. No. As of right now, today, 179th Street is not over capacity. If we lifted urban holding in the entire greater 179th Street/I-5 area, east and west of I-5, north and south of 179th Street, if that was all lifted, there would not be enough capacity at the 179th Street interchange. The other analysis, the one that David spoke to, is simply a very focused analysis, that acreage up there in shade, much of that traffic goes to the north and gets on and off at 219th Street and I-5, some comes down to 179th Street, but when we tested how that traffic could work through the existing infrastructure, it passed.

SLAYDON: Are we going to make any improvements to 10th Avenue to be able to handle this or are we just going to put our kids at risk?

SCHULTE: I don't think the County believes your kids are at risk.

SLAYDON: They haven't seen the school buses passing in a no passing zone and things like that that I've seen over the years.

JARDIN: I think something that I might add is that if this area were to develop, and we're talking about now current development, so if this urban holding area were to lift, it's not that the developments that came in would not be responsible for doing their frontage improvements or adding to the roadway out there. If they needed a left turn lane to accommodate their facility or if they needed to widen the road to an ultimate width or on their side, we're not saying that we wouldn't move forward and have the development mitigate their impacts.

It is just that the focus of the study was to look at primary intersections to see where we were with capacity. If we lifted this would this intersection break completely to where we couldn't function. So kind of the bottom line is development will be responsible for roadway improvements necessary to support their development.

SLAYDON: And then once they start developing you're still going to monitor the traffic and you guys can make them upgrade or does that have to be negotiated before they actually break ground?

JARDIN: That would be discussed very heavily. I believe it would be my opinion that it would be discussed very heavily because this area is kind of removed from other areas that are developed. I think we would ask for a more extensive traffic study to look at how the impacts from that particular development were distributed over the road system. And, again, they would be responsible for their frontage and then we would look at the intersections along the way until they got to a 219th or a 179th and then into the interchanges.

SLAYDON: Thank you.

SCHULTE: Just to relate back to when we lifted urban holding in the North Orchards area, it was lifted but following that lifting we had numerous developments that had to make improvements on the public road system. So as part of our development review process specific localized impacts it looked at and conditions are set forth.

SLAYDON: I'm just a little afraid of what happened on 179th when they put in the Amphitheater and stuff, all that wasn't supposed to happen and it's turned into a major headache that we're still fighting. Thank you.

DELEISSEGUES: Well, thank you.

VARTANIAN: Could I just ask a quick question. Your study anticipates some amount of traffic going north, some amount of traffic going south, how do you estimate that? How do you come up with that?

JARDIN: The estimated traffic volume is based off of a regional model. The regional model looks at or is, the words escape me now, so we have a 2000 base year model and then we have a 2030 look forward and then the difference between the two.

And you can look at these types of areas, a lot of times they will have traffic coming from these areas and they'll be distributed north or south and you can use those distributions to come up with percentages and then you take the individual areas and then look at their potential trip generation and then distribute based on the percentages in the regional model.

VARTANIAN: I guess that's what I'm getting at, the percentages, how are the percentages arrived at? I mean I understand how your absolute number of traffic trips can be arrived at, I'm not quite sure I follow how do you know what's going to go north and what's going to go south?

JARDIN: It's actually a statistical analysis, pretty complex too, but it looks at trip distributions towards the more regionally significant transportation facilities and attractors like shopping centers and different things that regional model looks at land uses, so the shopping centers of 2000 versus land uses of the future or what future zonings may be, so it sends trips based on attractors.

VARTANIAN: Thank you.

DELEISSEGUES: Thanks. Thank you both. Next on the sign-up sheet is Glen Slaydon.

SLAYDON: That was me.

DELEISSEGUES: That was you?

VARTANIAN: That was him.

DELEISSEGUES: Oh, okay. Cheryl Slaydon, you would like to testify.

SLAYDON: Cheryl Slaydon, 1719 NE 209th Street. In regard to lifting the urban holding I'd like to see it delayed for another year and reconsider some other things. One thing is the traffic he was talking about I think he's wrong. I rarely, and if you talk to all these people who are in this area, they rarely ever go up to 219th, we always go down to 179th to get onto the freeway. Rarely do I ever go up to 219th.

And as also on 10th Avenue, if you've ever been on 10th Avenue, you're coming up from 199th and it goes up a little slope and then 209th it dips down and then back up and it's

really dangerous if you're on 209th to pull out onto 10th Avenue. I've almost been hit several times trying to pull my horse trailer out on there. And he was saying, well, that the road is capable of all of this. Well, if you put businesses there you're going to have to do something about 209th that dip and that hole because there's going to be accidents there and I don't care what they say, those people.

I would like to see it reconsidered residential office campus just like what they do over there in Europe or in the Pearl District here in Portland, Oregon. What they did was the businesses are down on the bottom and you can live up above and I would like to think about that. That way we that want to live there as residents we can still live there as residents. And I thought that Steve Yochim had a good idea with trails along right in there. And am I to understand that from 179th to 199th on 10th Avenue is still in urban holding?

EULER: This entire area is in urban holding, it's gray.

SLAYDON: No. But Mr. Carlson was saying something about 179th was still in urban holding, it hadn't been released yet?

VARTANIAN: East of this area that they're talking about.

DELEISSEGUES: The other side of the --

SLAYDON: Yeah, the south of this.

VARTANIAN: Well --

EULER: Yes.

VARTANIAN: -- on 179th east of 10th.

EULER: The area to the south of this area is still in urban holding, that's correct.

SLAYDON: It's still in urban holding?

EULER: Yes.

SLAYDON: So why would you release this to develop when there are all those properties from 179th to 99th and if you drive there there's all those properties have "for sale" signs and they say "for commercial" on them so I don't understand why you would release property above 199th for development when there's all those properties below 199th south that still haven't been sold or haven't been developed, that's what I'd like to know. And that's all I have to say.

DELEISSEGUES: Any questions?

SLAYDON: Thank you.

DELEISSEGUES: Well, you must have done a good job. Thank you.

VARTANIAN: Thank you.

DELEISSEGUES: Ted Johnson.

JOHNSON: My name is Harley T. Johnson, I live at 20419 NE 10th Avenue, and I'm probably one of the biggest property owners in that area, I have about 45 acres sitting on that corner of 10th and 209th. So basically now I've owned my property about pretty close to 40 years now.

And about 20 years ago it seems to me there was a County Commissioner by the name of Nutty Butley or something like that that we went through this whole charade with at that time she was going to force all of the county into certain zoning as she saw fit and they had quite a few hearings and I attended a few of them.

And one of the appeals at that time was the fact that we as farmers with children would like to eventually divide our land and give a portion, maybe a few acres, to one son and a few acres to one daughter and so on like that.

Well, basically if this goes into campus zoning, I understand I'm barred from giving my land to any of my children and I would like to do that. So, anyway, basically you're taking my rights away on that.

Another thing is we had a neighborhood meeting out there at the neighborhood, fairgrounds neighborhood association, and the gentleman from the County made a statement that maybe none of this -- well, whatever you do with the zoning, maybe the development won't take place for 20 years. Well, I was 40 years old when I bought my property, I've owned it for 40 years, now 20 years in the future before the land comes out, I don't have too many 20 years projections, I'm running out of time.

So basically my plea to you is leave the zoning alone, I don't want it changed. My land a lot of it's wet area, it's hilly, it's not flat, it wouldn't make a Tektronix or a Nike or anything like that, basically it would be a poor substitute, but it does make for a good home site and a place for my grandchildren to play. Anyway, I thank you.

DELEISSEGUES: Did you say your property was on 10th and what, 189th?

JOHNSON: 199th.

DELEISSEGUES: 199th, okay, thank you.

AUDIENCE: 209th.

ALLEN: 209th.

DELEISSEGUES: Oh, 209th.

JOHNSON: 209th. Excuse me, 209th.

DELEISSEGUES: Somewhere in there.

JOHNSON: Yeah, somewhere in there.

DELEISSEGUES: Thank you.

JOHNSON: Thank you.

DELEISSEGUES: I got it. I think it's Jean, Jean Johnson.

JOHNSON: No, I have nothing to say, thank you.

DELEISSEGUES: Thank you. Does anybody else in the audience wish to testify? Will you come up and state your name and address, please.

GEARIN: My name is Rick Gearin, 19715 NE 10th Avenue, and I was contacted about two and a half weeks back that the urban holding was going through for a lift and I had sent in a letter with a picture of our facility at 19715 NE 10th Avenue to make sure that was included in the lift of the urban holding if possible.

VARTANIAN: Is it --

EULER: Commissioners, this is Mr. Gearin's piece right here and he's not included in this proposal so that's why he's here to testify. So can you see where the cursor is here?

ALLEN: No, because we cannot see it on our screen.

VARTANIAN: Yeah, I can see it.

EULER: Do you see where the cursor is moving?

ALLEN: Oh, there it is.

EULER: I believe that's Mr. Gearin's piece right there. Is that correct, sir?

GEARIN: Yes.

EULER: Yes. He did send a letter that was forwarded. It should have been forwarded to you.

GEARIN: So I developed that lot in 2006 and met all the standards with the habitat for the creek in the back. I also put in a \$23,000 septic system that's a filter system and a sand

mound system to meet future capacity of the building.

There's no room with the setbacks and with the right-of-way of the road to build anything else on the property other than the shop that's already existing. So with that, in my letter I asked that that parcel and the five acres I believe to the north that is nondevelopable to be included in the lift of the urban holding.

DELEISSEGUES: In urban holding or lifting of urban holding?

GEARIN: Lifting of the urban holding. I need it removed. When we purchased the property, actually Clark County had a different way of acknowledging the ML zoning on their website. So I wasn't living in the state, I bought it when I was living out of state, when I went to build my shop in 2006, I actually found out this holding was in place.

So since 2006 it's been a headache and ups and downs with Clark County trying to get it removed and trying to find a practical use for the building because I was stuck in a residential zoning, but I have a light manufacturing building on that site.

VARTANIAN: I think I'm familiar with your business, I go by there quite often. How did that happen that you were allowed to build a building in a residential zone?

ALLEN: It could have been home permits.

GEARIN: It was a what?

ALLEN: Were there any permits issued?

GEARIN: Yeah. No, we went through the whole permitting process. I just had to jump through some odd hoops and with the blessing of some of the employees sitting at the counter they told me -- I explained to a few of them my situation and got the building on the site. The second hurdle was dealing with Mr. Pierce trying to get a release of the urban holding, Gary Pierce. I went through that for about three years and it was like beating my head up against the wall.

VARTANIAN: He's not the one to get it removed.

GEARIN: Right. At that time I believe it was him and Marty --

VARTANIAN: Snell, yeah.

GEARIN: -- Snell.

VARTANIAN: Yeah. Again, all that has to come before the Planning Commission and the County Commissioners --

GEARIN: Yeah.

VARTANIAN: -- before it gets lifted.

GEARIN: So therefore that's why I asked for us to be included. I also have two granted Washington State DOT approaches so I can head north or southbound on 10th Avenue turning around on our facility without having to get out in the road.

VARTANIAN: Are you conducting any business at this location now?

GEARIN: Yes. I want to open it up for a business, yeah.

VARTANIAN: You're not open right now?

GEARIN: No.

VARTANIAN: Did counsel say something about how that could happen? Not that I have a problem with it being there, I'm just curious.

COOK: Christine Cook, Deputy Prosecuting Attorney. I don't know anything about the permitting process when Mr. Gearin's facility was built, but if you look at the map now, it says that it's ML zoning so it's not a residential zone.

GEARIN: But it has the urban hold on it.

COOK: Right.

VARTANIAN: Well, yeah. But it's not residential on it.

COOK: But it does not make it residential.

VARTANIAN: Urban hold means it's just that you can't develop it just yet.

COOK: Well, it can't be divided. It appears that there was already a legal lot there.

VARTANIAN: Yeah, okay. So it wasn't a matter of --

GEARIN: Yeah. And it can't go any further. It's a .53-acre lot I believe.

VARTANIAN: It's just that when you said it's a residential area and it has this industrial building on it, I was wondering that doesn't sound right, but it is in light manufacturing, okay.

GEARIN: Yes.

VARTANIAN: Thank you.

GEARIN: So that's all I have.

DELEISSEGUES: Any questions? Thank you. Anybody else in the audience wish to testify?

GEARIN: So is that a possibility, then, of getting that put in? Is that okay?

ALLEN: There were a couple of people that just --

DELEISSEGUES: Well, for tonight I think what we're going to have to do is deal with the issue before us. You may have to bring your request in separately I would think. We can recommend that it be considered but --

GEARIN: Okay. And also when I --

DELEISSEGUES: I think it would be better if you brought it in. We have a period each year where we take a look at special request zoning changes and things of that nature that you're talking about.

GEARIN: Well, that's why I was --

DELEISSEGUES: What do you think, Gordy? Would that be more appropriate to bring it in separately as a --

EULER: All I can say is that the proposal before you is the area that's in gray shading.

DELEISSEGUES: Right.

VARTANIAN: Yeah. We can listen to you but we can't do anything about land that's not within that gray area.

USKOSKI: I think what he's --

GEARIN: Well, Mike Mabrey contacted me specifically and asked me to put together that letter so I could be included in this and when he contacted me he told me it was from 194th to 199th. I've been out of town and I show up now and we have a whole new zone from properties north of 199th now that we're lifting the urban holding on so that's changed in just the last couple of weeks unless he misinformed me. But he contacted me directly and asked for me to put together the proposal so I could be included in this.

USKOSKI: I think what he's alluding to is during the workshop we had discussed that we forward to the Commissioners a recommendation that we include these areas and the parcel to the south of him and then due east for inclusion that we forward that recommendation to the Commissioners and then it would be public noticed at that time. There was some --

VARTANIAN: You may be right, I just don't remember it, sorry.

USKOSKI: -- conversation about that. I think that's what you're alluding to that ask that the Planning Commission would make that recommendation to the Commissioners to include it also going forward.

GEARIN: Is that a possibility, then, to include it?

VARTANIAN: We could recommend it.

DELEISSEGUES: Well, we'll leave it up to the deliberation when we get to that point. It's possible that we won't lift any of the urban holding. I mean that's a possibility for tonight. We don't always go along with the staff recommendation. There's been some testimony tonight that people would prefer to hold the lifting of the urban holding off for a while so that's on the table also.

GEARIN: Well, I found it kind of odd that it was north of 199th as well when a lot of that stuff is going on from 199th to 179th, but that's a whole separate issue. My main concern is that we would like to be included in that. If the urban holding is lifted, we would like 19715 NE 10th Avenue to be included in that.

DELEISSEGUES: Fine, I understand. Thank you. Anybody else wish to testify?

SNODGRASS: Good evening, Commissioners, appreciate the opportunity to testify. Just wanted to enter into the record a letter from Laura Hudson on behalf of the City of Vancouver. I don't know if you had received that.

DELEISSEGUES: We know who you are, but for the record could you give us your name and address.

SNODGRASS: Sorry. Bryan Snodgrass with the City of Vancouver.

DELEISSEGUES: Thank you.

SNODGRASS: And we wanted to speak briefly to this issue. We submitted a letter just before 5:00 today, I don't know if you had received that. If you have and had a chance to read it, I won't go into it in great detail. I think the overriding point is we're recommending that you not lift urban holding at this time for a couple of reasons which were spelled out in the letter. I think part of the concern is that on some of the transportation issues that the analysis required to show that full services are available, that services are adequate and available is a different analysis than the shorter term concurrency analysis.

I think as the letter goes into describes somewhat there's been a couple of traffic studies, one that looked at the first six years and another looked at a longer term. I think we would just want some further analysis showing what intersections would need to be improved within the span of the plan through the year 2024 and so maybe that could be done just

simply by looking at the two studies that are there and finding that information. I think also the other transportation improvements that may be needed for nonconcurrency reasons is something I think just a little further information would be needed on.

The broader point surrounds economic development in the Discovery Corridor which as we note in our letter and as you're no doubt familiar with is the County's economic development element goes into some detail starting on the very first page of it in terms of the vision for the corridor and the concern here is that by lifting urban holding without at least as best we could determine implementation tools to further that vision of the corridor that's in the policy direction of the plan, you wouldn't be able to meet the criteria for rezone which one of which as indicated in the County staff report is that the zone change better implements applicable comprehensive plan policies.

And so, again, I don't know if you've had a chance to read the letter, it's productive to go over the details, but what we tried to do is highlight some of the elements of that vision, some of the ways in which existing policy does or doesn't allow it to be addressed and provide some options for you in terms of some standards that could be developed to help implement the vision.

Best of those standards I think the foremost recommendation would be that you not lift urban holding in this area and perhaps refer that issue to what we understand is the beginning or ongoing process that the County's looking at in terms of revisiting some of the commercial and particularly industrial codes.

I guess sort of the overriding concern as indicated in the letter is just that in a down economy the likely development that you might get if urban holding is lifted, recognizing that the site is zoned mostly for business park and also a little bit for ML, is a lot less likely to be something that goes along with that vision established in the comprehensive plan.

And so it may be that the comprehensive plan policy direction needs to be revisited, but certainly we think that would need to happen prior to any lifting of urban holding that essentially might detract from that vision. In fact probably would so. That's a brief summary of our letter and I'm here to answer any questions you have about it or about the broad concern.

DELEISSEGUES: Okay, thanks, Bryan. Any questions of Mr. Snodgrass? Thank you very much. You usually don't get a second chance, but okay if you can summarize it quickly.

YOCHIM: I've just got two quick questions. Steve Yochim again, 20716 NE 10th Avenue. There's a couple of issues that I've noticed. I've lived on my piece of property for 25 years and we dealt with traffic constantly up 10th Avenue going to Battle Ground and as soon as 219th opened up it went away, I mean the traffic went down probably 80 percent, but for some funny reason I've noticed in the last year and a half that it's gotten heavier.

And whether people enjoy driving through there I don't know, but I've noticed that trucks

start coming through there at 5:00 in the morning and I have no reason, I have no idea, I want to go out and stop them to see why they don't go to 219th. I don't know if their GPS is broken or whatever, but this gentleman is exactly right, the concurrency there should be done again because I think that's all changed.

And frankly the concurrency issues that the County, their process of doing concurrency I don't think is right. We ran into that when we were having issues with the Amphitheater, and that's another issue that hasn't been brought up here, let's take into consideration if the Amphitheater has on a venue of every Friday night and every Saturday night supposedly that isn't programmed into concurrency either, so that again makes that intersection fail at 179th. Plus it makes 199th fail because at those nights those people line up there to turn right to go down 199th to the Amphitheater.

And the other question I had is what is the criteria for infrastructure for lifting urban holding. I realize that there should be criteria like there should be sewer, there should be water, there is no sewer around that they can hook up to and that's the confusing thing because the sewer department does not have any money to put in a sewer system at this point.

DELEISSEGUES: When a specific development proposal comes in --

YOCHIM: Right.

DELEISSEGUES: -- then they have to deal with all the things you're talking about. If they can't meet it, then they don't build.

YOCHIM: Right. So again my question is is how far out is that. We had a visit with the sewer people and we know that nothing's going to ever happen there for at least two years even to put in a pumping station. That's just a pumping station, that's not any of these 30-foot deep sewer lines that have got to go in there to mitigate the sewer.

And that brings up the point of 199th south, that's a gravity feed sewer system there, they wouldn't need any pumping station. So again that brings up the fallacy of why is this piece being opened up to be taken out of the urban growth boundary and not the portion below 199th. I mean it just doesn't make sense to me. So, anyway, that's all I had, thank you.

DELEISSEGUES: Thank you. Any questions?

VARTANIAN: Oh, yeah, Steve, is there a weigh station between 179th and 219th?

YOCHIM: That's a good point, there isn't.

VARTANIAN: There is not? There is.

YOCHIM: No. No.

VARTANIAN: At Gee Creek?

YOCHIM: The funny thing is I think they're like Albertsons delivery trucks that come up there to turn right to go to Battle Ground, it's just kind of strange. Every morning at 5:30 --

VARTANIAN: On I-5 I mean?

YOCHIM: Pardon me?

VARTANIAN: On I-5 I mean?

YOCHIM: There is one at --

AUDIENCE: The weigh station is north of Pioneer.

YOCHIM: Yeah.

VARTANIAN: Is it, okay.

YOCHIM: Yeah. Yeah, it's close to Pioneer.

VARTANIAN: I guess I'm not -- okay, never mind.

ALLEN: MapQuest might be one of the blames because yesterday I had Googled a location on 254th and it directed me at 179th to take 10th north so check it out.

YOCHIM: Yeah, that's what I mean, that's probably a GPS issue. But, anyway, thank you.

DELEISSEGUES: Yeah, thank you. Anybody else in the audience wish to testify? If there's none, we'll return it to the Planning Commission for deliberation.

RETURN TO PLANNING COMMISSION

ALLEN: Could we have staff address some of the issues that were brought up before we deliberate?

EULER: Well, staff will try.

DELEISSEGUES: Well, it would help if you would ask a specific question.

ALLEN: Well, there were several issues addressed including on the wetland areas, urban sprawl, leapfrogging, no apparent standards to implement the comp plan, and also I believe that there was one about no criteria for rezone within this Discovery Corridor to guide a strategic development and implementation of the vision.

DELEISSEGUES: If you can answer all those questions in ten minutes or less, we'd

appreciate it.

EULER: I tried to pull up a couple of maps that will help get there but I'm not getting much help here.

VARTANIAN: You got Mike Mabrey's cell phone number?

EULER: No. These were supposed to have been loaded on and be available to print, but they apparently won't open.

DELEISSEGUES: Well, we've got maps you can --

EULER: Part of this was to show the habitat and the wetlands in the area was what I was trying to put up here, the priority habitat. Questions on sewer, let's see if this one opens. Well, something's working, that's good.

This is a proposed sewer map for the area. My understanding is it doesn't show up on here but there's a ten-inch trunk line that's supposed to run up 10th Avenue in 2012. So the proposal is to run sewer here, it would come down to here and then down over this way. So there is sewer that's being proposed for the area.

AUDIENCE: So where's 199th?

EULER: 199th, hang on a second, right here. 209th is here, 199th is here.

AUDIENCE: Where the star is; right?

EULER: So the area we're looking at is and I had a map that was going to show habitat and the wetland on the property, but I can't seem to open those.

AUDIENCE: So what is the purple dotted line, that purple?

JARDIN: Those look like basin lines.

VARTANIAN: What purple?

AUDIENCE: Well, it looks purple from here.

EULER: Yeah, it's this, whatever that says up there, I can't read it from here.

VARTANIAN: Oh, okay.

EULER: It's the first thing on the legend.

DELEISSEGUES: It looks like a boundary.

EULER: Sonja, can you pull the whole thing over? All right, I'll do it.

VARTANIAN: It says --

USKOSKI: New basin boundary maybe.

VARTANIAN: Try zooming in on it one more time.

DELEISSEGUES: Well, what difference does it make?

VARTANIAN: I don't know. Something boundary.

DELEISSEGUES: What's the next question?

VARTANIAN: I have a question maybe for Counsel. If the criteria for lifting urban holding has been met must it be lifted?

COOK: Well, that's a good question. I think that whether the criteria had been met is a decision that this Commission needs to make. If you decide that the criteria have been met, then I think a decision not to lift it would need to have some pretty extraordinary justification.

I don't quite know what that legal justification would be at this point because nobody has offered any. So in general if the criteria for a proposal are met the thing to do is to approve the proposal, but that is the decision of the Commission for you to make.

VARTANIAN: Thank you.

COOK: You're welcome.

DELEISSEGUES: Milada, did you ever get all your questions answered?

ALLEN: No.

DELEISSEGUES: You had more than just the sewer you asked about.

ALLEN: No, because I had a question about the urban sprawl and the leapfrogging approach to removing urban holding since there are some urban holdings down below south of that as we had testimony tonight.

So just because this particular area meets the criteria doesn't mean that the other ones did not meet the criteria and that's why they were not included or are we just concentrating in this particular area because of a specific reason and leapfrogging basically over the other areas that are attached to it that would make a more orderly approach to lifting urban holding if you either included them or begin with those first, that's the question that keeps coming up not only from the owners but also from the City of Vancouver.

EULER: I think that's the issue for you to decide. This was a docket request which means we were asked to process this as the County being the applicant and you need to decide whether it meets the criteria that we've laid out. Remember that in 2007 the criteria for lifting urban holding were vastly simplified to the extent that we had to prove that by the lifting of urban holding there would be transportation issues were taken care of.

I mean those are the things that are within the County's purview in terms of facility funding, and you've heard David and Steve talk about that, and according to what the testimony you've heard from staff those criteria have been met. Now does it make sense to do this area as opposed to some other area, that's your decision.

Sewer is in this area, it's going to be here before it's in other areas to the south at least from a sewer map that I've looked at, and you have the testimony of the people who live there, you have the testimony from the City of Vancouver, this does leave other areas to the south it's still in urban holding. So the question for you is do you want to make this recommendation to the Board.

ALLEN: Well, one of the biggest, I guess, questions in my mind was were the other areas analyzed and they did not meet the criteria, that's why we concentrated on this particular portion only not including the ones that are below or south of a hundred and down to 179th or we just decided to concentrate on this particular area without looking at the adjacent area that would have presented a more orderly approach to doing this particular docket item?

EULER: We were asked to analyze this area.

ALLEN: By the Commissioners?

EULER: Yes. That's because it's a docket which means the County becomes the applicant.

ALLEN: Right.

VARTANIAN: I have a question for traffic folks. We're skipping over the 179th Street up to 194th I guess, is that because we're worried about transportation issues on 179th if that area south of this area develops or comes out of urban holding?

SCHULTE: No. We were simply requested to look at this area in shade. We have not looked in recent months at anything south of this area.

VARTANIAN: Well, for whatever it's worth, if we're having discussion, are we?

DELEISSEGUES: We discuss away.

VARTANIAN: I agree with staff's position. However, I don't agree that it's a rational

movement northward. I'd much rather see the area south of here developed first and come out of urban holding first. And quite frankly I'm not really satisfied that the land from everything I'm hearing, and I go up in that area quite often, that the land that's being proposed for the kind of development that we're talking about is appropriate.

So I appreciate the County staff doing the work they've done, and as usual it's always good, it's just a matter of to me it's not a sensible approach to a development. So that's basically my position.

USKOSKI: Did the County staff look at the environmental impacts that were brought up as far as the creeks and tributaries for Gee Creek through this area and how that would impact?

EULER: Again, lifting this would be a nonproject action and any development that takes place will have to meet the County's requirements, development standards for if it turns out to be business park for business park. There is some wet ground in here, that everybody has testified is correct. I had a couple of maps, again, I was trying to open here, I couldn't get them to open, but there is some wet ground in here both priority habitat and wetlands and those would have to be addressed with any development. Those will be addressed with any development.

DELEISSEGUES: We're done with the public testimony for now.

AUDIENCE: I was just really curious on the sewer. You said there's one proposed for 2012. Was they planning on (inaudible) eminent domain that run right through that piece of property that doesn't belong to the County, that's not marked out on the easement?

DELEISSEGUES: I don't know.

HOLLEY: I didn't hear everything he said so that didn't get in the record just to let you know.

DELEISSEGUES: I didn't hear it either. What do you say, Chris?

COOK: I'm wondering whether that comment was in order.

DELEISSEGUES: Well, no.

SCHULTE: Commissioners, just to help clarify something. If you go to the second page of the staff report, it sets forth the criteria that are in the comprehensive plan that staff looked at. There's just two of them and the first one dealt with the transportation issues we talked about earlier.

Let me just read it: Determination that the completion of localized critical links and intersection improvements are reasonably funded as shown in the County's six-year transportation improvement program or through a development agreement.

Staff's finding was we simply don't have any localized critical links and intersection improvements that need upgrading as a part of this proposal, there's adequate capacity at those features. That was staff's finding.

DELEISSEGUES: Does anybody else want to give their reasons for either adopting or rejecting the staff recommendation? Where are you with this? Milada, do you want to start and we'll come down the line here.

ALLEN: I think that there were several recommendations that maybe the County should reconsider this and wait for another year, and there were also some the City of Vancouver had mentioned that we don't really have the criteria for a rezone and/or for the standards to implement this specific comp plan for the Discovery Corridor.

We are in the process of revising the industrial code or the commercial code and to me this represents, and I do understand that it was Board of Commissioners driven; however, I do not understand why we don't look at the areas that are south of there for orderly development as well as for orderly approach and then just concentrating on something that's up above something else that exists between the two bodies.

And so to me it's a little bit of a leapfrogging effect that may not be very strategic in its outlook. We don't really have a very good inventory out there because of the wetlands. I mean there may be some strategic locations there that we're after, but it's not very clear to me from what I'm seeing here today.

So I have a problem with the leapfrog, I do have a problem with the urban sprawl, no orderly approach, lack of strategic planning as well as no standards for implementation if we do lift the urban holding here because it will affect the southern portion as well as the north of it. But once we start doing this Band-Aid approach of leapfrogging and doing something that's totally separate from the whole, then I'm afraid that we're going to create some precedents as well as some problems in the future to implement the vision of that Discovery Corridor.

DELEISSEGUES: Valerie.

USKOSKI: Well, based on the approval criteria set out in the staff plan I do think staff has made the point that we've met those criteria and that we could lift urban holding. The thing that does concern me is the property owners who have definitely turned out tonight to state their dissatisfaction with the current zoning and whatnot. So I guess I'm kind of in the middle at this point, but I do think staff has met the criteria put out.

DELEISSEGUES: George.

VARTANIAN: Well, I said it before, I think it's not a normal progression northward which is what I was hoping for along these lines.

HOLLEY: I didn't hear you.

VARTANIAN: It's not a normal progression going northward which is what I would have hoped going along here. I agree staff has pretty much done what it needs to do to demonstrate that urban holding can be lifted, the issue is should it be lifted, and Counsel gave me her advice, but there's just an awful lot that I still would like to see.

I'm not happy with the land being called appropriate for the uses that I'm seeing on a map. This is a real good way to start going from commercial which is south of 179th up to 199th and 194th which is BP and I can see ML very easily going away in between those two, just completely being lost aside from the fact that ML includes a number of things that I don't think really are ML as far as land use is concerned, that's a whole different topic.

But no, I don't think we should hopscotch like this. I think that's one of the reasons we had the mess that we had before, and still have, is because you have an urban growth boundary, you go out to the edge of the urban growth boundary, you develop it and now you've got this area in between that's not developed and it either sort of defaults into something else or it just goes and doesn't get used and then we increase the urban growth boundary again, I'd rather not see that.

I'd rather keep it just the way it is. And I don't care if it takes three years to determine what we need to do with that land, that's the homeowners have said a year, I let it go for as long as we need to or as long as we can just because I don't see any real reason to go up there. And that's my two cents worth.

DELEISSEGUES: Well, listening to everything tonight it just seems to me that if urban growth shall be located primarily in areas where urban growth has already occurred and it has the existing public facilities and service capabilities like the City of Vancouver's pointed out here, there's plenty of those areas that exist right now that have this zoning that are vacant.

The economic slowdown I believe has slowed everything down including the sewer development, transportation development. We have big plans to put these things in place in 2012 and 2013 and so forth, no way that that's going to happen unless there's a whole lot more money coming from somewhere. And this area, I don't know why it's targeted when looking at it it's fairly well developed where you can develop anything. There's a lot of wetlands on the aerial photo it appears and from the testimony that sounds to be the case. I see no urgency in jumping ahead, leapfrogging as you say.

There's no orderly process here in the planning to take a look at the bigger picture, we're targeting this area for some unknown reason where there's no demand right now, no public services available right now, we're betting on them to come, absolutely no urgency to lift the urban holding at this point in time. I don't even believe that if this is true, and I think it is, where we're talking about existing public facilities and service capabilities are adequately available to serve the development that it does meet the criteria, it may be planned but I don't know when.

If you want to talk about lifting it on the south side of 199th, fine, but I would not personally vote to lift urban holding north of that. So anybody want to further deliberate? Do we have a motion?

VARTANIAN: I move we do not advance staff's recommendation to the County Commissioners, that we disagree with lifting urban holding in this area.

ALLEN: Second.

DELEISSEGUES: But could you give us your reasons for that too? I mean I tried to give mine.

VARTANIAN: Me?

DELEISSEGUES: Yeah. Both of you. The County Commissioners want to know --

VARTANIAN: Yeah. Well, the reasons I'm saying, the reasons were the ones I stated before, that it's hopscotching, there's no logical progression of land use, I'm not convinced that the land is appropriate for the use intended.

DELEISSEGUES: So if I understand your motion and second, it's to deny the staff recommendation for approval on all of it?

VARTANIAN: That's correct.

DELEISSEGUES: Any other deliberation?

ALLEN: Friendly amendment?

DELEISSEGUES: Sure, go.

ALLEN: That they take this back and analyze it for the properties that are south of this.

VARTANIAN: Normally I would accept the friendly amendment, it's just that the staff was specifically requested to look at this particular area.

ALLEN: Right.

VARTANIAN: We can recommend to the County Commissioners that they task the staff with looking some place between 179th and here but --

ALLEN: Right. But if they're going to come back within a year let's say --

DELEISSEGUES: Well --

ALLEN: -- and look at, that they look at in an orderly fashion to prevent urban sprawl, leapfrogging and to develop some standards.

DELEISSEGUES: My suggestion would be to either vote yea or nay on the staff recommendation and we get that done. If you want to make a second motion to cover your concern, we could talk about that.

ALLEN: Okay.

DELEISSEGUES: Is that acceptable?

ALLEN: That sounds fair.

VARTANIAN: That's fine with me, yeah.

DELEISSEGUES: Any other deliberation on the motion? Roll call.

ROLL CALL VOTE

ALLEN: AYE
VARTANIAN: AYE
USKOSKI: AYE
DELEISSEGUES: AYE

DELEISSEGUES: We're going to take a break and we'll come back at about ten minutes to 8:00.

(Pause in proceedings)

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS & PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION, continued

B. CPZ2010-00028 – AMENDMENTS TO THE 20-YEAR COMPREHENSIVE PLAN DOCUMENT, COMPREHENSIVE PLAN MAP AND ZONING MAP, UDC TITLE 40 CHAPTERS 40.230.010, 40.100.070 AND 40.210.050, 40.260 AND APPENDIX C

In an effort to streamline and simplify the Unified Development Code regarding commercial districts, the county is considering the adoption of the following changes: reduce the number of urban commercial zones from four to three zones; simplify and limit the number of conditional uses in Table 40.230.010-1; revise Chapter 1 Land Use Element Table 1.6 (Urban Plan Designation to Zone Consistency Chart) in the 20-Year Growth Plan and remove limited commercial zoning in the 20-year plan designations and location criteria, move the rural commercial districts to a new section, 40.210.050; add drive-thru facilities to 40.320.010 (E), and repeal Title 40 Appendix C, Commercial Design Guidelines.

This action would include rezoning the following Limited Commercial parcel numbers: 147724-000, 106040-000, 118261-190, 118261-192, 118261-194, 118261-196, 118261-198, 189194-000, 189204-000, 189205-000, 189250-000, 189251-000, 189253-000, 189367-000, 189376-000, 189388-000, 189392-000, 144492-000, 144514-000, 144516-000, 144534-000, 157498-000, 157499-000, 157500-009, 157501-005, 106910-000, 106920-000, 106921-000, 106922-000, 106923-000, 106924-000, 106941-000, 106950-000, 106970-000, 106995-000, 107020-000, 107020-002, 107320-000, 107325-000, 107330-000, 107335-000, 107340-000, 107350-000, 108860-000, 108870-000, 108871-000, 108880-000, 108900-000, 108910-000, 108920-000, 108930-000, 108940-000, 108950-000, 108960-000, 108970-000, 109010-000, 109020-000, 109021-000, 109030-000, 109040-000, 109054-000, 109057-000, 109060-000, 109090-000, 109110-000, 109140-000, 109145-000, 109150-000, 109160-000, 109167-000, 109170-000, 109175-000, 109190-000, 109200-000, 109204-000, 109207-000, 109210-000, 109220-000, 109380-000, 109390-000, 109392-000, 109400-000, 109415-000, 109420-000, 109431-000, 109440-000, 109445-000, 109450-000, 109470-000, 109480-000, 109490-000, 109495-000, 109500-000, 109510-000, 109530-000, 109540-000, 109550-000, 109555-000, 109560-000, 109565-000, 109570-000, 109580-000, 109581-000, 119887-020, 119887-040, 119887-060, 119887-070, 119887-080, 119887-110, 119887-120, 119887-140, 119887-200, 119887-210, 119887-220, 119887-230, 119887-240, 119887-250, 119887-260, 119887-280, 119887-300, 119887-320, 119887-340, 119887-560, 119887-590, 119887-620, 145234-000, 145238-000, 145239-000, 145297-000, 145310-000, 145772-000, 145777-000, 145782-000, 145793-000, 145797-000, 145810-000, 145814-000, 145816-000, 145818-000, 145820-000, 145822-000, 145996-000, 145997-000, 145998-000, 147953-000, 147966-000, 147972-000, 147977-000, 147999-000, 148009-000, 148029-000, 148068-000, 148094-000, 148131-000, 148134-000, 148258-000, 148264-000, 148268-000, 148269-000, 148272-000, 148281-000, 148291-000, 148292-000, 148304-000, 148307-000, 148366-000, 148374-000, 157508-000, 157508-002, 157508-006, 157508-008, 157508-010, 157508-012, 157508-014, 157508-016, 157510-000, 157511-000, 159767-000, 159768-000, 159769-000, 159772-000, 159773-000, 159818-000, 159833-000, 159835-000, 198071-000, 198077-000, 198092-000, 198094-000, 198115-000, 198115-005, 198115-010, 198115-015, 198121-000, 198121-005, 198121-010, 198121-015, 199079-000, 199256-000, 199288-000, 199343-000, 199344-000, 199349-000, 118255-011, 118255-013, 118255-014, 147576-000, 147576-005, 147576-015, 147579-000, 147585-000, 147595-000, 147600-000, 147601-000, 147606-000, 147607-000, 147630-000, 147632-000, 147635-000, 147663-000, 147689-000, 147699-000, 147709-000, 147720-000, 147721-000, 147725-000, 147726-000, 147727-000, 147728-000, 147736-000, 147740-000, 148001-000, 148008-000, 148052-000, 148107-000, 148251-000, 148300-000, 157500-000, 157500-004, 157501-000, 157501-010, 157501-015, 157501-020, 157501-025, 157507-022, 158337-000, 158339-000, 158369-000, 158440-002, 158440-004, 158442-002, 158442-004, 186519-000, 186524-000, 186617-000, 186618-000, 186694-000, 186766-000, 186796-000, 189477-000, 189478-000, 189491-002, 189493-000, 189530-000, 189627-000, 186644-000, 098675-024, 098675-025, 098675-026,

098675-046, 098675-048, 098675-050, 098675-052, 098675-054, 147660-000,
147670-000, 147671-000, 147672-000, 147673-000, 147674-000, 145565-000,
145566-000, 145583-000, 145584-000, 145789-000, 145792-000, 145807-000,
117900-000, 117907-000, 117907-005, 117907-010, 117914-000, 117915-000,
117921-000, 117928-000, 117942-000, 117943-000, 117949-000, 117972-000,
117985-000, 117986-000, 117986-005, 117986-015, 117987-000, 117988-000,
118097-000, 118256-010, 118256-015, 118256-020, 118256-030, 118256-040,
118256-045, 118256-050, 118256-055, 118256-060, 118256-065, 118256-070,
118256-075, 118256-080, 118256-085, 118256-090, 118256-100, 118256-105,
118256-110, 118256-115, 118256-120, 118256-130, 118256-135, 118256-140,
186551-000, 186551-003, 186553-000, 186555-000, 186562-005, 186562-010,
186562-015, 186574-000, 186725-000, 186728-000, 186762-000, 186814-000,
186854-001, 189479-000, 189480-000, 189496-000, 189496-005, 189496-007,
189526-000, 189528-000, 189538-000, 189626-000, 189629-000, 189631-000,
189631-005, 189631-010, 189631-015, 189632-000, 189647-002, 189648-000,
189657-000, 189658-000, 986027-024, 189565-000, 189587-000, 157288-000,
186564-000, 186949-000, 189472-000, 189572-000,

The total acreage subject to this action is approximately 265 acres.

Contact: Gary Albrecht (360) 397-2280, Ext. 4318

or e-mail: gary.albrecht@clark.wa.gov

DELEISSEGUES: We'll resume the Clark County Planning Commission hearing. We're going to change the agenda again apparently. We've had a request to make the next one which would be 4. Which one was it?

VARTANIAN: Commercial code update.

DELEISSEGUES: Commercial code update.

ALBRECHT: 28.

VARTANIAN: The second one here.

ALBRECHT: CPZ2010 --

DELEISSEGUES: So is that CPZ2010-00028? Is that correct?

ALBRECHT: Correct, yes.

DELEISSEGUES: Amendments to the 20-year comprehensive plan document?

ALBRECHT: Yes.

DELEISSEGUES: Staff report.

ALBRECHT: Well, good evening, Chair and members of the Planning Commission, Gary

Albrecht, Clark County Community Planning. I'm here to discuss CPZ2010-00028, amendments to the 20-year comprehensive plan document, comprehensive plan map and zoning map and Title 40, Chapters 40.230, 40.100, 40.210 and 40.260 and Appendix C.

Just some quick background. Clark County is in the process of streamlining its development code for commercial uses. As part of the streamlining efforts the County appointed a technical advisory committee comprised of commercial real estate brokers, property owners, developers and commercial experts. The technical advisory committee was charged with reviewing the current code and providing recommendations.

The technical advisory committee's recommendation is to remove the limited commercial zoning and by doing that there are several benefits to the County. One is increase code compatibility with the City of Vancouver; two, reduce its confusion of allowable uses; three, it improves the clarity of allowed uses in different zones, and number four, it creates consolidated urban zones.

Now the parcels affected by removing the limited commercial zone are shown on the map that are behind me and on the maps that you have in front of you. Now there are 14 proposed actions which includes Exhibit 8, Revision, that I've given you. It's to Clark County Code Table 40.230.010-1. And the recommendations based on the information and the findings presented in this report and in the supporting documents staff recommends that the Planning Commission forward to the Board of Clark County Commissioners a recommendation of approval of CPZ2010-00028.

DELEISSEGUES: Questions of Gary?

VARTANIAN: Not right now, no.

DELEISSEGUES: We'll think of some.

VARTANIAN: Well, I have some, I just don't know if it's now I should ask them.

DELEISSEGUES: Any other questions? We'll go to the sign-up sheet. I've only got one name on the sign-up sheet, Ray Kindley.

VARTANIAN: Oh, there's two of them.

KINDLEY: We're not clones.

ALLEN: Twins.

KINDLEY: My name is Ray Kindley and with me is Gregg King. I'm general counsel for the Northwest Public Power Association and Gregg is the CFO for the same organization. Our employer organization represent is located at 9817 NE 54th Street, Vancouver. The property that Northwest Public Power Association owns and where it conducts its operations will be affected by this designation, the changes in the zoning designations.

NWPPA's property is currently designated limited commercial and under the proposal it will be changed to community commercial or C-3. NWPPA understands that the proposed zoning and redesignations are part of the County's efforts to streamline its code and the County has been working on this proposal for several years. NWPPA appreciates this, we support the periodic review and the zoning designations and the County's efforts to streamline its code and to make a more workable framework.

However, NWPPA does not support the reclassification of its properties to the community commercial designation. NWPPA would prefer to be reclassified in the general commercial zone. NWPPA is a trade organization of electric utilities. It has over 150 members that are scattered throughout the Western United States including Alaska. Its membership is primarily consisting of public utility districts, municipalities and electric and utility cooperatives.

NWPPA has operated from its current location since 1986 and it picked this location primarily because of its proximity to the Portland International Airport and I-205. NWPPA's property consists of three tax lots that cover approximately two or three acres. If you look at the map it is located in the lower left-hand corner where it says Northwest Public Power Association.

As you can see from the map it is literally adjacent to I-205 and it borders on the south with NE Fourth Plain Road. Immediately across I-205 is the Vancouver Mall which I believe is zoned general commercial. Immediately to the southeast on the map there you can see that it's also within the Vancouver city limits and that area is I believe zoned under the Vancouver City criteria as general commercial also. There's a Toyota dealership across the street. As you can see this is part of that whole interchange there of major highways and the Interstate road.

The community commercial zone is intended to provide the shopping and services needs for the adjacent neighborhoods. In other words it's more of a local focus zoning. The general commercial designation is to provide a full range of goods and services to serve large areas of the county and the traveling public or in other words it's more of a regional focus. The location of NWPPA's properties adjacent to the Interstate 205 and to the other State highways there is better situated to serve the broader regional needs of the county and traveling public.

NWPPA's property should be based in the general commercial designation we believe to achieve those goals. Considering that the surrounding properties are general commercial the potential use of NWPPA property should be at an equal level and it shouldn't be restricted by the community commercial zoning. The County should maintain maximum commercial flexibility and uniformity at this juncture of two significant components of the transportation system.

Although the Clark County 20-year comprehensive growth management plan adopted in September of 2007 suggests that the NWPPA property is too small for general

commercial, we believe that approach is too rigid. The community commercial designation also states that properties generally for that designation should be also 5 to 20 acres.

The general commercial designation applies to locations at interchanges along State highways and Interstates. The general commercial comprehensive plan language goes on to say the new general commercial areas should generally be more than 20 acres. In short, whether we're in the community commercial or the general commercial redesignation, the goal of minimum acreage cannot be met by NWPPA's properties, but that is only one criteria.

The other criteria considering the term "generally," the best outcome to maintain maximum flexibility and development purposes of this property would be to redesignate this as a general commercial, especially considering the location it is to the transportation system. The general commercial designation would provide NWPPA with its current uses, it would allow ultimate use of the property in line with the level of public investment and transportation infrastructure and is consistent with the surrounding areas.

NWPPA respectfully requests that zoning classifications be consistent with its neighbors and the character of the area. Thank you. Do you have any questions?

DELEISSEGUES: What was it zoned before they went ahead and streamlined it?

KINDLEY: It was zoned limited commercial.

DELEISSEGUES: So there's no change from what it was to what it is proposed; is that correct?

ALBRECHT: No. So it's currently limited commercial and then the proposal is to change it to community commercial and that they're suggesting --

DELEISSEGUES: What uses are not approved in the new zoning that might have been under the existing before you changed it?

ALBRECHT: Well, there are not a lot, but specifically to talk about their property according to the Assessor's Office it's their property is a professional office building so that wouldn't change anything, it's still a permitted use in community commercial and general commercial and it would still be classified as a professional office building. So does that answer your question?

DELEISSEGUES: Well, I just wondered if there's some intention to change the use on the property? Is that what you're suggesting, that you might want to change the use on the property?

KINDLEY: Well, we believe that there is a chance this property may change use in the future and quite frankly where it's located right now and next to the interchange and the transportation system a better future use would possibly be general commercial.

DELEISSEGUES: So the answer's yes, you want to not foreclose that use on the property?

KINDLEY: That's correct.

KING: We just want to maintain the flexibility.

DELEISSEGUES: Well, I kind of think what we're doing here is we're kind of up or down on the proposal of the staff unless you want to suggest that we could recommend that that parcel be changed, but usually that's like I say an annual review, they come in and request it.

ALBRECHT: Well, I did talk to Bryan Snodgrass at the City of Vancouver about that area, these parcels, and they were fine with having them go to general commercial. Is that from their point of view it does seem kind of odd looking, across the street it's general commercial but then --

DELEISSEGUES: So do you want to change the staff recommendation to include this as general commercial?

ALBRECHT: Well, yes.

DELEISSEGUES: Okay, good. That simplifies it.

VARTANIAN: Anything else we can do for you?

DELEISSEGUES: That simplifies it, Gary, we can deal with that.

ALLEN: Just to clarify. One of the statements that you made was that the general commercial that at one point in time they said that it was too small for a general commercial. What was the reason behind saying that when I'm looking across the street at the GC, it doesn't look that much bigger than what this piece of land is?

KINDLEY: The comprehensive planning document suggests that generally general commercial should be 20 acres or more. It also says that the community commercial zoning should be 5 acres or more. And quite frankly this property being about two to three acres it doesn't fit either one of those criteria. It's just we're primarily focusing on the criteria where it's located next to the Interstate and just kind of has to be tucked right there in the middle of the interchange.

ALLEN: Then a question to staff is why wasn't this considered to begin with before this staff report was presented to us?

ALBRECHT: Well, directly under the Northwest Public Power Association the label that I put on there it's actually zoned parks.

ALLEN: Oh, it is?

ALBRECHT: Yeah, it's parks, then residential.

ALLEN: So it's not CL?

ALBRECHT: No. Yeah. But the arrow pointing down, that all red triangle, that's actually limited commercial, the CL, but where the name is that property right there is parks. So limited commercial, parks, residential and it seemed to make sense by looking at it that it ought to be community commercial. But then after talking with Gregg and Clark and it seems to make sense that it ought to be general commercial.

Now as far as parcel size go that is the problem when it gets rezoned. I mean you've heard the criteria for new community commercial and new general commercial which this doesn't apply to and you have to look at the surrounding uses and at first glance that's the way it appears, it makes sense, but talking with the property owners it makes sense as well so staff is fine with it going to general commercial.

ALLEN: Yeah, because I'm looking at the precedent that's already been set with the GC across the way to the east of that piece of property it doesn't appear to be much bigger than what this one is so that's why I was asking why it wasn't considered to begin with.

DELEISSEGUES: Are there any more questions for Ray? Would you like to add to anything that's been said?

KING: No.

DELEISSEGUES: No?

KING: No. We thank you for listening.

DELEISSEGUES: Thank you very much for your testimony.

KINDLEY: Thank you very much.

DELEISSEGUES: Anybody else in the audience wish to testify on this? Seeing none, we'll return it to the Commission. Deliberation? Motion?

ALBRECHT: Chair Deleissegues.

DELEISSEGUES: Yes, go ahead.

ALBRECHT: Can I add just to make sure it's clear, for the triangle it's all the parcels in that triangle down there. I don't have the parcel numbers so I'm not sure how to word the motion when you do say it.

DELEISSEGUES: We'll just --

ALBRECHT: And so it will be the parcel across the street I think that's 54th Street; is that right?

KINDLEY: Yes, that's correct.

ALBRECHT: So could we just refer to it as the Fourth Plain Boulevard and 54th Street triangle? Okay.

ALLEN: A quick question for you. Is this one legal lot that happens to be bifurcated by a street or I heard saying three tax lots, that doesn't really mean that it's three separate legal lots. But is this one legal lot that is owned in its entirety by the same organization?

KING: I can give you the tax lot numbers if that would help.

ALLEN: Then of course we have no way to verify that now.

DELEISSEGUES: In other words there's more than one.

VARTANIAN: I take it we just can't say for purposes of this activity the red triangle that's labeled CL at this point and then have staff fill in the right property owner numbers?

KING: Sure. Right. So the property numbers are 159767-0 --

VARTANIAN: That's okay, I think we just solved the problem.

ALLEN: Yeah. But it's all in one ownership; right?

KING: Right.

ALLEN: That whole triangle including the bifurcated piece to the east?

KING: No, not all. We own three of those and then there's another gentleman that owns the other three over on the other side of us.

ALLEN: Oh, okay. That gentleman is not here today?

KING: I do not see that gentleman.

ALLEN: I have a problem with doing something without their approval and/or consent and/or notification.

DELEISSEGUES: Well, you're requesting that the entire parcel, your ownership and his ownership, all be --

KING: We don't have a recommendation for his ownership, we were looking at our ownership.

DELEISSEGUES: So we're just talking about yours, not his?

KING: That's correct.

DELEISSEGUES: So we don't care if he's here or not.

ALLEN: But which one is yours because my understanding was that the entire triangle was to be considered for a GC whereas you're saying that there are three tax ID numbers that you own and three that somebody else owns within that one triangle that right now says CL?

ALBRECHT: Correct. They're saying three and staff, me, we're saying all of them so it doesn't look like a spot zone. And I haven't talked to that property owner specifically either about the change to community commercial or the change to general commercial, but they have received a letter --

ALLEN: Okay.

ALBRECHT: -- about the change. I'm just trying to take away the --

ALLEN: I'm thinking about notification or full disclosure to the owner that co-owns that triangle.

ALBRECHT: Sure. In this case it's improving their ability to use the property and --

DELEISSEGUES: You're not taking that away from them.

ALBRECHT: Yeah, we're not taking anything away from them at all, we're giving them more options for their property.

DELEISSEGUES: Well, thank you. Make sure Gary and you agree on the lot numbers, but we are talking, then, about the whole triangle, right, Gary?

ALBRECHT: Correct.

ALLEN: I'd like to have some legal advice on this one.

DELEISSEGUES: Well, the advice would be to vote "yes" or "no" I guess.

KINDLEY: Thank you.

VARTANIAN: Thank you.

ALLEN: I'm having a problem with the disclosure.

COOK: I'm wondering, Gary, the letter that you sent to the other owner did it signify what the ultimate zoning of that property was to be?

ALBRECHT: Yes, community commercial.

COOK: So that that person really doesn't have notice. On the other hand this is a small amendment to a bigger piece and it needs to go to the Board of Commissioners before it's finalized. So between now and then there would be the possibility that planning staff could have some direct contact with that gentleman and he could have some input to the Board of Commissioners if so desired.

So I would see that you as the Planning Commission could take the initial staff recommendation and vote it up or down, you could amend it by changing the Northwest Public Power Association property only to GC with the suggestion that staff contact the other owner and perhaps bring that to the Board of Commissioners, and then the third possibility is to do the latter, to do the whole triangle but also suggest that staff contact the other owner.

DELEISSEGUES: That sounds pretty --

VARTANIAN: I vote number three.

DELEISSEGUES: Me too.

USKOSKI: Yeah.

DELEISSEGUES: So is that a motion?

VARTANIAN: Is it an acceptable motion?

ALLEN: No.

USKOSKI: I'll second it.

VARTANIAN: Okay. I **MOVE** that we accept staff's recommendation for all the other parcels and accept the alternative that was given to the Planning Commission at this meeting to change the Northwest Public Power Association and the intending property within the red triangle to general commercial and to contact the property owner who was not present today to give him adequate notice for agreeing to or disagreeing with that before the County Commissioners' hearing for the matter.

USKOSKI: I'll **second** that.

ALLEN: Wow, that was a long motion.

VARTANIAN: That's what I do.

ALLEN: Would it be possible to maybe make a motion saying that we recommend approval for this particular proposal as outlined by staff with the exception of the Northwest Public Power Association and associated ownerships which would be contingent on proper notification for the owners?

DELEISSEGUES: It sounds like the same motion.

VARTANIAN: Isn't that what I said?

ALLEN: So approval, I was just discussing that first, so maybe recommend approval for the proposal contingent on proper notification to the owners within the CL or that triangle.

VARTANIAN: That's a different motion from the one I offered.

DELEISSEGUES: Well, wait a minute now. Do you want to accept a friendly amendment?

VARTANIAN: I don't consider that a friendly amendment.

DELEISSEGUES: Oh, okay. I mean she just was talking about --

VARTANIAN: Yeah. No, I understand. Well, I understand her point, yeah.

DELEISSEGUES: I thought it was just clarifying what you said, I don't see the difference between the two motions frankly.

ALLEN: It's just that I said "contingent on proper notification."

DELEISSEGUES: Well, he said that too.

COOK: Mr. Chair.

DELEISSEGUES: Yes.

COOK: I don't think Mr. Vartanian said "contingent on," I think he wants staff to do that. I'm not sure how a contingency would work. If this Commission voted to approve something based on a contingency and then the contingency didn't happen, what happens it automatically goes away. I don't think that this Commission can act like that.

DELEISSEGUES: I don't either.

COOK: So I think you can vote to do something with direction to staff, but I don't think that

you can make your vote contingent upon something that would happen later. I just don't think that you have the power to do that.

ALLEN: Can we make two separate motions for everything except for that piece and then as it applies to that piece?

DELEISSEGUES: Well, I think we got to take --

VARTANIAN: There's a motion on the floor and a second.

DELEISSEGUES: We got to take the motion we've got on the table first --

VARTANIAN: And there was a second.

DELEISSEGUES: -- and if that passes I think it covers everything we need to cover. And if it doesn't, we can deliberate further. Or if you feel that it doesn't cover what your concern is and then if we had another motion we could vote that one up or down in accordance with our counsel's advice. So is there any discussion on George's motion which has been seconded? If not, roll call, please.

ROLL CALL VOTE

USKOSKI: AYE

ALLEN: NO

VARTANIAN: AYE

DELEISSEGUES: AYE

DELEISSEGUES: Okay, that won. Now, Milada, what did we leave out?

ALLEN: The reason why I voted "no" was because if for example in worse case scenario that the co-owner of that triangle says, no, I don't want to do this, then the whole motion is affected.

VARTANIAN: Well, the motion that the Planning Commission is offering is more advisory for the County Commissioners and the County Commissioners --

DELEISSEGUES: Well, that's all we ever do anyway.

VARTANIAN: Yeah. And the County Commissioners will decide at their hearing when there's been adequate notice and time for the owner of the other property to respond to act accordingly. I mean we're just giving them our opinion at this point I think.

ALLEN: Well, the reason why I voted "no" I'm for everything else but that one little triangle because I'm afraid that there might be some issues of proper notification to the owners. But that's why I voted "no." Otherwise I am for the project except for there needs to be

some clarification and notification to the co-owners of that triangle, their piece.

DELEISSEGUES: I think the County Commissioners can probably figure out what we're recommending hopefully. So we'll move on, then, to the bicycle finally, the adoption of the County's bicycle and pedestrian plan which is CPZ2010-00025. Laurie, you're on.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS & PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION, continued

A. CPZ2010-00025: ADOPTION OF THE COUNTY'S BICYCLE & PEDESTRIAN PLAN:

This hearing item will be for the Planning Commission to make a recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners on the adoption of a twenty-year Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan. The plan will include the following components: twenty-year priority project lists for sidewalk, bicycle lane, and off-street path improvements; recommendations for bicycle parking standards; bicycle and pedestrian policies; and a work program for the plan's implementation.

**Staff Contact: Laurie Lebowsky (360) 397-2280, Ext. 4544
or e-mail: Laurie.Lebowsky@clark.wa.gov**

VARTANIAN: Where's your bicycle?

DELEISSEGUES: Yeah.

LEBOWSKY: It's at home. We need the map too, Sonja, can you bring the map up?

WISER: The map didn't work, Laurie, I tried it. There's too many gigs.

VARTANIAN: That's okay, we memorized the maps anyway.

LEBOWSKY: That's good. Good evening, Commissioners. My name is Laurie Lebowsky from Community Planning. The item before you is CPZ2010-00025, the bicycle and pedestrian plan. With me is Mike Tresidder from Alta Planning & Design who helped prepare the plan. This plan is the culmination of 18 months of work from County staff and Alta, a culmination of 14 meetings of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Task Force, four open houses and extensive public review of this plan.

To give you a little bit of background, the Board of County Commissioners included the development of the bicycle and pedestrian plan in community planning's work program. The County bicycle plan has not been updated since 1996. The County's never adopted a pedestrian plan. Adoption of the bicycle and pedestrian plan will provide a guiding vision for bicycling and walking in Clark County which will promote health and livability.

We received five comment letters or e-mails, I'm going to list them. One letter from David Morgan, one e-mail from Diana Perez, one letter from Bob Flores of U.S. Fish and Wildlife

Service, one letter from Phil Brown, chair of the Clark County Bicycle Advisory Committee, one letter from Lisa Goorjian of Vancouver-Clark Parks Department.

As you recall I e-mailed all of these e-mails or letters to you as well as my responses. We have copies of the letters and my responses on the back table. Three Creeks Advisory Council voted unanimously on October 14th to support adoption of the bicycle and pedestrian plan.

Recommendation and conclusions. Based upon the information presented in the report and supporting documents staff recommends the Planning Commission forward to the Board of County Commissioners a recommendation of approval of CPZ2010-00025 which would adopt the County bicycle and pedestrian plan with the revised Chapter 4. That's the end of my presentation and I can answer any questions you may have.

DELEISSEGUES: Questions for Laurie?

VARTANIAN: Yeah, I have a question. One of the letters that I saw, I didn't make a copy of, was about the use of some private land as part of and I don't remember the response, I'm sorry.

LEBOWSKY: That was regarding a trail that was in the plan and Jane Kleiner is here from Parks and it's, I know you know it, the name of it better, it's the Western Trail that Parks has recommended that that trail be removed from the plan.

VARTANIAN: From the plan, okay.

ALLEN: So that addressed that issue. Now I did have a question on Page 45 where it talks about Cougar Creek Trail and then it shows from and to and it says NW 139th Street to NE Hazel Dell Avenue. That does not make any sense because I thought the creek trail goes from about 78th, maybe 80th, to Salmon Creek parallel to NE Hazel Dell Avenue so it would not be, so that's the one that I was a little bit concerned about the --

LEBOWSKY: I'm going to have Jane Kleiner answer that question, that was their recommendation.

ALLEN: Thank you.

KLEINER: Good evening. Jane Tesner Kleiner, Vancouver-Clark Parks & Recreation, Park Manager.

HOLLEY: You need to slow down a little bit, I did not get anything you said.

KLEINER: Sorry. Long day. Jane Tesner Kleiner, Vancouver-Clark Parks & Recreation, Parks Manager. Good evening. The Cougar Creek Trail follows the greenway property, and sorry I don't have a map to point to.

DELEISSEGUES: Well, we got a map but you can't read it.

KLEINER: It's very teeny tiny. And it connects into the Salmon Creek Trail connection, the existing multiuse path is along the Salmon Creek greenway. There's an existing Cougar Creek Trail that connects there and goes down to 119th. This proposal is to continue that trail down through the greenway properties, many of those properties are owned by Clark County already, to get down to Hazel Dell Avenue. So that's the greenway corridor.

Sorry the map is a little confusing. Where it says it goes up to 139th is the intent to get it, oh, there you go, thank you, yeah, so follow the pen there, the intent is to connect it up to 139th, to have that whole connection all the way up.

ALLEN: So go on the other side of Salmon Creek --

KLEINER: Of the greenway.

ALLEN: -- but would that be still appropriate to call it the Cougar Creek Trail because that no longer will be a Cougar Creek Trail even though it may be connecting to the Salmon Creek watershed and, or excuse me, the creek, you cannot really cross the creek to continue on a Cougar Creek Trail.

KLEINER: The intention is that as that north/south alignment of the creek, I'm sorry this is a fuzzy map, the intention is when we have alignments of trails that run either north/south or east/west to have one continuous name. The actual alignment will be determined at a future date as properties and easements occur, but the intent is to get folks up to 139th with the final alignment yet to be determined for a future planning date.

ALLEN: But there's no bridge over Salmon Creek to go to 139th.

KLEINER: Correct. When we align our trails sometimes we have to look at opportunities for utilizing existing right-of-ways and such to make jogs to get to those, but the intent for planning purposes is to get folks up to 139th. Once again final alignments to be determined as the plan moves forward.

ALLEN: So it really may not even align with the Cougar Creek Trail itself once it's the final thing. So that's what I'm having a problem with, maybe segment it out to where it would say NE Hazel Dell to Salmon Creek and then a second segment on the north side of Salmon Creek.

LEBOWSKY: But this is a 20-year plan, it's conceptual at this point. I just think --

ALLEN: Because it sort of implies that you're going to build a bridge.

KLEINER: And once again it's a planning document with the intent to get folks from 139th along that greenway up to 139th and once again bridge, existing right-of-way, other

pathways, et cetera, to be determined in the future.

ALLEN: Yeah, because that sort of implies an expectation and we all know what happens with expectations.

KLEINER: Yes, ma'am.

ALLEN: We've been through that a couple of times.

KLEINER: Yes, ma'am.

DELEISSEGUES: Any other questions? Milada, do you have any other questions?

ALLEN: Nope.

DELEISSEGUES: Valerie?

USKOSKI: No, I'm good.

DELEISSEGUES: George.

VARTANIAN: No, sir.

DELEISSEGUES: We'll go to the sign-up sheet. We've got Phil Brown. Would you like to testify or are you still here?

LEBOWSKY: He went home.

DELEISSEGUES: He went home.

VARTANIAN: He couldn't take it, huh.

DELEISSEGUES: I don't blame him. I would have gone home too. Dennis Johnson.

JOHNSON: I have nothing to add.

DELEISSEGUES: And Patricia McConaughy says she's in support of the plan but do not wish to testify. Not here, is she?

LEBOWSKY: She went home.

DELEISSEGUES: Your troops have abandoned you, Laurie, you're going to have to take up the --

ANDERSON: We're here.

LEBOWSKY: They got on their bikes and headed home.

DELEISSEGUES: Anybody else in the audience wish to testify?

VARTANIAN: What, are these guys chopped liver here? What is that?

DELEISSEGUES: Seeing none, we'll return it to the Commission for deliberation.

ALLEN: I think the expectation was that they were going to be heard first and I did see several members out there that were on that bicycle committee so I as a volunteer to a volunteer group, I would like to commend them on all that hard work that they did and participated in this very, very wonderful plan.

DELEISSEGUES: Well, I do have some questions. This is I understand a long-range plan, is there any plan for a source of funding?

LEBOWSKY: We have a chapter talking about funding and implementation and there's no specific pot of money that we identified, but we did identify funding strategies that we will pursue.

DELEISSEGUES: Which ones sound the most promising, the strategy?

LEBOWSKY: It would be grants, pursuing grant funding opportunities, and partnering with other jurisdictions.

DELEISSEGUES: I'm sure if I would have read this whole thing, which I did not, I admit, were they coordinated with the other cities like Battle Ground, La Center and the rest of it?

LEBOWSKY: Yes, they were. We had a technical advisory committee that included staff from all of the jurisdictions. I've also gone to planning commissions of the other jurisdictions. Actually in November I'm going to Camas Planning Commission to present the plan to them in a work session. But I've spoken to Battle Ground Planning Commission, Ridgefield Planning Commission. Vancouver Planning Commission I wasn't able to get on their docket, they didn't have time for me this year.

DELEISSEGUES: They're a busy bunch.

ALLEN: But then of course you don't really have any parks or trails or bicycle routes going through the city of Vancouver or do you?

LEBOWSKY: We coordinated with the City of Vancouver and Vancouver staff were involved in this plan. They were on the technical advisory committee and provided comments on the document and assisted in the development of this plan all along the way.

DELEISSEGUES: This didn't include equestrian trails, did it, or did it?

LEBOWSKY: No, it did not. That's another plan.

DELEISSEGUES: The only thing I see is a lot of these plans are hard to implement because they don't link up. I mean there's a little piece of trail here and then one there and one someplace else, so it's kind of tough when there's no dedicated source of funding so that you can develop these trails in a systematic way so that they go from point A to B to C to D instead of A to B and then F to G and they have all the missing links you might say and if you depend on development --

LEBOWSKY: Right.

DELEISSEGUES: -- who knows when and if that will occur. I just see kind of an improbability of a plan without a source of funding being implemented in such a way that it's going to accommodate the users.

LEBOWSKY: Right. So we do have an implementation plan that's part of this document that we will start carrying out and when the plan is adopted that will be adopted with the plan.

Also I wanted to say that coordinating with Parks and other jurisdictions that we want to have the ability to leverage funds when they are available that we have a list of projects that we can go to and if we see funding available, then we can maybe bundle projects which has not been done to this point.

DELEISSEGUES: Yeah, I understand that. But you're ready to go but the trigger mechanism is the funding and --

LEBOWSKY: Correct.

DELEISSEGUES: -- that's the unknown.

LEBOWSKY: Right.

KLEINER: Jane Tesner Kleiner again. If I could add one comment for dedicated funding the Board of County Commissioners and the voters of Clark County did pass the Metropolitan Parks District which is also commonly known as the Greater Clark Park District which is a dedicated funding source and we are actively pursuing over the next two years six trail corridors, a couple of which are mentioned as priority projects in here including the Cougar Creek greenway, in the Salmon Creek area, in Whipple Creek area.

So there is some dedicated funding to fill those gaps and knowing that the County owns several parcels of land along the Cougar Creek as an example our goal is to close those gaps so that there is a corridor and development of those trails will move forward with grants and partnerships and volunteers, et cetera. So it's not a big pot of money but it's something to get something on the ground and we are very actively pursuing those trail acquisitions and easements over the next two years.

ALLEN: And of course when you have a plan when opportunities come up, you can focus on the areas where the opportunities are happening and it still fits into the big plan picture, but also for example the partnerships that you were talking about which is a great way to go including with the wastewater regional let's say just along the Cougar Creek Park or Cougar Creek Trail if they're working in that area partner with them to see what kind of improvements you can do together --

KLEINER: Exactly.

ALLEN: -- that way share the cost as well as maximize the benefits.

KLEINER: Right. We are working with the clean water program which is actively installing many projects throughout the urban area and where they have access roads that they need to put in can those future as trails in the future and line those so they meet multiple goals. Those are some of the partnerships that we are looking at implementing some of these, some which are priority projects here but also secondary priorities to the parks plan.

ALLEN: And also if you partner with some of the environmental groups including the Clark Conservation District which has for example a grant this year to improve the Salmon Creek waterway and also as well as restoration of some banks which do abut against those trails --

KLEINER: Correct.

ALLEN: -- so that will be a great partnership and I think that this is a great plan.

LEBOWSKY: Thank you.

KLEINER: Thank you.

DELEISSEGUES: Any further questions or deliberation or motion?

VARTANIAN: I'm all moved out, let somebody else do it.

DELEISSEGUES: Nobody wants to do anything?

ALLEN: I **MOVE** that we recommend approval to the Board of Commissioners.

VARTANIAN: **Second.**

DELEISSEGUES: I think what we're talking about is recommending approval of the staff recommendation to adopt the County's bicycle and pedestrian plan. Is there a second? You seconded it?

VARTANIAN: Second.

DELEISSEGUES: Any discussion on the motion?

LEBOWSKY: I have a question, sorry to interrupt, so the staff recommendation is approval of the plan with that revised Chapter 4 that Parks had recommended?

VARTANIAN: Yes.

ALLEN: So I amend my motion.

VARTANIAN: And my second.

DELEISSEGUES: Is it clear?

LEBOWSKY: Yes.

DELEISSEGUES: Roll call, please.

ROLL CALL VOTE

USKOSKI: AYE
ALLEN: AYE
VARTANIAN: AYE
DELEISSEGUES: AYE

DELEISSEGUES: Good work, Laurie.

LEBOWSKY: Thank you.

VARTANIAN: Thanks for all the people who worked on the project, good, good (inaudible) of volunteering.

ALLEN: That was partnership at work.

DELEISSEGUES: Yeah, task forces aren't easy to work on, I can tell you that.

OLD BUSINESS

None.

NEW BUSINESS

None.

COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION

None.

ADJOURNMENT

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 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 Wiser, Administrative Assistant