



Clark County Planning Commission

Steve Morasch, Chair
Ron Barca, Vice Chair
Bill Wright
Eileen Quiring
Karl Johnson
John Blom

CLARK COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF PUBLIC HEARING 2016 COMP PLAN UPDATE THURSDAY, JUNE 2, 2016

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

6:30 p.m.

CALL TO ORDER & ROLL CALL

MORASCH: Welcome to the June 2nd Planning Commission hearing. Can we get the roll call.

BARCA: HERE
BLOM: HERE
JOHNSON: HERE
QUIRING: HERE
WRIGHT: HERE
BENDER: HERE
MORASCH: HERE

Staff Present: Oliver Orjiako, Community Planning Director; Gordy Euler, Deputy Director; Steve DiJulio, Attorney; Sonja Wisner, Administrative Assistant; Kathy Schroeder, Staff Assistant; Colette Anderson, Planner; Laurie Lebowsky, Planner; Matt Hermen, Planner; Sharon Lumbantobing, Planner; Jose Alvarez, Planner; Jacqui Kamp, Planner; Gary Albrecht, Planner; Ken Pearrow, GIS Analyst; Barbara Hatman, GIS Analyst; and Cindy Holley, Court Reporter.

GENERAL & NEW BUSINESS

A. Approval of Agenda for June 2, 2016

MORASCH: Okay. We will move to the approval of the agenda. Does anyone have any objection to the agenda? If not, I'd take a motion to approve.

JOHNSON: Make a motion to approve the agenda.

BENDER: Second.

MORASCH: All in favor?

EVERYBODY: AYE

MORASCH: Opposed? Okay. Motion carries.

B. Communications from the Public

Next item on the agenda is communications from the public on matters that are not on our scheduled agenda. So is there anyone from the public that wants to testify on something other than the comprehensive plan? No? Okay. Then we will move on to the public hearing item tonight which is the 2016 comprehensive growth management plan update.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS & PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION:

2016 COMPREHENSIVE GROWTH MANAGEMENT PLAN UPDATE

Clark County is updating its comprehensive plan to meet the Growth Management Act deadline of June 30, 2016. The update process began in July of 2013. The County Council adopted population and job numbers for the 20-year planning horizon that ends in 2035. The Council also adopted a public involvement plan that the County has implemented. The environmental review process included the analysis of four alternatives, and a final supplemental environmental impact statement on a preferred alternative was released in April of 2016.

The comprehensive plan update includes the following:

- Changes to the comprehensive plan map;
- Updates to policies and text in the comprehensive plan document;
- Changes to Clark County Code Title 40, the county's unified development code, to implement map and policy changes;
- Changes to the Arterial Atlas;
- Updated Capital Facilities and Capital Facilities Financial Plans; and
- Updated school, parks, and traffic impact fees

Plan adoption materials can be found at: <https://www.clark.wa.gov/community-planning/plan-adoption>.

This is the hearing for our deliberation on that matter. And before I open it up to deliberation, I'll ask Oliver, is there any comments from staff or are you ready for us to begin our deliberation?

ORJIAKO: Good evening, Mr. Chair, members of the Planning Commission. I don't have any comment to make except to say that I think some folks will be concerned because our legal did say that there will be public testimony, but the reason for that, we have no idea that the Planning Commission will close your testimony on the 24th, so we left today as a possibility of testimony. But I just want to comment that you closed that, but you provided opportunity for written testimony to be submitted by 5:00 p.m. on, I believe, the 25th last week, last Wednesday. So that's the remarks I have to make.

We provided the Planning Commission to the best that we can response to the questions that you raised during your joint hearing with the Council. And unless you have further questions, we also did provide you additional materials to help you in your deliberation. While you are no longer making a recommendation to a Preferred Alternative, we still provided you some bookends, some issues to be aware of as it pertains to the State law now that you're making a final recommendation to the Council for the plan update.

The only remark I will make is you are aware that we updated the County comprehensive plan in 2007. As you're aware, that plan was appealed, just like the other two that were done in '94 and 2004; however, that plan was found to be in compliance with the Growth Management Act after we resolved all the appeals. That took us seven years to resolve. So what we have done during this update, we would have come to the Council or come to the Planning Commission and said, you know, we have updated the shoreline master program, which is the 14 goal of the Act, and submitted that to Ecology and approved it. I'm very -- what should I say? -- very proud that we were in the first county in the state that did our shoreline and it was never appealed and also on time.

We updated our critical area ordinance to be consistent with the recent revisions to RCW as it pertains to best available science. So if you look at what are we doing now, it would have been a very -- the Act says, you know, review your plan, update and make changes if necessary. That's what the statute says. What we would have liked to do, and I think we've made that very clear to the Planning Commission, that we would have taken this opportunity to reorganize our comp plan text, make it very friendly and easier to use. You went through that process with the retooling of our code. We wanted to make that same effort with the comp plan text. Didn't have the opportunity to do that, but hopefully in the future we will.

So in a nutshell, this is your opportunity to deliberate and make a recommendation to the Council. In doing so, we have provided you a Decision Table or matrix if you want to use that. I think it will be helpful. You can use the same format, like the Council uses on their consent

agenda, you can vote on everything together. You can pull certain items and vote on it individually, however you want to do that, but I think this tool will be helpful to you.

We also provided you, my staff did an excellent job in providing the Issue Paper 8.1 which summarizes everything that is before you, provides the rationale for some of the changes that we are proposing, so I think that was done to assist you in reviewing the materials. So I'll just stop there. I'm not giving testimony or anything. I just want to help guide you. This is your deliberation and you all have met our legal counsel, Mr. Steve DiJulio, and I have Gordy here and some of my staff, including staff from the GIS Department, to help answer questions and help you in your deliberation if you have questions. So that's my remark, Mr. Chair.

MORASCH: All right. Thank you very much. And I'm holding this document here that I think I picked up today. It's four pages long and it starts out the Board and Planning Commission had the following questions. This is staff's response to our questions?

ORJIAKO: Yes.

MORASCH: All right. That looks good. Okay.

Any member of the Planning Commission have any questions about the process before we get started? I think my plan is to go through the work sheet that Oliver mentioned and have a vote on the main numbered items, unless an individual Planning Commissioner wants to pull out a sub item for discussion or vote. That way I think we can get through this whole thing tonight. Otherwise, I mean, there's 11 pages of this. If we go and discuss each one of these individually, we could be here for a long time, maybe even until next month. So if that sounds okay to everyone, I think we'll start and ask, does anyone have any items under Number 1, Rural, any sub items they want to pull out for separate discussion?

QUIRING: Actually, Mr. Chair, could I just say something --

MORASCH: Sure.

QUIRING: -- before we begin the deliberations. I just have to say that I personally am not going to be supporting this comprehensive plan. I think that we've gotten the information that is voluminous, too much for us to comprehend and actually know what's in it. I think that people that do know what's in it are very much opposed to many of the things in it. It impacts a lot of people in Clark County. I think a lot of the Clark County people don't understand what's in it. They haven't had an opportunity to agree with or approve it.

And while I know we're going to go through the process this evening, I thought rather than belabor it as we go through each and every item that I would just say at the outset that I think that we should actually go back and start again, even though it would make this plan late. I also understand I'm not going to be very popular with my Commissioner members here for this

stance, but this is just how I feel. I just can't abide by many of the things that are in this plan. Thank you.

MORASCH: Any response?

BARCA: I do have a question then, Commissioner Quiring. Are you intending to vote no on every item if we break it out or if we keep it whole?

QUIRING: We'll see.

BARCA: Oh, we'll see?

QUIRING: Yeah.

BARCA: Oh, okay. So we're still in the game. Okay.

Mr. Chair, I do have differences of opinions on some of the items in the Rural zone. On Item Number 1 --

MORASCH: So which ones would you like to discuss separate?

BARCA: Well, I would say --

MORASCH: All of them?

BARCA: Well, I can go through a through d and explain my position on them and take a vote on those as a start. I don't know how the rest of the Commission feels about anything in the Rural areas.

WRIGHT: I would like to see b, c and d addressed separately.

BARCA: All right.

MORASCH: B, c and d.

BARCA: Well, that's a through d is separate then.

WRIGHT: A smaller subset.

MORASCH: Okay. So does anyone want to see e, f or g separate or can we take those as a group?

BARCA: I need g broken out as well.

MORASCH: G. All right. Well, let's just go through each one of these because no sense in combining e and f, we'll just go through them each individually then. And I would actually like to add one, two, I actually want to add two items. One is following up on Commissioner Quiring's comment. It was raised by the DEAB that maybe what we need to do is hit the reset button. That would prevent us from being out of compliance by adopting something and then maybe start this whole thing over again soon to take a second look. And given Commissioner Quiring's concerns, I think that is worthy of a separate discussion and vote. And --

BLOM: So are you suggesting that we -- I'm unclear as to what you're suggesting.

MORASCH: I'm suggesting we discuss that item and decide whether or not someone wants to make a motion on it or not.

BLOM: Which item?

MORASCH: The idea that we should recommend to the Commissioners that whatever they do with this plan that they should reset the whole thing --

BLOM: The whole plan.

MORASCH: -- for next year. I don't think we're required to make a recommendation on that, but there was enough testimony on it I'd like to see us at least discuss it and decide whether we want to make we certainly can make a recommendation on it.

And the other issue is the City of Ridgefield raised a concern about wanting a buffer around the City of Ridgefield for one mile if we do smaller lot sizes. So we may or may not vote for some of the smaller lot sizes under Rural, but I think the buffer is another thing I'd like to see voted on.

BARCA: Is that more appropriate to be handled in f with Ridgefield's UGA, Mr. Chair?

BLOM: Number 4.

BARCA: 4. I'm sorry. Yes.

LEVANEN: Do you have this document for the public because it's not back there what you're going through is not.

MORASCH: Do we have the checklist available? It's on the screen. They're reprinting it, I guess. Are they reprinting it?

BARCA: There's your answer.

MORASCH: All right. Okay. We can add it as c under Ridgefield's UGA. Okay.

All right. Well, with that, we'll turn it over to 1.a, Comprehensive Plan Map Legend. Any individual discussion on that item? If not, I would take a motion.

BARCA: I'd be happy to start.

MORASCH: All right. Jump in.

BARCA: Okay. So I do not understand what our individual need for this particular map change is. If we go in and we look at the comp plan on Page 20, there's discussion about the allowance for additional lots that would put us in a position of saying that we're going to continue to plan for and violate the 90/10 rural split, and by doing this one designation here, we make smaller rural lot sizes. This also puts us in a position of saying we're no longer supporting the population designation that we had stated was going to be part of the urban/rural split by adding additional parcelization.

To me, I think this is the essence of what we're really trying to get at tonight is the idea of there's a lot of political favor about doing much more in the rural area, but we're working with a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement. Specifically we're saying that we're not doing any additional changes to the urban and yet we're adding to the rural areas. It puts us in a position of saying we're no longer following our own planning assumptions by making this change.

If we look at what it does into the concept of the capital facilities plan for transportation, which is in the EIS Page 7-9, it talks about us moving into the need for 26 unfunded projects that are specific to the rural lands. And if we look at what we have in the way of a capital facilities deficit, most significantly just talking about the \$158 million of unfunded transportation projects, that 26 unfunded projects for the rural lands is specifically focused on trying to favor putting additional lots into the rural lands.

Our Councilors gave us the resolution from March 1st of 2016 that adopted all those planning assumptions. When we go before department -- or the Commerce Department and show them what we're doing, we need to ensure that our plan follows our own assumptions on this; otherwise, we're going to end up in a non-starting position.

I really think that for me, this is the basis for a through d in this section as why I can't support what we're looking at. We have a goal for one-to-one additional jobs to housing ratio, but we don't have a plan on how to add additional jobs, but we do have a plan on how to add additional houses. I think that puts us, once again, in a poor position to be able to say that we

understand our own planning assumptions and this supplemental plan which already adequately gave us enough residential land and enough jobs to housing ratio before we changed it to get us through.

So if we don't have a plan on how to achieve our own goals but we're going to go forward and say this is our plan, I think we're putting ourselves in a position that says we're not really adequately addressing what we have already adopted as our own planning assumptions; therefore, I put it to you that I think a through d are not items that I can support.

The Planning Commission itself has voted on this twice now and both times we rejected these same changes by just adopting what was at one time called the Alternative 1. To me it is the fiscally conservative choice for those people that like to put themselves in a position to say they are or are not a fiscal conservative. We don't have a plan for the money. We don't have a plan on how to get to the money and we are ignoring our own planning assumptions by going forward. So that's a through d and I'm interested in hearing from the rest of the Commission.

ORJIAKO: Commissioner Ron Barca, if I may, and I will help you all Planning Commission members as you go through this. A, I clearly understand your position. What you have just said may relate to b, c and d and you can have that deliberation among yourself, but a is you have already voted on a and you approved it in the last vote on 17th and also on the 19th, I may be mistaken, but a is simply what is currently in our -- is it in our code or in our comp plan, Jose?

ALVAREZ: Right. So we have three zoning codes for the rural area, R-5, R-10 and R-20. In our comp plan, we have one rural comprehensive plan designation in the matrix and those are implemented by the three zones. What we have is an inconsistency between that matrix and our zoning map which shows the comp plan as R-5, R-10 and R-20 as opposed to just rural, and that's the only change that's proposed with that.

MORASCH: And as I understand, the only real affect of this change is going to be if people want to apply for a zone change between a rural designation, if you have one rural comp plan, then they can do that through the zone change process through the Hearing's Examiner. They don't have to come to us as part of annual review.

ALVAREZ: And that's currently how we interpret the code because it's --

MORASCH: Okay. And I'm showing that we passed that 6 to 0 --

ALVAREZ: Right.

MORASCH: -- back in February.

ORJIAKO: That's what I mentioned. You passed it already, Item a, but you twice rejected b, c

and d.

MORASCH: Right. Okay.

ORJIAKO: Just for clarification.

MORASCH: Any other comments on Item a? I'd like to get a vote on that separate and then we can move on to b, c and d and respond to Ron's comments on those. If there are no comments on a, I'd take a motion.

WRIGHT: **MOTION to approve Item 1.a.**

BLOM: **Second.**

MORASCH: All right. It's been moved and approved. Sonja, can we have the roll call.

ROLL CALL VOTE

BARCA: NO
BLOM: AYE
JOHNSON: AYE
QUIRING: NO
BENDER: NO
WRIGHT: AYE
MORASCH: AYE

MORASCH: Okay. So that one passes **4 to 3**.

All right. Now we'll move on to b and I think now would be the appropriate time for someone to respond to Ron's overall comments on b, c and d.

WRIGHT: Well, since I raised the question, I wholeheartedly agree with Ron's point on the b, c and d. We've had a chance to look at these before. I think our deliberation and our decision in 2015 was the right decision. There is a change in that the Board has looked at these and has approved them, but nevertheless, I think we should stick with our previous reasoning. It was well-founded and I don't see any reason it should be changed.

HOLLEY: I'm sorry. Previous reasoning on what?

WRIGHT: I don't see any reason we should change our previous decisions. The reasoning was sound and I think we should reaffirm our opposition to these three items.

BLOM: I feel the same way. I would also add that since this was changed, it's been sort of a rush to get to this point on looking at these changes. So I think these may be something that we do revisit in future comp plans, but I think right now is not the time. And I think it should be looked at in a more comprehensive how can we add more housing options in the rural area in a more responsible way than the options that we've been presented. And I'm afraid that doing this might tie our hands in the future by creating the potential for these lots that may make it harder to do something better down the road.

MORASCH: Any other discussion on b, c and d?

WRIGHT: Well, I think John's last comment was excellent in that these are representative somewhat of a number of items we may be facing tonight that we're being pressured to make a decision on, and I think all of us or many of us would like some more time to look at those items in detail, study them, have staff look at them in greater detail and so that we can make more informed decisions in the future.

BENDER: I also agree. What really bothers me is the lack of funding or any plan to obtain the funding. I mean, it's wishful thinking.

MORASCH: All right. Anyone else?

Eileen.

QUIRING: For entirely different reasons, I would vote no.

MORASCH: Okay. Does anyone have an objection to voting on b, c and d as a group? All right. This is my old sheet from before. That's right, we can vote on it. Any other discussion? If not, I'd take a motion.

BENDER: Make a motion that we vote on b, c and d as a group.

MORASCH: And how would you vote?

BARCA: Approve or deny?

MORASCH: Approve or deny b, c and d.

BENDER: No.

MORASCH: Okay. It's been moved. Is there a second? It's been **MOVED** to **DENY** b, c and d. Is there a second?

WRIGHT: **Second.**

MORASCH: It's been moved and seconded. Sonja, can we have a roll call, please.

ROLL CALL VOTE

BARCA: AYE

BLOM: AYE

JOHNSON: NO

QUIRING: NO

BENDER: AYE

WRIGHT: AYE

MORASCH: AYE

BLOM: Wait. Can I get a clarification. **By voting aye, we're voting to deny it; correct?**

MORASCH: **That's correct.**

BENDER: Double negative.

QUIRING: Oh, permission to change my vote.

MORASCH: How did you vote?

QUIRING: I voted no.

BLOM: You voted no.

QUIRING: I want to vote aye, if this is to --

BARCA: Deny.

QUIRING: If it's to deny.

MORASCH: It's to deny the increasing the lot size.

QUIRING: Yes, I know.

MORASCH: Or decreasing the lot size.

QUIRING: Yes, I understand.

MORASCH: I'm confused. I thought you wanted to increase --

QUIRING: I do.

MORASCH: -- the density in the rural area and we voted to deny that. All right. To avoid confusion --

QUIRING: Yes.

MORASCH: -- let's redo the roll call. And for clarity --

WISER: Can you restate the motion?

MORASCH: -- the motion, as I understood it, was to deny the proposal to --

BARCA: B, c and d.

MORASCH: -- reduce the minimum lot size as stated in b, c and d.

BENDER: That is correct.

MORASCH: Okay. So can we have the roll call again.

ROLL CALL VOTE

BARCA: AYE

BLOM: AYE

JOHNSON: NO

QUIRING: NO

BENDER: AYE

WRIGHT: AYE

MORASCH: AYE

MORASCH: Okay. That's the same vote we had last time, 5 to 2.

WISER: 5/2.

QUIRING: I decided not to.

MORASCH: Okay. So the **MOTION to DENY b, c and d carries 5 to 2.**

Brings us to e, the Comprehensive Plan Map Legend which is the same issue as a only it's

dealing with the CR-1 and CR-2 zone where we're combining those into one designation on our comp plan map. Is there any discussion on e? If not, I'd take a motion. But for your information, we approved this last time on a 5 to 1 vote.

BLOM: Can we take e and f together? I don't think there was any concern about f.

MORASCH: Does anyone have any objection to voting on f at the same time as e? Does anyone have any discussion on f?

BLOM: I **MOVE that we approve 1.e and 1.f.**

JOHNSON: I'll **second** it.

MORASCH: It's been moved and seconded to approve 1.e and 1.f. Sonja, can we have roll call, please.

ROLL CALL VOTE

BARCA: AYE
BLOM: AYE
JOHNSON: AYE
QUIRING: AYE
BENDER: AYE
WRIGHT: AYE
MORASCH: AYE

MORASCH: All right. That one passes, both of those **pass 7/0.**

Moving on to g, the Comp Plan Map and Zoning Map, removing the Urban Reserves and replacing it with Rural 5 and AG-10 respectively. Any discussion on this item?

BARCA: I would like to bring up the point that the cities made and to also reiterate my concern by changing this designation. We're going to have individual landowners coming forward impacting the ability for cities to go ahead and plan for their outer boundaries and the land we'll see, I believe, additional segregation. And if I just go back to the testimony from Bill Zimmerman, Bi-Zi Farms, talking about any division of farming land is going to be detrimental to the choices that the agricultural community has to make.

MORASCH: I have a question for staff. I'm not seeing this one. Did we vote on this in February or when we had our last meeting? This is it looks like a new item that's being pulled out for a separate discussion.

ORJIAKO: I think so. The only thing I will add is that they have the language you saw in September and November, don't know whether that says AG-10.

EULER: It should say 20.

ORJIAKO: It should say ag, ag what?

EULER: It should say 20.

ORJIAKO: It should say 20. I'm sorry. Given the action that you've taken on b, c and d, the AG-10 should read AG-20 if you're going to act on it, but I don't think it matters, but I believe that you acted on it both in September and --

MORASCH: It looks like it was combined with what we just did on g or on f.

ORJIAKO: I believe so.

MORASCH: So f and g were combined before. And as I understand this g now, we're actually removing the urban reserve --

ORJIAKO: Yes.

MORASCH: -- and letting people divide land based on the base zone?

EULER: This is a that we can pull up a map. This is a few parcels bordering the Vancouver UGA where we're taking the urban reserve designation off. And in the 1994 plan, there was actually some parcels that were zoned urban reserve, and then we created the urban reserve overlay, so in some cases if we remove urban reserve from these, there's no zoning at all. So because they're rural lands, the proposal is to replace them mostly with Rural 5 just as an underlying designation, so...

BLOM: It would still have the urban holding overlay?

EULER: Reserve.

BLOM: Urban reserve?

EULER: Unless the urban reserve overlay is taken off, then they'll just be regular R-5 parcels because they're outside of an urban growth area.

BARCA: That's what it says, remove.

WRIGHT: A question for staff then. In light of what was done under b, c and d holding to that, if g was approved, would it make it R-20 then rather than R-5 or R-10 or is it completely a --

EULER: No. We're proposing where there isn't zoning to give the underlying zoning of Rural 5.

WRIGHT: Okay.

ALVAREZ: And I think when you took action previously, this was under the Vancouver UGA and it might be under 2.p, I think that's how it set up under the Board, so if you look at your old --

MORASCH: There it is. Yep. Okay. We did approve this 5 to 1, although I find myself now agreeing with Ron. I'm not sure why we approved this before.

JOHNSON: Well, just taking your line of reasoning with the cities, Ron, so what you're saying - and correct me if I'm wrong - that the city's position was something that they may do that on property outside of their boundaries. The premise was, well, we want that to be a larger piece of property because we may want to use that for something in the future. There's no specifics other than it's better for us in a general term. That's just a question.

BARCA: The premise, I believe, is the less land division, the better off the opportunity for them to bring in contiguous land.

JOHNSON: But couldn't you also say the farther out the division of land is, the more it ultimately affects that city? Because isn't this a bor- -- we're talking about a border or a buffer zone around the city. Isn't it better that the five-acre parcels may be --

MORASCH: I think it's better that they're further out. If they're too close, the problem that you get is people go and build McMansions on those five-acre parcels and then when we the County, not the City, we the County expand the urban growth area to include those, then all of a sudden you've got a bunch of rural development, expensive rural development that makes it difficult for them to urbanize because the people that live there in their \$800,000 houses on their five-acre estate lots aren't going to want subdivisions and industrial development, you know, right next to them.

BLOM: Do we have any input from the landowners what they would like with their land?

ALVAREZ: Not I don't believe for this. So if you can put that other layer back on.

WRIGHT: There may be some other arguments.

ALVAREZ: So that area in the gray --

EULER: It's got a red outline.

BARCA: Oh, okay.

ALVAREZ: -- that's all of the urban reserve that's changing to what would mostly be R-5.

MORASCH: Okay. Now I'm remembering this and I think the reason we voted for it is it's already parcelized.

ALVAREZ: It's parcelized, right.

EULER: Correct.

ALVAREZ: And I think there's a small area in Washougal as well that's similar.

EULER: We've also heard testimony from some people who said that urban reserve, they felt like they were in limbo because they've been in urban reserve with the promise for a number of years of being brought into an urban growth boundary, in this case Vancouver's, and have not. So we're looking at this, we're saying it's parcelized. We're going to and -- or some of it's parcelized. I think a lot of it's parcelized. The idea is to remove urban reserve as an overlay and give this back to Rural 5.

MORASCH: Okay. Under g, are we talking about removing any urban reserve areas that are not parcelized like what we're viewing right here?

EULER: It's just what's on this map.

MORASCH: What about Washougal? You mentioned Washougal.

ORJIAKO: There's another case in Washougal when we get there, I believe.

EULER: I think it's covered under the Washougal UGA.

BENDER: This is focused on a specific piece of property, but what about future, if somebody else that's not in one of those wants to do it?

BARCA: No, they can't.

BENDER: Is it too general?

MORASCH: Well, the language here is fairly general. Can you be a little more specific on what we're actually voting for here.

ORJIAKO: I think what we are looking at is that this area has been in urban reserve for a considerable amount of time, and taking this effort to take a hard look at this area and looking and recognizing the fact that it's so parcelized and we really don't control, the cities come to us and propose an area to be brought into their urban growth boundary and we do push them to first look at the urban reserve areas that ringed their UGA, but often some of those requests for expansion of the urban growth boundary is property-owner driven. When that is the case, this area that has urban reserve continue to remain in urban reserve each time we readopt the plan without making any changes.

So this is an effort to take a second look at this area and say what is the proper zoning of this area. If it is so parcelized and the need to continue to designate it as urban reserve no longer warrants that, I think that's really what the --

MORASCH: I think the question is, if we vote yes for this, is this going to affect any other property potentially besides the ones that you just showed us on the map?

EULER: No.

ORJIAKO: No.

ALVAREZ: So in the Washougal, it's slightly different where the comprehensive plan is an urban reserve with the zoning being AG-20. So we're just taking the comprehensive plan urban reserve off of that, so it will just be AG-20 is both comp plan and zone.

MORASCH: But not if the Commissioners overrule us on --

ALVAREZ: Correct. That's the recommendation.

ORJIAKO: If they overrule you, that will be your recommendation to them and then they will act to accept, reject or modify your recommendation.

MORASCH: All right. Any other discussion?

QUIRING: And back to the other urban reserve, the other one that was parcelized, what size are those parcels? They aren't fives, are they?

ALVAREZ: Fives or smaller.

QUIRING: Yeah, I would think so. They look smaller to me.

ALVAREZ: Yeah.

BLOM: Are you ready for a motion?

MORASCH: I am. And I would even entertain a split motion on the Washougal versus the Vancouver, if someone was of a mind, because I see those as two different issues because the Washougal is not as parcelized as the one we just saw in Vancouver.

BLOM: **So I MOVE that we remove the comprehensive plan urban reserve in the Vancouver and the properties adjacent or near the Vancouver growth boundary and replace with the R-5 or AG-20 respectively. Or is it only R-5 in Vancouver?**

MORASCH: I believe it's R-5 in Vancouver because they're all parcelized.

BLOM: All right. R-5.

QUIRING: Vancouver.

JOHNSON: And AG-10 would be for Washougal, yeah.

MORASCH: Is there a second?

JOHNSON: I **second** it.

MORASCH: All right. Moved and seconded. Any discussion on the motion?

QUIRING: So does it include the AG-20?

MORASCH: Not this motion.

QUIRING: Okay. Thank you.

JOHNSON: It's only R-5 in Vancouver.

WRIGHT: But it does include AG-10 though; is that correct?

MORASCH: No, it's all going to be R-5. This is all in the very parcelized property in the Vancouver UGA that we saw on the map. This does not include the Washougal. We're going to have a second vote on that.

Any other discussion? All right. Sonja, can we get the roll call.

ROLL CALL VOTE

BARCA: NO
BLOM: AYE
JOHNSON: AYE
QUIRING: AYE
BENDER: NO
WRIGHT: AYE
MORASCH: AYE

MORASCH: That passes, I believe, **5 to 2.**

BARCA: Yep.

ORJIAKO: Yes.

MORASCH: All right. And now, John, would you like to make a motion on the other subsection of g that involves the ag property in Washougal?

BLOM: Can we get that map pulled up again, please. **And I'll make the MOTION that we remove the urban holding from the property near the Washougal urban growth boundary and replace it with AG-20.**

JOHNSON: Just a clarification. It's AG-10 on the --

BLOM: Right, but we said there is no AG-10. Yeah. I mean, that's in line with how we voted on --

JOHNSON: Yeah, sure. I'll second --

ALVAREZ: Can we --

JOHNSON: Oh, excuse me. I'll **second** that.

ALVAREZ: Just clarify, it's not urban holding; it's urban reserve.

BLOM: Urban reserve.

ALVAREZ: And ag is the comp plan designation.

BLOM: Okay. So I move that we remove the urban reserve and replace it with AG --

JOHNSON: AG-20.

ALVAREZ: Ag. Just ag.

MORASCH: All right. And, Karl, you second?

JOHNSON: Yes, I second that.

MORASCH: All right. So it's been moved and seconded to remove the urban reserve and replace with AG-20 for Item g dealing with the Washougal area just outside of Washougal. Any other discussion? All right. Sonja, we'll take a roll call.

ROLL CALL VOTE

BARCA: AYE
BLOM: AYE
JOHNSON: AYE
QUIRING: NO
BENDER: AYE
WRIGHT: AYE
MORASCH: NO

MORASCH: So that passes **5 to 2** just like the other one, but people voted differently.

All right. That moves us to the reset issue. This was the issue raised by a number of people at our hearing, including the DEAB, that suggested that there are a lot of issues to resolve in this comp plan, and in order to resolve them, we need more time, and the best way to do that is to adopt something now and go back into the cycle next year and take a second look. Is there any discussion on that issue?

BLOM: I don't necessarily disagree with the idea of it, but I question whether it's responsible if the Board were to accept our recommendation for them to tie the hands or to pass on this recommendation to a future Board.

Another factor being whatever is approved, if a plan is approved by June 30th, it's likely to be challenged, so we'll be trying to rewrite, potentially trying to rewrite one plan while defending another. So I think it's a good sentiment, but I think let's wait and see how the cards fall.

JOHNSON: Though would it hurt to -- at the end just to issue a statement or, you know, something to the effect of the Planning Commission strongly urges?

BLOM: I mean, I think we've just put that on the record. I don't know if we need to vote, but...

JOHNSON: Yeah. Yeah. That's kind of where I'm --

BARCA: Yeah. It's my position on this that I think this is a very political discussion and not representative of just planning has been handed to us. It's easy to recognize deficits in any plan, but I don't think it's really our place to tell the Board what we believe the appropriate action should be taken, other than recognizing there's deficits.

And so as you stated, Karl, I think we're on the record by saying that, but John's question about the idea of defending a plan while changing a plan pretty much puts us in a position that we would not be able to have anything to give to the public that would say time certain when we would start that task. And Lord knows this was a Supplemental EIS that we just went through. Imagine when we really want to go ahead and change it, that's a jobs program for us and I don't want to be advocating additional workload.

WRIGHT: Yeah. I believe a straightforward adoption is going to be the best for the county and for the Board recognizing there probably will be some issues. A lot of them were brought up in the hearings a few weeks ago that deal with code issues and changes to code can certainly be considered in the future to address those given the proper study and staff work prior to looking at them. And I would assume that would come down from the Board, that desire, yeah, if there is that desire with the Board. But, again, I reiterate, let's get the plan approved and adopted, not risk all the problems that would follow if we didn't.

MORASCH: Eileen.

QUIRING: I just have a comment about the issue of the Planning Commission not -- you know, it not being appropriate that we tell the Councilors one thing or another. This is a legislative committee that is to advise the Council, and when there's any subcommittee that sees a lot of information, I for one know and have experienced that you count on that subcommittee or that group of people to have looked at the information and give a truthful, honest appraisal of what it is you're looking at and your true feelings about what should be done with the plan, and so I don't think it is just all politics at all. I think there are definite flaws in this plan that need addressing, so...

MORASCH: And I agree with Commissioner Quiring on that. We're here to make recommendations. We don't have to be super specific in our recommendations as to how the Board implement it down to the last i dotting and t crossing. We can make a general recommendation that we think the plan is flawed and needs to be looked at again. I completely agree with Commissioner Quiring on that.

I think we may have different flaws in the plan. We may not agree on that completely, but we

do agree that it is flawed and would like to see a reset button hit. But since there doesn't seem to be much consensus from the individual Planning Commissioners, I don't know if we need a motion on this. I think we can leave our verbal statements on the record and move on, unless anyone has objection.

JOHNSON: Yeah, I just really quickly. I think we're at a kind of a wonderful tipping point which is I totally respect what you're saying and also the testimony reflected, much of the testimony was wait, wait, wait, kind of look around at it. At the same time my fear is - and I don't want to diminish because I hear what you're saying - I don't agree that it's political as much as it is, and even if is, so what? I look at this and I say what is the best path to getting this right? And I'd go back, then I'm on your side, Bill, saying let's not muddy the waters. Let's get this one, get it done and then let's take a step.

I fear when a planning commission says, okay, we're going through these, we're passing or denying them or whatever, then the next thing we say is, but we don't -- there's flaws or whatever. I think that that kind of gets us in a dangerous situation. Not that we don't want to correct or tell them. We can tell them. I just think there's a path here and I'm not sure yet if it's during this.

That's why I kind of suggested a statement or, like you said, that maybe it's just our record, everybody on record saying, hey, look, this has been pushed. I've said that from the beginning, for whatever reason, I don't care. I wanted more. The litany of information cannot get effectively digested even if you read it all so, and I've tried to read it all, but when you look at it, and, Oliver, that's not a reflection because you're giving it to me I'm sure as fast as you're getting, but at some level, we have to say, wait, we got a new Board. Things happen. Let's approve this. Let's get it through, and then from there, let's step back and say, okay, look, Board, you ought to reset this or something like that, so... I'm both ways and I just think a statement is probably the best thing versus a vote.

MORASCH: All right. Well, I think we've all made our statements. Does anyone want to add to their statement or can we move on to the next item?

WRIGHT: I think it's futile to try and create a plan that is not flawed, that's --

MORASCH: Okay. With that, we will move on to Battle Ground.

BLOM: We had -- you suggested a Ridgefield, the buffer for Ridgefield.

MORASCH: Ron suggested. We'll talk about that when we talk about Ridgefield. I'll move it down, although honestly, I think that that kind of -- that general topic could apply to any city, but...

BARCA: I'm not opposed if you want to bring it up.

MORASCH: Should we bring it back up and talk about buffers? All right. We'll do that.

I, Buffers, any discussion on buffers?

QUIRING: I think that buffers are wonderful for cities; not so good for the particular property owners that own those buffers. That's my comment.

WRIGHT: I still find the idea offensive. The plan is supposed to establish growth areas for 20 years and to tie a plan just because it happens to be adjacent to the city boundary to make it convenient for some future city council to do something or other --

BARCA: Bill, talk more into your microphone.

MORASCH: You need to talk into your mic.

HOLLEY: I cannot hear you.

WRIGHT: Okay. I'm sorry. I still find the whole idea of these buffers offensive. Our plan is for 20 years of growth and to hold these areas hostage so it would be easier in the future possibly for the city to do something or other and 20 years hence is not right.

MORASCH: Anyone want to respond?

BENDER: Aren't urban holding areas a buffer in a sense?

MORASCH: Urban reserve areas.

BENDER: Urban reserve, excuse me.

MORASCH: There are, but we haven't really implemented those with very much enthusiasm. There's none that I saw on the map around Ridgefield and I think there should be.

BARCA: Yeah. I think ideally what the suggestion was trying to propose was to not force cities into a panic of needing to push their boundaries because another city is encroaching from one direction or another, to try and give them a certain amount of breathing room where they don't feel the need to grab before it as a resource is taken by another municipality.

MORASCH: I don't think it's so much the municipalities as it is rural development, particularly if we approve smaller lot sizes and clusters in the rural development, because right now you've got, let's say, a 40-acre, 20- or 40-acre piece outside of Ridgefield that might be perfect to bring

in for industrial in the next comp plan cycle, which might be as soon as next year or it could be eight years from now, but it's a 20-year plan, but we've got to readdress it at least every eight years and so I don't think eight years is a long time, you know, for a property owner to wait.

In fact, if you're that close to the UGB, you may want to wait because your value's going to go, you know, up by ten-fold once you get urbanized and the issue is if you have like a cluster of five or six, you know, \$800,000 homes with, you know, a larger open space parcel surrounding it and you try to urbanize that and bring in a developer to, you know, develop a industrial use there, it's going to be very hard because you're going to get opposition from the people that own those homes. They've got a little neighborhood. They're going to organize and they're going to say, hey, we don't want those, you know, that industrial use right next to us. And that's the concern I think that I heard from Ridgefield, and it's not a city concern; it's a community concern about preserving our future job-producing land supply.

BARCA: And that is one component. But I think, just like you said, any time you get a certain build-out, you're going to have resistance from whomever is there of any type of future development, whether it be residential, industrial or whatever the case is.

Throughout this process, I've had people come to me and say that they're concerned about an increase of density in their neighborhood in a rural setting as it is. Whether it's urban density without a city boundary around it or whether it is one in which the city has actually annexed out to it, I think the concern is still one city's boundary butting right up against another city's boundary.

In this particular proposal, I don't believe we are well read enough or wise enough from the standpoint of the consequences of having that discussion to bring any kind of motion forward where I would feel comfortable being able to vote on it. But I do believe the outcry is for something similar but for a variety of reasons and we need to start preparing to address those in the future. But I would be hesitant to support or deny a motion because I just don't feel I'm knowledgeable enough to understand the impact.

BLOM: I would join with Ron. I'm having a hard time giving a straight yes or no on this because some of it, in my mind, would depend on what happens with the what we move to deny in b and c.

And if I remember correctly, Ridgefield was talking specifically that if you're going to allow increased parcelization in those resource lands, that if we allow that in general that there be a buffer where that didn't happen within a certain perimeter of the UGB. Now, if the Council does override us and move forward with that, I think that Ridgefield has a valid concern in that having some kind of buffer would protect that parcelization near the boundary line, but if they follow our recommendation, then I don't think it's necessary and I think it is then creating a secondary urban growth line.

So without knowing, I have a hard time making a recommendation not knowing if they are, since they've already previously approved what we have said, we denied, it makes it hard to make a recommendation on this part of it because I see the two as being tied together.

MORASCH: Exactly. Which is why I wanted to pull it out for separate discussion because they may stick -- the Board of County Councilors may stick with their February 23rd vote, and if they do, you'll have 10 acres instead of 20 acres in those ag lands, and I think that's what Ridgefield is saying, hey, look, if you let them split some of these properties up, it's going to make urbanization more problematic and reduce our future job supply land.

And by the way, Washougal came back in September and made the same statement and I believe that we made some adjustments on the Washougal map from the beginning and now some of the parcelization outside of Washougal was reduced. Am I remembering that correctly, Oliver?

ORJIAKO: I think in the case of Washougal, I think all the cities, if you go back to their early testimony, said they would like some whether it's half a mile or a mile radius, I think that's how collectively they made their presentation. I think it was until recently that I heard about the halo idea coming from Ridgefield which is the same concept.

In the case of Washougal, I think Washougal was requesting about 40 acres to be added to their UGB and their council, I believe, did not approve that and our Council also did not approve inclusion of that piece. If you recall, that 40 acres or so in the case of Washougal had an approved cluster on it and folks came out in opposition for inclusion into the Washougal UGB.

MORASCH: I think that supports my point that --

ORJIAKO: Yes.

MORASCH: -- we need these buffers, because otherwise, you get the cluster owner stopping the property from being urbanized --

ORJIAKO: Yes.

MORASCH: -- and you lose your industrial land supply.

BLOM: So I'd make a motion that we ask the Board if they adopt any policy that would increase parcelization near the urban growth that they also consider the impact that has on the future city growth just as a general policy consideration.

MORASCH: All right. It's been moved. Is there a second? Well, I would second it. I don't

know. Should the Chair second motions? But being that there's no second, I'm not going to. It doesn't seem like there's a point to have a vote. I think we'll stand on our verbal statements that we made on the record on these issues and move on.

Battle Ground UGA. Does anyone want to pull any of the individual items?

BARCA: Mr. Chair, I'd like to talk a, b and c --

MORASCH: As a group?

BARCA: -- as a group. I'm happy to do it as a group. Is there any discussion about a, b and c? Are you okay with doing that?

MORASCH: And you want to discuss d separately?

BARCA: I can do d and e together.

MORASCH: Does anyone want to discuss any of these individually or can we just discuss them as a group?

WRIGHT: I could go with them as a group, but if folks want to split them out.

MORASCH: I'm okay as a group. Unless there's an objection, let's do it as a group.

ALVAREZ: I just want to clarify that d is part of c. It's tied with that.

MORASCH: Okay. Well, it sounds like we're going to do it as a group anyway.

JOHNSON: Can you pull up the maps as we go through these.

MORASCH: All right. Discussion on Battle Ground UGA. Anyone want to start?

Ron, you had you wanted to discuss a, b and c.

BARCA: So at our joint hearing with the County Council when the Battle Ground representative came forward, I asked specifically about their annexation policy, the idea that they did not provide any evidence that they needed additional lands brought into the urban growth boundary. They did not have an annexation plan to bring any particular parcels into the annexation. And my question, since we are adopting a Supplemental EIS that basically says we have adequate amount of inventory to hold all of the residential projected growth in the existing urban growth boundaries, my question was, what was the need for this?

And I do not believe that there was any evidence brought forward by the City of Battle Ground for that, and there was nothing that showed that they needed to change from their industrial to residential to accommodate additional growth. There was nothing that showed they needed to consume rural land for additional residential growth. So I was baffled by the lack of evidence, and I don't see it as being anything except for a just-in-case placeholder by a city that didn't provide the homework.

MORASCH: Okay. It looks like we voted to approve this 6 to 0 last time.

ORJIAKO: That's my recollection, Planning Commission members.

MORASCH: That's what I'm showing on my little BCC Preferred Alternative sheet. It says Planning Commission motion to approve, Aye 6, Nay 0.

ORJIAKO: I'm not here to speak for the City of Battle Ground; however, what they're proposing is that this 17 acres be for mixed use employment, and I don't know the mix in terms of percentage how much of this will be --

MORASCH: 17 parcels.

ORJIAKO: It's 17 parcels.

MORASCH: I believe it's 80 acres.

ORJIAKO: What I mean by mix is whether it is 80 percent going to be for employment, but this land is being brought in and designated for mixed use employment. So it's -- but what I'm saying is that I don't know what their mix for residential will be, but it is intended for mixed use employment and the Council or the Planning Commission voted to approve this request, the 80 acres, and it's currently zoned for Rural 5.

MORASCH: So what's the area we're talking about on this map?

WRIGHT: Where the cursor is.

MORASCH: That green area?

EULER: Yes.

ORJIAKO: Yes. And the other b, c and d are more for housekeeping. Some of it, even d, are parcels that have already developed as residential but zoned inadvertently as an industrial piece. This is what happens when you take about three years to do a very simple plan update. People develop their property. It wasn't current time and we are now trying to make the correction to identify that the property have already developed for residential.

You can see the subdivision. There's no need zoning it for ML. That's the reason we are making the recommendation for d. So it's more of housekeeping. I'm glad we have our staff here to show you and you made a recommendation to grant the request from the City of Battle Ground.

MORASCH: Any other discussion?

BARCA: So I do think it's important for the Commission to recognize that by adding this piece, we are now sanctioning the City of Battle Ground to go west of 92nd and that is a new wester expansion on the boundary for them. Certainly in the past, we have tried to create straight lines with contiguous lots and bring in sections at a time, but this particular situation here, I can only assume that there's some amiable opportunity for the landowners to get inside the boundary.

It does concern me that without an annexation plan, we have just gone ahead and broached the 92nd Avenue line which will mean, then, the pressure will be on to continue to fill in and move westward, so Dollars Corners is not far away.

JOHNSON: Do not think that would have happened without the 502 expansion? That doesn't seem like --

BARCA: I think that we would manage it in --

JOHNSON: Well, sure.

BARCA: -- accordance with them being able to absorb what they already have first. That's the way, I believe, the comprehensive plan is meant to be utilized is for them to consume what they already have within their urban growth boundary and then continue to propose areas that they can support in the form of expansion as opposed to continue to wrap up little bundles and then go ahead and take them at their discretion.

JOHNSON: As I recall, and notwithstanding the last testimony, that this was about using this as some type of industrial or some type of jobs creation. I don't know why 92nd is some type of magic road. It's an expansion going west towards I-5.

We have dealt with properties before where the City of Battle Ground, there was staff testimony regarding their concerns about if you're -- something back there at the freeway interchange and so right there, the tale was there. 502 is now a four-lane highway, so I think it was natural. Yes.

I'm not sure why it's such an extreme deal. I understand what you're saying about because I

wasn't really sure what the answer she gave either, but I think during staff, we talked about this somewhat extensively and what they were trying to do with it and all of these seem to have reasonable. I think the only one we had problems with was Ridgefield's expansion. They all had reasonable reasons, so I'm not sure why that's changed all of a sudden.

BARCA: Well, it was 6 to 0 so it hasn't really changed significantly. But I'm just trying to voice my concern about when we go ahead and make a decision to add land into urban growth boundaries, what is the reasoning behind it, and then I would like to see the City be able to support it with data, rather than just saying it's their right to expand. They're calling it employment land but mixed use, even in County vernacular is a very loose term for how many residents are put on compared to how many jobs are created. So I think there's a lot of room to say that it's primarily residential with some opportunity for commercial.

QUIRING: Ready for a motion?

MORASCH: Is there any other discussion? All right. We're ready for a motion.

QUIRING: I **move we approve items** -- and we're talking all of them; right --

MORASCH: All five, as I understand.

QUIRING: -- a through e, the Battle Ground UGA, approve.

BLOM: **Second.**

MORASCH: It's been moved and seconded. Any discussion on the motion? All right. Sonja, can we get a roll call.

ROLL CALL VOTE

BARCA: NO
BLOM: AYE
JOHNSON: AYE
QUIRING: AYE
BENDER: AYE
WRIGHT: AYE
MORASCH: AYE

MORASCH: So that passes **6 to 1** and that covers Battle Ground.

Moving on to La Center. Can we take these as a group, is there any objection? All right. Let's take La Center UGA as a group. Any discussion?

JOHNSON: I make a **MOTION that we approve the La Center UGA expansion.**

BENDER: **Second.**

MORASCH: It's been moved and seconded. Any discussion on the motion?

BARCA: I'd like to put into the record that I don't believe the de-designation information that the City of La Center put forward is significantly different than the type of de-designation information that was put forward in our 2007 comp plan, which we ended up having the ag land roll back. I do recognize that the Cowlitz are building out there now and, therefore, La Center believes that it's different. There are casinos inside of agricultural land throughout the state of Washington. I don't believe this is going to hold up, and I believe this is one of the items that's going to cause us to have to see this again.

MORASCH: Any response? All right. In that case, Sonja, we're ready for a roll call.

ROLL CALL VOTE

BARCA: NO
BLOM: AYE
JOHNSON: AYE
QUIRING: AYE
BENDER: AYE
WRIGHT: AYE
MORASCH: AYE

MORASCH: Motion passes **6 to 1**. Ridgefield UGA. I think we can take these as a group. Is there any discussion on the Ridgefield UGA?

MORASCH: The same comment as La Center?

BARCA: Well, the de-designation comment is still valid. We've actually visited some of these same parcels for the ag land and had the same results, but I do think it's also really worth noting that this was a Supplemental EIS in which we did not state that we had any type of shortages of employment land even to meet what we've said was the one-to-one job to housing ratio. We did not show any work that said we needed additional employment land, and I think when we talk about 111 acres and the opportunity to say that whether it's going to be residential or employment, this is Battle Ground, this is La Center, this is Ridgefield, I think we don't have the record that states we need to bring this property into the urban growth boundary and we're going to find ourselves unable to defend something that we don't have data for.

MORASCH: Any other discussion? I would take a motion.

WRIGHT: **MOVE we adopt the Ridgefield a and b items as proposed.**

JOHNSON: **Second.**

MORASCH: It's been moved and seconded to approve the Ridgefield UGA. Any discussion on the motion? All right. Sonja, can we have the roll call, please.

ROLL CALL VOTE

BARCA: NO
BLOM: AYE
JOHNSON: AYE
QUIRING: AYE
BENDER: AYE
WRIGHT: AYE
MORASCH: AYE

MORASCH: All right. That passes **6 to 1**. Brings us to the UGA Vancouver. I need to pull Item e. E is 179th, isn't that correct, Oliver?

ORJIAKO: Yes.

MORASCH: Okay. I need to pull Item e. I think Bill and I both are recusing ourselves from that sub item. Shall we go ahead and do that one first and then I'll come back and we'll do the rest of them and we'll let Ron chair Item e?

ORJIAKO: That would be appropriate.

MORASCH: Okay. You're up.

BARCA: I'm up. As soon as they leave the room, we'll get going. Okay. So we are looking at Vancouver UGA. We're specifically dealing with Item e, Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Map: Approve the Discovery/Fairgrounds subarea comp plan map and zoning changes.

BLOM: So I believe on this one, there was a landowner that came forward who had a zoning change on their property that they had not requested. They're ten years into planning what to do with that land and this zoning change would undo that ten years plus worth of work. Do we have the parcel numbers from that property? Or what do we need to make that adjustment here or recommend that adjustment?

ORJIAKO: I think the recommendation will be that it not be designated as mixed use but for urban low.

QUIRING: Urban what?

BLOM: Low.

ORJIAKO: Urban low.

QUIRING: Low.

ORJIAKO: Uh-huh. L-o-w. I think the zoning that they're requesting is R1-7.5, that will be consistent.

BARCA: So can we get a little more clarity on the specifics so when we make the recommendation, we will capture the disputed parcels.

ORJIAKO: I'm hoping that Jose will help us. I don't have the parcel serial number with me, but I think it's known as the Holt.

QUIRING: Holt.

BARCA: Holt?

ORJIAKO: Yeah.

ALVAREZ: Yes. So I think you may just want to keep the zoning as-is currently because it's zoned R1-7.5.

BLOM: That would be the motion?

ALVAREZ: Yes.

BARCA: For the Holt property exclusively?

ALVAREZ: Correct.

ORJIAKO: Yes.

QUIRING: So they aren't zoning changes, it's as-is?

BLOM: Yeah, I thought there were multiple.

BARCA: There are.

JOHNSON: That's the thing. You're going to have split it up.

BARCA: So a question for staff. It appears like we're being asked for, obviously, much larger area than just the Holt property, but the Holt property we want to retain its current zoning while we change the zoning on other parcels?

ALVAREZ: Correct.

BARCA: Okay. So for the subarea plan, we're looking at adopting the plan and zoning map exclusive of the Holt property zoning change.

BLOM: I have the tax parcels here.

BARCA: Oh, that's so nice. Thank you.

BLOM: I would **MOVE that we accept the Discovery/Fairgrounds subarea comp plan and zoning changes with the exception of parcels 181466, 181548, 181580, and 181581, all of those with three zeros at the end, so there's four parcels.**

BENDER: Is that a motion?

BARCA: That's a motion.

BENDER: I **second** it.

BARCA: Do we have discussion on that motion? Is there clarity of the motion?

ALVAREZ: Yes. So there are two subarea plans and this one is actually in the Salmon Creek subarea, so it would be Item d, not e.

BLOM: So a friendly amendment to change what I said from Discovery/Fairgrounds to Salmon Creek subarea.

ALVAREZ: Correct.

BLOM: Do you still support the motion?

BENDER: I still **second** it.

BARCA: Everybody okay with that friendly amendment? Yes? We've got it seconded. So we are no longer dealing with Item e. We are on to Item d with the Holt property.

QUIRING: No.

BARCA: All right. So we've got a motion and a second. We seem to have staff -- are you guys okay?

ALVAREZ: Yeah.

BARCA: Okay. All right. We have a motion and we have a second. Can we get roll call, please.

ROLL CALL VOTE

BLOM: AYE

JOHNSON: AYE

QUIRING: AYE

BENDER: AYE

BARCA: AYE

BARCA: And that was for Item d. Now we need to still do e.

BLOM: That was there -- I think they can come back now.

BARCA: Really?

BLOM: Yeah.

QUIRING: No.

MORASCH: I think we're okay with e.

QUIRING: Okay. It was d that you're --

BLOM: Yeah. Their conflict was related to those parcels.

MORASCH: If you just did d.

BARCA: We just did d.

MORASCH: We had to recuse ourselves from the one that involved the 179th Street

interchange area.

QUIRING: No.

BLOM: No.

BARCA: No.

MORASCH: Oh, then we need to leave again. That's the one we needed to leave for was the 179th.

BARCA: All right. We've lost another Commissioner. You want to take a break? Can we take ten minutes while we figure out what we really want to do?

QUIRING: Do we need ten minutes for that?

BARCA: It's only ten minutes.

QUIRING: There are two people. Okay.

MORASCH: We can come back. The one that we had an interest in is done, I've been told. My confusion because there's two 179th Streets that are involved.

BARCA: Okay. So, Mr. Chair, we have approved Item d adding the Holt property in their current state and now we're back to you for the remainder.

MORASCH: Okay. Is there any other sub item under the Vancouver UGA that anyone wants to pull out for a separate discussion and vote?

QUIRING: Well, I guess I'd just like to comment on the fact that it doesn't look like I think Vancouver should be willing to expand their UGA since they have a housing problem, and that would be my general problem, my general comment, that we have affordable housing issue and they probably need to expand it a bit.

MORASCH: I would tend to agree with that. I don't think that's in front of us here.

QUIRING: I know. I just wanted to make the comment. Thank you.

MORASCH: All right. So noted and the chair agrees. Any other -- well, does anyone want to pull one out for a separate discussion? I think that's what we need to figure out first, or can we take them as a group?

JOHNSON: Take them as a group.

MORASCH: All right. Let's take them as a group. I will open it up, then, to discussion and/or a motion on Items a, b, c, e, f, g and h of the Vancouver UGA. Any discussion? Any motion?

BARCA: Mr. Chair, **MOTION to approve as written for Items a, b, c, e, f, g and h.**

JOHNSON: **Second.**

MORASCH: It's been moved and seconded to approve a, b, c, e, f, g and h. Is there any discussion on the motion?

BENDER: Didn't pertain to the Holt property?

BARCA: No.

BLOM: No, d.

BENDER: Just d?

BLOM: Just d, yeah. I'm still I feel like we have not really justified the need to create the new public facilities designation, but I seem to be the only one, so I'll just put that on the record again, I'm not sure what problem we're trying to fix with that.

MORASCH: Any other discussion? All right. Sonja, can we get a roll call.

ROLL CALL VOTE

BARCA: AYE
BLOM: AYE
JOHNSON: AYE
QUIRING: AYE
BENDER: AYE
WRIGHT: AYE
MORASCH: AYE

MORASCH: Passes **7/0**. That brings us to Washougal UGA. Can we take these as a group? Does anyone object to voting on these as a group? No? Let's open discussion then on the Washougal UGA. No discussion? I'd take a motion.

JOHNSON: I make a **MOTION that we pass the Washougal UGA as written subsection a, b and c.**

BENDER: **Second.**

MORASCH: It's been moved and seconded to approve Washougal UGA. Any discussion on the motion? Sonja, can you give us a roll call.

ROLL CALL VOTE

BARCA: AYE
BLOM: AYE
JOHNSON: AYE
QUIRING: AYE
BENDER: AYE
WRIGHT: AYE
MORASCH: AYE

MORASCH: That passes **7/0**.

All right. Moving on, adoption of the updated comprehensive plan text, and this goes on for --

BLOM: Ten pages.

MORASCH: -- several pages. So do we want to discuss these individually? Does anyone want to pull any out for individual discussion?

BARCA: Yes.

BLOM: Yes.

JOHNSON: Yes.

MORASCH: Do we want to discuss all of them individually or do you have certain ones?

JOHNSON: I'd like to pull out b.i.

HOLLEY: B or d?

JOHNSON: B. I'm sorry. B as in --

MORASCH: B as in boy, little i.

JOHNSON: B, little subscript i.

QUIRING: Yeah. A --

MORASCH: Okay. All of a?

QUIRING: -- and the cluster in Chapter 2.

BARCA: Yes.

BLOM: Yeah, that's c, d.

EULER: Councilors, a goes away since you've already recommended that we not go to smaller parcel sizes in the first section, so you don't even need to vote on a.

QUIRING: What if the Councilors don't accept what we -- I mean, we are advisory.

EULER: You've already made your decision. Those two go together.

MORASCH: Right. But they might reject --

QUIRING: So they would bring it back.

MORASCH: They might reject our decision on those smaller lot sizes. They might still want to hear what we think about clustering in the event that they do that.

QUIRING: This. If they --

EULER: Fair enough.

MORASCH: So, Eileen, did you say a, all of a?

QUIRING: Yes, all of a.

MORASCH: Just as one item a or did you want to have separate discussion on the two sub items?

QUIRING: Forest and agriculture both.

MORASCH: Yeah. Can we combine that into one discussion --

QUIRING: I guess.

MORASCH: -- or not?

QUIRING: I guess we could.

BARCA: I'd prefer to have them separate actually.

MORASCH: Ron wants them separate. Okay. So we'll have that. Okay. So we've got a little i, a two little ii's as two separate discussions. B little i. Someone was moving on to c.

BLOM: Yeah, c.

MORASCH: All of c as one separate discussion or did you want to break it out?

BLOM: Can we deal with it when we get there? I think it kind of depends on what we do with c.i. I think there's some redundancy in some of those, so I think we need to have that discussion when we get there.

MORASCH: All right. Well, should we start debating a then and then move down to b and then have another discussion at that point as to how we want to break the rest of this out?

BLOM: Yeah, I think we're going to be breaking a lot of this out.

MORASCH: All right. Well, we will open the discussion then on item a, little i, Forest Lands, clustering. Who wants to start?

QUIRING: I just --

MORASCH: Eileen.

QUIRING: Okay. I would say that this whole clustering idea, anything that I read in it I thought was way overstepping, particularly this draft 40.210.10 in reading this. I know there was another option. This was the one that I read and I just think that it's -- I mean, I have so many questions or so many comments to this item that this is just unacceptable. It's unacceptable because there's, as one thing, a covenant is supposed to be made. That puts this into perpetuity for this remainder, et cetera. There's just too many decisions being made by, apparently, the planning or Community Development, whatever, when if this should happen and be determined. So I would be -- actually, my main discussion is is that I'm very much against this clustering idea as proposed here for these --

MORASCH: Any other discussion?

QUIRING: -- developments.

BARCA: So understanding what Eileen is alluding to, the idea of creating very specifics about how the clustering is going to take place, it seems to me that for the purposes of preservation for whether it's forest land or ag land, you need to put it into perpetuity somehow and that is what, of course, would grate against the idea of people being able to choose how they want to utilize their land themselves. The concept, I think, behind resource land is dictated to us by the State and the utilization of resource land is supposed to be that as well as the ability to have a residence there.

But I recognize your concern about the forceful nature of the way that the regulation is written, and I, on the other hand, see it as perhaps not achieving the goal that they're intending by doing that. It seems like there is a lot of problems where it would be a mandated scenario less so, of course, if the option was given there because then the people enter into in a willing basis as an option. I don't see it being any type of panacea for the preservation of resource land, but I see it as fulfilling one of the options that growth management offers as a way to try and preserve resource land.

So if you say to any guiding body that we have, indeed, utilized one of the options presented, it allows us to basically put this into the context of good faith. A mandatory condition is not something that I could accept, but an optional condition where the landowners enter into it of their own free will I could support. And the words that are listed here "allowed" tells me that it's optional.

What we read was certainly there was two proposals and one was going to be a mandatory scenario. So I'm not quite sure as we vote on this whether we are voting specifically for the optional allowance as opposed to a mandatory condition, but I would be opposed to a mandatory condition.

JOHNSON: I agree with you, Ron, that that was my first thing that it was going to be optional. I thought this was out of the response, and correct me if I'm wrong, that we were trying to do something to allow some more latitude for people that owned those properties for either families or if they were trying to somehow use their property as a -- to sell it or I don't know. It was out of us saying what could we do. So I am, I'm agreeing with you, Eileen, too that, look, it should be allowed. It's one way we can mitigate some of what we've done in the short-term. And I too, I looked right for that to see does it say allowed, not it is mandatory or this is how we're going to do that. So my hope is that it is a process that is up to the --

QUIRING: This is all resource land?

JOHNSON: Well, ag/forest, if you take them both.

EULER: The proposal before you is policy in the agricultural land section and the forest land

section of the comp plan that basically says -- recognizes what's allowed by the GMA, that as an innovative zoning technique that clustering would be allowed in ag and forest lands as dictated by County Code. We have no language currently in the policy that allows this, so we added these two policies primarily in anticipation of that we would be adopting them smaller minimum parcel size, and the quid pro quo here is that as we've said before, we feel we have the best chance for success if there's support for the smaller parcel size by requiring some land division that looks like it helps protect the long-term viability of both the ag and the forest land.

MORASCH: And those code provisions you're talking about, that would come later tonight under g little i.A it looks like?

EULER: That's correct. In response to the work sessions we had with the Board, we prepared another draft of what we now call Land Division Ordinance for what could formally be known as AG-20 and Forest 40 land, if it goes to AG-10 and Forest 20. So if you want to do a land division in there, you now have two options is the way the code reads - we're getting ahead of ourselves, I realize that - one is to you can cluster; the other is to designate building envelopes.

WRIGHT: Your original point is that these are moot now, that if our original decision earlier on hold that we're not going to allow the reduced lot sizes, you can't cluster because you don't have the ability to have more lots.

EULER: That's correct. If we're not successful in reducing the lot sizes, this discussion is moot. What we're trying to do is say what increases our chance of success in terms of implementation on the ground. The requirement for clustering is not favorable to many, so we said, okay, you can do a straight land division short plat, but if you don't want to cluster, you're required to use a building envelope.

WRIGHT: Well, it seems to me the idea of clustering is attractive not just in resource lands but in other rural areas as well, but in this plan, it's too much to bite off right now. I think it needs more work. It needs more study as to the ramifications. We heard testimony both ways, and when we get into the code section, there's testimony on both sides of it. I wouldn't feel comfortable recommending we go with any specific on clustering without a lot more thorough review and input.

EULER: And, again, Councilor, I'll state that, or Commissioner, I'll state that if you don't favor the reduction in parcel size, the issue is moot.

BENDER: Yeah. You're going to set up a paradox if you vote yes with the rural b, c and d and that would cause a conflict of what we're voting on.

BLOM: But couldn't there be a parcel now, though, that's 80 acres that's zoned AG-20 that even if we didn't change zoning would be able to cluster if we approved this?

EULER: No. You could split an 80-acre parcel zone AG-20 into two 30s and a 20 or four 20s.

BLOM: But if we approve this -- if we approve this, then you could also do a cluster and create four one-acre lots and a 76-acre remainder which they --

EULER: No. The way this is written, and there's lots of examples, let's take a -- if you have 80 acres, you can subdivide down to 20 because that's consistent with our County Code. You don't need to worry about it. The way we wrote the ordinance is if you're going smaller than what used to be the minimum parcel size, you have to take advantage of other clustering.

BLOM: Okay. So there's language beyond what we're seeing here on the decision matrix that would prohibit what I'm talking about.

EULER: We will get to code language that would implement this when we get to Title 40 changes. So we're just talking about a policy now in the comp plan in the forest section and the agricultural section that says the County says you can use clustering as an option to subdivide in these resource lands. All we're doing is talking about a policy. We'll get to the code as to how we implement this later.

ORJIAKO: And Gordy's correct. The County repealed the clustering ordinance in 1993 for the same reasons that you raised earlier in terms of conflict and so forth. So since 1993, the County repeal of the clustering provision in the resource area, you cannot do clustering in ag or 20, in AG-20 or Forest 40 or Forest 80. There is no provision since 1993 to allow for clustering in the resource land. The County Code allows for clustering now in R-5, 10 and 20.

So when we started this process, whether you agree with it or not and it boils down to providing some relief, looking at potentially lowering the minimum parcel size in AG-20 and Forest 40 to still do that and utilize innovative provision; i.e., clustering as required by the RCW. I believe it's 36.70A.177, I may be off. But that is the reason why we propose that in order to enhance, protect and conserve viable ag land, it will be appropriate to suggest, a, you can take the option of clustering or you can take the option of providing a building envelope.

Now, as Gordy indicated, you've taken a vote on reducing the minimum parcel size. This is moot. If you want to recommend that any of the two options we put out there be forwarded, that's fine. If you want to put this on the parking lot and recommend to the Council that we revisit this in the future, that will be your recommendation.

QUIRING: Not to belabor this too much and I know we're going to get to code language in a minute, but if I read this draft and we're talking about resource lands, what I want to know is if it's located -- here's, let's see, 2, no, 3.b.(6), "if located on agriculturally zoned land, and to the extent not precluded by other provisions of this subsection, to be limited to lands with poor soils or soils otherwise unsuitable for agriculture purposes," so what is this doing in resource

land if it has poor soils and can't grow anything, and so now and we're supposed to have a remainder lot and you can't have any driveways, you know, it is incongruent.

ORJIAKO: Councilor or Commissioner Quiring, make a recommendation. This is why you're deliberating. Make a recommendation whatever you would like to see changed.

BARCA: So, Commissioner Quiring, could you tell us what document you read that out of, please.

QUIRING: I'm reading the draft --

MORASCH: She's reading the code.

QUIRING: -- clustering code. And I know we're not discussing the code. We are discussing resource land for which this was written, but if you read what this document says, then you discover that somehow resource lands are being talked about and yet -- and that you're talking about poor soils and unusable for agriculture.

MORASCH: And so your question is why would that land be zoned resource in the first place?

QUIRING: Exactly.

MORASCH: That's a legitimate question. I think it goes beyond the scope of what we're really talking about here tonight.

BLOM: I have concerns about this. And are we just talking about forest or agriculture? My comments pertain to both so we can take a motion on them as we wish. I feel like this is still just a piecemeal approach to what should be dealt with in a whole in terms of providing options in the rural land.

MORASCH: I would agree with that. I'm also going to go back to the buffering issue, but the clustering near the urban growth boundary is really what, in conjunction with smaller lot sizes, causes a lot of problems for your future buildable land supply for industrial land. So I'm not really in favor of clustering either, at least not close to the urban growth boundary.

BLOM: I would **MOVE that we DENY a.i and ii. Is that okay with you, Ron?**

BARCA: Yeah.

MORASCH: Yeah. Is there a second?

WRIGHT: **Second.**

MORASCH: It's been moved and seconded. Any discussion on the motion? All right. Sonja, roll call please.

ROLL CALL VOTE

BARCA: AYE
BLOM: AYE
JOHNSON: NAY
QUIRING: AYE
BENDER: AYE
WRIGHT: AYE
MORASCH: AYE

MORASCH: All right.

WISER: 6/1.

MORASCH: Item a under 7 has been recommended for denial 6/1. That brings us to Item b. Someone wanted to discuss b little i separately. Who was the one that wanted to get started on that?

JOHNSON: That would be me. I was, you know, I'm looking at "Promote the advancement of energy efficiency, green building, waste reduction, composting and recycling, solar and renewable energy use, and local sustainable food production; as well as mitigate and adapt to climate change." I'm not sure why that's in there because the things that you talk about above that are actions that mitigate and adapt to climate change. I just -- it is something it's just put in there and I went, what is that? Why is that in there? Is that somebody's agenda?

BLOM: You're talking specifically about the last clause --

JOHNSON: Just the as well as actions to --

BLOM: -- just the following the semicolon?

JOHNSON: Yeah. -- to adapt, to mitigate and adapt to climate change. Well, if you are promoting the advancement of energy efficiency, green building, waste reduction, composting, recycling on and on, those are actions that are mitigating supposed adaptations of climate change. So I would like to see that struck and I'd be fine with the rest of, like John said, everything past the semicolon.

MORASCH: Any other discussion on that?

WRIGHT: I would tend to agree with that in theory, but I'm concerned about doing too much wordsmithing at this point because so many of these things are tied together. They relate to policies that are repeated in grant applications, and if they're absent, then some of the grants may not get the points they need. There's a ripple effect through the whole document that we may not be able to foresee by just chipping away at it. But I believe in what you're saying, but I don't think it's worth tinkering with it at this point.

BARCA: So, you know, Karl, I guess I see this somewhat just as a grammar issue. If you were to look at the word promote and then just go all the way down to actions to mitigate and adapt climate change, you're saying that we've enumerated a list of actions to mitigate climate change and this is in addition to that. Often I see the wording is including but not limited to and this just seems like what we don't know, we don't know, yet there may be other things we'd like to promote, but I don't see this beyond the word promote myself.

JOHNSON: Well, as well as actions to mitigate, that goes beyond promotion. We're talking about promotion and I don't know want to get too far in the minutia here, but I -- it just popped out right at me as, look, words have meaning --

QUIRING: Yes, they do.

JOHNSON: -- and in this case, the big elephant in this room is this is science that is debatable. Now, I don't want to have that argument right now other than saying --

BARCA: Thank you.

JOHNSON: -- without making it a big monster deal, I've heard nowhere, Bill, just somebody should have said that in work session, well, we have to have this type of wordage in there. I'm not sure that that holds water with me, but I respect it. But the things that are talked about allow us to mitigate and adapt to climate change if that is, in fact, something that is. And, again, I know I'll probably catch a little grief for that, but I have a problem with that. So I would be willing to accept it as written without the last.

MORASCH: Let me ask you this. If there was a comma instead of a semicolon and the words "as well as" were stricken and the word and so that this was just another thing in the list, would that change your view on it?

JOHNSON: Look, I don't want to hang us up. I'm not that -- I just -- I want suppose even that it's on the record and that it's, to me, it just when things pop out it's odd. It's just odd. And, again, you are promoting these things and those are actions that mitigate and adapt to.

QUIRING: So-called.

JOHNSON: I got to be careful what I say because I don't want to go down that road. I just -- I really just want to say what is this? Is -- there's an easy way out, which is strike it.

BLOM: I think it's just it's too vague. That can mean a lot of different things to a lot of different people. Here we can improve a clear list of we can get behind energy efficiency, green building, the rest of that list, but then for saying yes, one of our goals is what could be construed a lot of different ways, that's my concern. It's not to debate the science, but, okay, how is that enacted? If that becomes our goal, what does that translate to in the policies down the road? I don't want to give an open-ended approval to something that we're not knowing what that is.

QUIRING: And I agree with that because it is true, as Commissioner Johnson said, that actions do -- I mean, words have meaning, and action here is a very active word and I do not -- I don't think that this phrase belongs in this, and I'm sorry if it keeps us from getting any particular grants, but...

JOHNSON: So I'm going to, if I may, Chair, I'm going to make a motion and we'll see where that goes.

MORASCH: Make a motion and we'll see where it goes.

JOHNSON: The **MOTION would be to accept 7.b subsection i without "as well as actions to mitigate and adapt to climate change."**

QUIRING: **Second.**

MORASCH: It's been moved and seconded. Any further discussion on the motion? All right. Roll call, please, Sonja.

ROLL CALL VOTE

BARCA: AYE
BLOM: AYE
JOHNSON: AYE
QUIRING: AYE
BENDER: AYE
WRIGHT: NAY
MORASCH: What the heck, AYE

MORASCH: 6/1.

JOHNSON: Thanks.

MORASCH: It passes 6 to 1 with the language stricken. We will move on now to the remainder of Chapter 4. Are there any other elements in Chapter 4 people want to pull for individual discussion? Hearing none, we will move on to discussion of the remainder of Chapter 4. Anyone have any discussion? If not, I'd take a motion.

BLOM: Move that we approve 7.b.ii through iii.

MORASCH: Is there a second?

JOHNSON: Second.

MORASCH: Any discussion on the motion? Sonja, roll call, please.

ROLL CALL VOTE

BARCA: AYE
BLOM: AYE
JOHNSON: AYE
QUIRING: NO
BENDER: AYE
WRIGHT: AYE
MORASCH: AYE

MORASCH: All right. **6/1.**

BARCA: I was concerned about that word "continuously." I'm kind of wondering what the County's going to do with that.

MORASCH: Too late.

All right. Moving on to Chapter 5, Transportation. Does anyone want to pull some of these sub-policies out for individual discussion?

BLOM: Yeah, number c.ix.

MORASCH: Number ix will be pulled. Any others? All right. Hearing none. Can we get discussion on Transportation Policy Elements i through viii or a motion, if no one wants to discuss.

WRIGHT: A MOTION to approve Transportation Policy Elements i through viii.

BARCA: **Seconded.**

MORASCH: It's been moved and seconded. Any discussion?

BLOM: The only -- just on this, I feel like ii, iii and iv and v are a little bit redundant with i. I mean, all of those things are included in that bicycle and pedestrian master plan. So if we're including that by reference, it just feels redundant. I think they're generally good policies, but...

BARCA: Well, they're each separate actions.

BLOM: But they're all listed in that plan that we're referencing. Anyway, it's -- if we're trying to make the plan shorter, which I thought was a goal to make it a little bit more understandable, I just feel like we're not quite, yeah, that plan shorter, but that's okay.

QUIRING: And I would say that while this transportation element and many parts of the transportation is very important, I think that embedded in this transportation element are issues that were put into the plan that I don't think were actually passed, and if they were, I don't think it was understood it was going to go into a comprehensive plan. So I'm going to be actually voting no on the transportation portion of this.

MORASCH: All right.

JOHNSON: Mr. Chair, can I make a motion that --

MORASCH: Well, there's a motion --

JOHNSON: There's already a motion. Sorry.

MORASCH: -- that's been made and seconded.

JOHNSON: Sorry. My fault.

MORASCH: So we need to have discussion on that motion and a vote, and then depending on how that goes, you can make another motion.

JOHNSON: No. No motion. I didn't -- I misspoke.

MORASCH: Is there any other discussion on the motion? All right. Sonja, could we get a roll call, please.

ROLL CALL VOTE

BARCA: AYE
BLOM: AYE
JOHNSON: AYE
QUIRING: NO
BENDER: AYE
WRIGHT: AYE
MORASCH: AYE

MORASCH: 6 to 1 it passes.

Now, that moves us on to Item ix under Transportation. John, do you want to start the discussion?

BLOM: Yeah. My concern with this is that we're currently waiving all traffic impact fees for commercial development. So if we're going to take a proportional share, that means that proportionate share is all going to go on residential which has already been subsidized on the commercial side. I don't have a problem with the policy if both residential and commercial is paying their share, but as long as commercial's not, I can't support this.

BARCA: Are you saying that by passing this policy, we are endorsing the continuation of the commercial fee waiver?

BLOM: No, I'm not saying that we're endorsing it, but I'm saying that if this policy, I read this as saying we are looking forward, we're going to be looking for more money from traffic impact fees, and right now only the residential construction is paying those fees. So unless that changes over the next seven years, eight years till we revisit this or until the fee waiver program is removed, all of that impact is fallen on residential.

BARCA: So a proportionate share of funding for all growth-related roadway projects shall be obtained from traffic impact fees would be a wording change that would get, I think, to the root of what you're discussing, so it isn't just a selected group of types of growth, but it would be including all types of growth.

BLOM: No, and I don't think what you said changes the meaning, at least as I'm understanding what you said.

WRIGHT: A question for staff. Is this the current language in the current plan that's been carried forward as a policy?

EULER: I don't think so.

BARCA: No.

ALBRECHT: Good evening, Commissioners. Gary Albrecht for the record.

So this is new language. So there is a policy that discusses something very similar, but somebody from the past who worked for us, Steve Schulte, he worked for Public Works, it was strongly recommended that this policy be added to take care of the impact fees for growth, so that's why it was created.

WRIGHT: Well, this provides the policy basis for the traffic impact fee program which assigns cost by trips whether they're derived from residential, new residential trips or new commercial trips, and I have to agree with John in that the current situation is a miserable aberration from a good policy; however, I think we should affirm the good policy and hope that it's fully implemented in the future.

MORASCH: I think the idea behind this policy - and, Gary, you can chime in if I'm misunderstanding this - but that the idea is that we would set our traffic impact fees to be high enough to accommodate a full proportional share as opposed to what they might be otherwise, which could be less than a proportional share. Is that the intent of this, so that in the future when we look at our SDCs that we make sure that they are, in fact, a full proportional share and not something less than that?

ALBRECHT: That's correct.

BARCA: I don't think Cindy got your acronym of the RS whatever it was.

MORASCH: SDC. Did you get my acronym SDC? S as in Sam, D as in dog, C as in Charles.

WRIGHT: System Development Charge.

MORASCH: It's an acronym for System Development Charge.

All right. Any other discussion on Item ix?

BARCA: Well, so hearing what Commissioner Wright said, and I'm going to paraphrase, this is an opportunity for us to affirm that, and using the words I said before, all growth is paying a proportional share to traffic impact fees. It's our way of trying to recommend that we return to the concept of everybody that's contributing to the community pay their fair share. Yeah.

MORASCH: All right. Do we have a motion?

WRIGHT: I **MOVE to approve the Transportation Element Policy No. ix.**

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

MORASCH: All right. It's been moved and seconded. Is there any discussion on the motion?
All right. Sonja, we're ready for a roll call.

ROLL CALL VOTE

BARCA: AYE
BLOM: NO
JOHNSON: AYE
QUIRING: NO
BENDER: NO
WRIGHT: AYE
MORASCH: NO

MORASCH: **I think that fails 3 to 4.** And that brings us to d, Housing. Does anyone want to pull any subsections out of housing?

QUIRING: 2.7.3 and 3.

MORASCH: I'm sorry. I didn't hear you.

QUIRING: 2.7.3.

MORASCH: 2.7.3.

QUIRING: And 3, the Aging Readiness Plan.

MORASCH: And you want separate discussions on those --

QUIRING: Well, I, you know, actually --

MORASCH: -- or do you want to discuss it together?

QUIRING: -- I don't need to. You know, I don't need to discuss any further what I think about this. I've said this before, this is all part of the actual part of this plan that I disagree with wholeheartedly. I don't think it belongs in our comprehensive plan. I think it's good education and I appreciate the task forces that came forward with this information, but I don't believe that it needs to be written into any ordinance, code or plan.

MORASCH: So did you want to discuss all of them together or did you --

QUIRING: I'm fine with it.

BLOM: Yeah, I would like to discuss the Aging Readiness Plan and the Growing Healthier Report separately.

MORASCH: Separate discussion for each or combined separately?

BLOM: It can be done together. I just have a -- yeah, a small recommendation on both.

MORASCH: Okay. So you want to separate those from Items i and ii?

BLOM: Yeah. And so what I'm -- on those two, I think there's a lot of good ideas and I think without getting into the wordsmithing, I would like to have a recommendation that it be changed to --

MORASCH: Are you talking about Items i and ii?

BLOM: No.

MORASCH: All right. Right now I'm trying to decide do we take these all as a group or individually?

BARCA: Let's break i and ii out.

BLOM: Yeah, let's do i and ii.

MORASCH: Each separately or together i and ii?

BARCA: I'm happy together.

BLOM: Together.

MORASCH: Together. Okay. i and ii together, let's do that. And then can we do aging and growing healthier together?

BLOM: Yes.

MORASCH: Okay. Let's go. Who wants to start with Policy i and ii?

QUIRING: I, once again, I think that it's really good to introduce the idea of Universal Design in

housing, but I don't even think that it needs to be written in to encourage it. I think the market will determine whether builders will build it and if they build it and if it's good, they'll come.

MORASCH: Any response?

BARCA: I find the word "encourage" fairly benign in a sense there is no mandate that goes along with the word encourage. I believe we are fulfilling Eileen's request of education and community involvement without burdening the building industry with any requirements.

QUIRING: When it's written into a plan and it's written, it can be amended to change that language and it's a whole lot easier to do that when it's already existing so that you can change it and then require it.

MORASCH: So your concern is that the word "encourage" might be changed to a more mandatory word through some subsequent --

QUIRING: And it will. It will and I guarantee it.

MORASCH: -- action where they come and say, well, this obviously makes sense to be mandated. It shouldn't be encouraged and --

QUIRING: Yes, we really should.

BLOM: If we use that log- -- if we use that logic, we wouldn't do anything here. I mean, that's any word -- any word could be changed. It would --

MORASCH: Well, we wouldn't encourage anything. We wouldn't put anything in a plan that we want to encourage.

QUIRING: That we encourage. We'd say what we want to do actually, what we want to mandate.

BLOM: I think encourage and education is a good thing. I mean, there's plenty of practical ways that it could be encouraged without being mandated, and that's something that I think we should strive for.

BARCA: Think of it as an advisory note for staff, as they train new people, they'll be able to look at our comp plan and understand there should be encouragement.

JOHNSON: Mr. Chair, may I make a motion on subsection i, i and ii?

MORASCH: Sure.

JOHNSON: **I MOVE that we accept as written policy i and double ii in Chapter 6 of the Housing.**

BARCA: **Second.**

MORASCH: It's been moved and seconded. Any discussion? I have a comment. I am going to -- I'm going to support the motion, but I do understand Commissioner Quiring's concern and I will be very vigilant during my time on the Planning Commission to review these kinds of things as they come to us as we did with the Highway 99 when there was a suggestion to change shoulds to shalls and we recommended against it. So with the understanding that the Planning Commission will continue its vigilance on those sorts of changes, I will support the motion and I'll open it up to any other discussion on the motion. All right. Sonja, can we get a roll call.

ROLL CALL VOTE

BARCA: AYE
BLOM: AYE
JOHNSON: AYE
QUIRING: NO
BENDER: AYE
WRIGHT: AYE
MORASCH: AYE

MORASCH: All right. The motion carries **6 to 1**.

Okay. Now moving on to Aging Readiness and Growing Healthier. John, did you want to start the discussion since you wanted to pull these out?

BLOM: Sure. On the Aging Readiness, the one thing that I can't support being in here is the incorporating universal design into the building code review process. To me that is stepping over the line, and as Commissioner Quiring said, we don't want to mandate this. So I would ask that my support would be for removing Number 5 within that.

And then in Items 1 and 2 and 6, changing that language from more of a shall to a either consider strategies or encourage on those, and exactly how those sentences or how those things are phrased, I can leave that to staff, but with the idea that we're going to encourage weatherization of homes to reduce energy costs, provide information, et cetera.

And, you know, encourage or consider strategies to facilitate the design of accessory dwelling units, I would like to see the language by exempting them at the end of that, remove from the

plan. I think that's not a bad idea, but that's something that should be considered separately.

And the same thing on the Growing Healthier Report, instead of changing zoning, saying consider zoning to allow for more diverse -- more diverse - a little bit of a difference there - more diverse.

MORASCH: You're going to be quoted in the Columbian tomorrow.

BLOM: Yeah, I'm sure the tweets are going out now.

So summarizing that, all those strategies, just changing them from shall to a consider, encourage, a little bit softer language because those are things that should be encouraged. I think the County does have a role in trying to help facilitate that without mandating it. Is that clear what I'm saying there?

MORASCH: Yeah. Any response to John?

BLOM: And I would just agree that with what you said, Steve, that as long as I'm here, yes, keeping those from moving from an encourage to a will is something that I'll support.

BARCA: So let me clarify in my mind what you're saying. So for both the strategies on Aging Readiness and in the Growing Healthier Report, we're not opposing staff coming up with the recommendations on how to get a more diverse housing type or the concept of considering the exemption of ADUs for age restricted, we're not telling staff they can't do that. What we are saying is we don't want it to be a mandate in specific zoning itself?

BLOM: Not a mandate in this document. I think we need to look at exempting the ADUs from TIFs and PIFs and, you know, that's next year's project. We don't want to mandate weatherization to reduce energy costs but say consider strategies to.

BARCA: Okay. So it says provide information, education and assistance. I don't see it now.

BLOM: Right. And that second sentence, yeah, I know. But the first one, weatherize homes, I mean, does that mean the County's going to go out and start installing insulation? I mean, that's, to me, that's -- I think the intent is good. I think it's just language that could be clarified.

BARCA: Okay. Because everything I see is really in the concept of allow and encourage.

QUIRING: How do you preserve and expand rental housing for seniors with incomes below 60 percent of the areas median income? How would that manifest itself?

BLOM: I mean, it could be tax abatement for apartment complexes that have a certain

percentage. I mean, we've seen strategies like that for other things. And that's off the top of my head, that's one thing. You know, looking at could that be something with ADUs where if someone's going to build an ADU and rent it out to a senior below that. So there's --

QUIRING: Yeah. I was -- rather than speculate with the Commissioners here, I was actually directing that to the staff because they're the one that wrote it. How would we preserve and expand rental housing for seniors with incomes below 60 percent in the areas median income? How does that manifest itself?

BARCA: I know this one. I know this one. I want the Board to know there's actually things we can do.

ALVAREZ: I think what the plan was trying to emphasize is that these are potential strategies. There aren't any specifics in mind, just to look into these. That's what the strategies' intent is. We don't have specifics for these. That's why they're there.

QUIRING: Why are they in the comp plan? This is -- yeah.

ALVAREZ: That's the recommendation from the committee.

EULER: We're required to have a housing element, Commissioner. This is part of housing and housing choice for the next 20 years.

BARCA: So let me add in here, specifically utilizing the wording about income below 60 percent established by the Federal guidelines, that puts us in a position to apply for HUD grants and loans where we would be establishing housing that would have this as a specific guideline.

QUIRING: Section 8 housing?

BARCA: No, it's not Section 8 housing.

QUIRING: Okay. I'm just curious.

BARCA: I understand, but it's not in that format.

QUIRING: So you're saying -- okay.

BARCA: It's specifically targeted for the age and income level.

WRIGHT: I had a question for staff. Is this language lifted directly from the Aging Readiness Plan?

ALVAREZ: Correct.

WRIGHT: And which was adopted by the Board?

ALVAREZ: Correct. Well --

QUIRING: Wait a minute. Yeah.

ALVAREZ: Approved.

WRIGHT: So we're making the comp plan inconsistent in language with an adopted plan. Is that a problem?

QUIRING: When was it adopted by the Board?

ORJIAKO: It was adopted February 2012.

QUIRING: 2012?

EULER: Correct.

ORJIAKO: February 2012. The Growing Healthier Report, June 2012.

QUIRING: That's when -- did the Planning Commission hear that one then or did we hear another report later?

ORJIAKO: The Planning Commission, it went through the Planning Commission. They recommended approval. Both plans were approved by the Planning Commission and also approved by the Council.

And if I may, the Growing Healthier Report, I believe the directive was to incorporate that report into the comp plan. Planning staff on my department would have done so in 2012. We said it's appropriate to during the global periodic review, which we are now undertaking, that it makes more sense to look at the entire document, look at what amendment will be made to the County land use plan and see how that fits in so that when we finally incorporate the two documents into the comp plan, we'll see where it fits in more appropriately.

I recall that the Director of Public Health then was John Wiesman who is now the governor appointed at the Secretary of Health, they strongly push that we have the Growing Healthier Report as an element in the comp plan. The Board at the time heard their plea, but at the same time, recommended that it be included or incorporated into the comp plan.

So to answer your question, it was approved. The Aging Readiness Plan was February of 2012 and the Growing Healthier Report was June of 2012. It came through this Planning Commission.

QUIRING: I remember it. I didn't know it was that long ago.

ORJIAKO: It was, yeah, it was approved. We would have, like I said, if staff would have incorporated them in 2012, this would be a moot issue, but we are doing it now, and I think comprehensively looking at it now makes more sense and I take the full responsibility of delaying and doing it now so that people can see where it fits in and I think that's the appropriate thing to do.

QUIRING: I just had one more question, Mr. Chair, just not -- I don't want to belabor this, but I do want this question answered. Gordy, in the other comprehensive plan about housing, what did that -- what other kinds of things are in the housing portion of the comprehensive plan in former times?

EULER: Pretty much what we have is we're required by GMA to have a housing element and most of that is to have a choice of housing. A choice of housing is type of dwelling units, whether it's single-family, multi-family, townhouse, and we also assist that in all areas by the difference in parcel sizes that we offer, 5,000-square feet, 6,000, all the way up to the one acre and two and a half acres in rural centers, all the way up to 5, 10 and 20 in rural, so there's a couple of different ways.

QUIRING: So it would have made a statement about the type of housing that we want to have in the county?

EULER: To the extent that our policies mirrors that which GMA, I think, wants us to have, which is allow a choice of housing for just, as I explained it, types of housing, also parcel sizes and that's pretty much what we've got now and I'm not a housing expert.

Jose, anything you want to add?

ALVAREZ: I just wanted to add that in Tab 3 of your binder, Book 1, there's a preface, a sentence that deals with the strategies, and I just wanted to read that for you that might alleviate some of your concerns. "The following" -- we have a page of existing strategies in the comp plan and this is additional to that. "The following strategies are proposed as a means to achieve the goals and policies of the Housing Element. These are a range of strategies that the county is considering and some of these strategies may be implemented over time." So that's the overarching.

BLOM: What was that? Sorry. I'm pulling up the Housing Element.

ALVAREZ: Page 30 under Tab 3 of the Housing Element.

ORJIAKO: While you're looking at that, the statute also calls for an inventory of existing housing stock and also to maintain -- do whatever the County can do to maintain that housing stock. So you will find some multiple languages or criteria that is in the required in the Housing Element, and I don't have that in front of me, but what staff have done is consistent with the requirement of the State statute.

MORASCH: Oliver, I recall when both of these two came through and I recall that they were presented as being more of an encouragement than a mandate.

QUIRING: Yes.

MORASCH: Has anything changed since then or is this language still intended to be more of an encouragement than a mandate?

ORJIAKO: It's more of -- it's in the form of encouragement, and I don't think we -- I'm not sure that there's any language in here that mandates, unless you can point me to one, but it's in the form of encouragement and ensuring and, again, encouragement and promoting opportunities for some of these strategies to occur.

MORASCH: I think Number 5 was the one that John pointed out initially, which instead of saying encourage universal design principles, it says incorporate universal --

QUIRING: Incorporate.

MORASCH: -- design principles. I think that word is what's giving some people some trouble.

ORJIAKO: I don't believe that this strategy changed from the one that the Council and Planning Commission approved or that is in the Aging Readiness Plan.

BLOM: I think it's different, though. For me, it's different when it moves into the comp plan.

ALVAREZ: And I can speak to that. There was a subcommittee of the aging on housing and one of the things we were looking at with that was having a voluntary system to develop maybe a rating system for different levels that meet universal design standards, and the incorporating the into the County's building review process is that when building inspectors go in to review, that would be one method where they could check off whether it meets -- what threshold it meets.

Right now, the way we do our grade building standards is a third party is contracted to review the construction, and so if we could incorporate it through the building process, it would

alleviate the builder from having to go outside of the county and having to pay for that separate consultation, but that's really what it was addressing and so I understand your concern.

MORASCH: All right. Is there any other discussion? If not, I would -- well, before I take a motion, I think I want to respond to Commissioner Wright made a comment about can we recommend that they adopt something that's inconsistent with an already adopted plan, and I think we can. We can also recommend that they go back and redo the plan if we want to, unless legal counsel thinks that's incorrect. All right. So that's within the scope of the things we can recommend, and with that, I would take a motion.

BLOM: I would **MOVE that we accept 3. How is this one numbered? There isn't a number for the Aging Readiness Plan. So accept the strategies, move we accept the strategies from the Aging Readiness Plan and Growing Healthier Report but encourage staff or ask staff to rework some of the language to clarify that it is encouraging, not mandating.**

BARCA: **Second.**

MORASCH: It's been moved and seconded. Any further discussion on the motion?

WRIGHT: Yeah, I would urge us to resist the desire to wordsmith too much. Staff has a lot to do. Everybody has a lot to do to get this adopted in the next few weeks, and I think there's more important things to worry about than some of this wording. I mean, there's tens and hundreds of pages (inaudible) like this we could dig into.

WISER: Use your mic.

WRIGHT: There's tens and hundreds of other pages of wording that could have issues as well. I hope we don't want to delve into it in that much detail at this late date.

QUIRING: And I would just say that there's, you know, maybe a few items in here that are very good. Number 6, facilitate the development of accessory dwelling units, et cetera, and duplexes in residential and are in single-family zones, but I'm going to have to say no to the -- since we're voting on the entire piece here, that I'm explaining there are some things in there that might be good, but overall, I can't support it.

MORASCH: Okay. Not even with the recommendation changed --

QUIRING: Yes. Correct.

MORASCH: -- the language to make it more encouraging and less mandating?

QUIRING: Correct.

MORASCH: Any other discussion. Okay. Sonja, can we have a roll call.

ROLL CALL VOTE

BARCA: AYE
BLOM: AYE
JOHNSON: AYE
QUIRING: NO
BENDER: AYE
WRIGHT: AYE
MORASCH: AYE

MORASCH: I lost count. Is that 5 to 2?

WISER: **6/1.**

MORASCH: 6/1. All Right. 6/1. The Aging Readiness Plan and the strategies for Growing Healthier Report pass with a recommendation to make the language more encouraging and less of a mandate. And with that I think we are going to take a short break. Let's try to be back here by 9:00 so we can resume and we will take a break. Thank you.

(Pause in proceedings.)

MORASCH: We are on. All right. We are back from a break and we were moving through our worksheet and we finished Transportation.

So now we are on Chapter 8, Historical, Archeological and Cultural Preservation. Does anyone have any objection to taking this as a group, Chapter 8, Item e?

BARCA: I do have something I would like to break out. That would be Item vi.

MORASCH: Item vi, that's 8.1.6, promote preservation, restoration, rehabilitation, and reuse of historically or architecturally significant older buildings.

BARCA: Yes.

MORASCH: All right. Anything else to take out for a separate vote? All right. Well, we will take Item 8, vi separately and why don't we start with that.

Ron, you want to pull it out, you want to start us off?

BARCA: Okay. The concern I have is specifically around situations where people have had historically significant buildings in which they want to utilize in a public fashion and the requirements are is they not just restore them, but they have to upgrade them to the current standards for seismic loads, and quite often the upgrades are so significant that they can't afford to turn it into a building that is able to have the public come in and utilize.

So I'm wondering about when we use the word promote and reuse, if it's our intention that we promote and reuse but not for anything other than the private utilization. I'd be interested to hear what staff's intention for this particular policy is.

KAMP: Hello. Jacqui Kamp, Clark County Community Planning. I manage the Historic Preservation Program.

The intent of this policy is just to really promote historic preservation of older buildings, encourage the property owners to nominate it to one of the registers, national historic or State, where there's some resources to assist with renovations and keeping the building in use.

MORASCH: I had a question and it might be more for Oliver, but, Oliver, my understanding is seismic upgrades are required under the building code whether something's historic or not and they're triggered based on things like how much remodeling you're doing and there's various thresholds and such, but I'm not sure that they're anything we can get out of just for historical properties. Is that your understanding or am I misunderstanding that?

ORJIAKO: I'm not sure that that's the case, except certain structures, depending on how old they are, and in this case when they were built whether they met the -- whether they can withstand earthquake and then the need for retrofitting, but I'm not sure that it is required.

I think what Jacqui is getting to here is that as one that administered the Historical Preservation Program that we do in some cases go after grants, and when we receive them or some certain buildings are on the register, that you continue to review, promote and enhance the historical nature of that building. And you take the courthouse, for example, when it was listed, I think that listing elevated to certain statutes, if you will, and then encourages that when they do some renovation upgrades, that they do it in such a way that continue to preserve the historical nature of that building as an example.

MORASCH: Okay. My question was, though, if it's being required to do seismic upgrades, wouldn't that be something that was required under the building code and not something that we're requiring under our historic code?

ORJIAKO: Yes, it will be.

BARCA: So I guess carrying that discussion further, I know that I had said I was going to just

stick with vi, but I'm looking at what is now -- let's see. It's Policy xvii on Page 9, 8.4.2. What, Oliver, what you just mentioned, then, would that be in the context of what we would offer in the form of incentives for preservation and maintenance?

KAMP: We currently have a couple incentive programs that the County offers for historic preservation, but there always could be more. There used to be more federal programs that allow people to use it for renovations of their buildings, but that no longer is around. So there could be some other options for local Government's to also provide additional incentives.

Currently we have a special evaluation program that if you have a historic building on a register, on the local or the national register and you want to put a substantial renovation into it, there's a tax incentive available for you to do that. So it's those kinds of programs that encourage people to restore their homes or their buildings and then keep them historically significant.

BARCA: Okay. Is there anything that would preclude us from offering the grants out in the form of trying to purchase, like, engineering for the sake of the upgrades or reduction of permitting?

KAMP: You could. Yes. Like the special evaluation program does allow those kinds of costs to be utilized for the incentive, so you could.

BARCA: Okay. Thank you.

MORASCH: All right. Any other discussion?

BARCA: Mr. Chair, I would withdraw the need to vote specifically on 8.1.6 by itself. I can add it back into the roll.

MORASCH: Okay. And also 8.4.2 I think it was?

BARCA: Well, I needed to, yeah, expand my understanding of what the words "incentive" means and I'm satisfied with that.

MORASCH: Okay. So you're ready to vote on the whole Chapter 8?

BARCA: Yeah, I have no need to break it up.

BLOM: I **MOVE that we accept Chapter 8 all sections.**

BENDER: I **second.**

MORASCH: It's been moved and seconded. Discussion on the motion? No discussion? Sonja,

can we get a roll call.

ROLL CALL VOTE

BARCA: AYE
BLOM: AYE
JOHNSON: AYE
QUIRING: AYE
BENDER: AYE
WRIGHT: AYE
MORASCH: AYE

MORASCH: All right. It carries unanimously. Moving on to Chapter 11, Community Design Element. Does anyone want to discuss any of that separately?

BARCA: May I ask for a clarification from staff on 11.2.3?

MORASCH: Sure.

BARCA: The development of urban activity centers, would you remind me of our definition of urban activity centers, please.

ORJIAKO: I will recall Jacqui Kamp to come, but I think the activity centers are not limited to, for example, when we developed the Highway 99. If you expand that to include major urban centers or downtown or other activity centers, whether it's Salmon Creek hub, and then you take some other areas and lump them all into activity centers, those are just example of what I mean by activity centers. When we did the Highway 99 subarea plan, there was some areas that we identified as activity centers that I don't have a clear definition in front of me. I don't know.

Jacqui, do you have anything else to add?

KAMP: They're areas that have retail, that's pedestrian accessible, coffee shops, third places where people can come and gather and shop and do their business, that's kind of a node like Oliver was saying with the Highway 99 subarea plan. We had activity centers that were specifically meant for those purposes where then you had the residential around it. So that's kind of the intent is to consider those kind of activity centers as kind of places you would go for your business and your retail and your shopping needs.

ORJIAKO: If you take that further, when the Columbia Tech Center was developed or being contemplated, it was also identified as a major center, if you will. Many people don't remember that now, but the Columbia Tech Center started out developing, even though you

had the industrial facility where consolidated Freightliner's used to be, but when they left and the concept of developing the Columbia Tech Center, the first thing that went in was the residential and you're still seeing the residential going in on the north side of Mill Plain when it was extended all the way to 192nd.

So if you take the Columbia Tech Center, you could also characterize that as an activity center, that those that live around there minimizes them driving, shopping, any other activities, in some areas you have movie theaters. So it lessens that opportunity. It becomes really a vibrant -- you don't have that all over the place. It's just real, what I may call hotspot, identified spots that you identified as an activity center. You see that in some other communities. That's why when the Highway 99 was developed, that same concept was included in. And, you know, that area is beginning to bear fruit of that plan in terms of how that area is beginning to develop.

BARCA: Thank you.

ORJIAKO: You're welcome.

QUIRING: To comment on that, so that Columbia Tech Center, would you count that as an urban activity center to foster community identity and reduce reliance on automobiles, but do you think a lot of people walk there?

ORJIAKO: If you look at it in the context of a destination or a shopping center, yeah, people will drive --

QUIRING: They don't go as far, yeah. They go back and forth to the various stores that are there.

ORJIAKO: That's true. If you look at it in terms of, okay, I'm there. I'm going to catch a movie or I'm going to go shopping, you can do that at that center. So it depends on how you look at it. If you take the Highway 99, for example, because of there are many things and because of the level of development activities that are currently occurring there, it provides less opportunity to travel from the west side to the east side to do your shopping. Those are just a few examples.

QUIRING: And I know we're probably talking about 11.2.3, but I'm in noticing 11.2.1, I see that creates standards to achieve the following, increase storefront use, visual interest. So we're creating standards and that decision is going to be made as these storefronts, et cetera, are being built, is that they would have to pass muster in the planning by code or something? How would you do that?

KAMP: How would you facilitate the developed? Yes. So like just the Highway 99 has form based code, there could be opportunities for other areas in the county that might have an

interest in doing something similar to that area, just an opportunity for that.

ORJIAKO: And Jacqui is correct, but it has to be code based. It doesn't have to be project-by-project. It just -- you know, you have to -- here's the code, for example, in the Highway 99, if you're going to utilize it, here's what the code says how you develop this area, so it's not going to be project specific.

MORASCH: And that code hasn't been developed yet. It's not later on in our agenda tonight?

ORJIAKO: No. The form based code have been developed for the Highway 99 area.

MORASCH: No. You were talking about you said you could expand it to other areas. Is --

ORJIAKO: Right. No. No. Nothing happening. Nothing is proposed for other areas.

MORASCH: Any other questions or discussion? Does somebody want to make a motion?

JOHNSON: I make a **MOTION that we accept Chapter 11, the Community Design Element.**

WRIGHT: **Second.**

MORASCH: Moved and seconded. Any discussion on the motion? Sonja, can we have the roll call, please.

ROLL CALL VOTE

BARCA: AYE
BLOM: AYE
JOHNSON: AYE
QUIRING: NO
BENDER: YES
WRIGHT: AYE
MORASCH: NO

MORASCH: Passes 6 to -- or 5 to 2. **5 to 2.**

All right. That takes us to Title 40, Code Amendments. i.A and B, i -- i and i.A and i.B all look to me like things we've already basically decided. Does anyone want to discuss these? If not, I'd take a motion.

BLOM: Motion on just those or on --

MORASCH: Those three, yeah.

BARCA: Just to carry on.

MORASCH: Just to get rid of them, to carry on with what we already decided.

BARCA: So make a motion to deny?

MORASCH: That would be consistent with our prior handling of the issue, yes.

BARCA: There is my **MOTION to deny i, i.A and i.B.**

BLOM: **Second.**

MORASCH: It's been moved and seconded. Any discussion? Could we get a roll call, please, Sonja.

ROLL CALL VOTE

BARCA: AYE
BLOM: AYE
JOHNSON: AYE
QUIRING: AYE
BENDER: AYE
WRIGHT: AYE
MORASCH: AYE

MORASCH: Okay. That carries 7/0. And, yes, Karl, we already did it, but we did it with the comp plan, so now we're all --

JOHNSON: I understand, but I didn't want my vote confused as my aye was yes, just move it on, we've already done that, not that I'm --

MORASCH: Okay. Not that you're -- no, we're opposing, not that you're opposing to it. Gotcha.

JOHNSON: Yeah. That's fine. Somebody will figure it out.

MORASCH: All right. Anybody else want to pull any of these out for individual discussion?

BARCA: Mr. Chair, I would like to pull out g.ii on the Commercial Business Mixed Use.

MORASCH: Okay. Any others?

John, did you want to pull out public facility zone?

BLOM: No.

BARCA: It's an option.

MORASCH: So everybody is comfortable with taking iii through x together? I'll give you a minute to review.

All right. Well, let's start with Number ii, and if anybody wants to pull one of the other ones by the time we get there, let me know; otherwise, we'll take them as a group.

Ron, you wanted to pull Number ii, do you want to start?

BARCA: Yeah. I read the wording specifically on these three items and there is overlap at the boundaries of each one of these items where neighborhood commercial can be as large as the smallest description for community. Is it community commercial? I'm sorry. Let me see here. We have, yeah, so neighborhood commercial NC and then community commercial from C-2 to CC.

Basically let me just reiterate, I think this isn't really driving any changes in the land use and I believe that we're not actually adding developer certainty by the way we've described this. It seems to me that there's enough overlap, you can be from 1 to 5 acres, 5 to 20, 20 or above, but somebody's definitely going to come in with 19 acres and they're going to want to go to the bigger designation. And I don't think this is actually creating more clarity or certainty for the development community even though I believe that was the intention. So I'd like to strike this one and have staff continue to review it for the intent, which I believe is to drive certainty for the development community.

MORASCH: I have a question for staff, a simple one before you respond to that. Why is this under our code changes? The first sentence says, "Commercial Business Mixed Use: Combine the three commercial zones into a single Comp Plan designation." Doesn't that belong under our comp plan part of the analysis?

ORJIAKO: This is the code that will implement the comp plan, what is in the comp plan chapter. And here what we've already -- what we're proposing here is simply to combine the three commercial zones into single comp plan designations with a C.

MORASCH: And wouldn't that require a comp plan amendment, though, rather than a zoning code amendment?

ALVAREZ: Yes. So we would have to change the comp plan to one single comp plan designation of commercial, right. We've lumped them into this. So it is a comp plan amendment to have one commercial comp plan designation.

MORASCH: And what's the rest of this section talking about? Because I think Ron's point goes to the rest of it, not to just having one because one comp plan designation means you could ask for a zone change and go to the Hearing's Examiner rather than having to come to us and go through the annual review, but what's the rest of this?

ORJIAKO: Well, you know, if I may jump in, I think the concern that Planning Commissioner Ron Barca is raising is a good one. What I will probably say is that doing this doesn't guarantee that it will be easier for the Hearing Examiner to grant a zone change; however, my primary concern will be it is something that we're going to be monitoring, because what I will suspect would happen is because the highway commercial allows for a greater flexibility in the uses permitted, I could see where a property owner may come in and say I want to go from community commercial to general commercial, if you will, because the general commercial gives you more latitude in terms of the uses permitted. It will be -- I won't say it will be difficult, but it will be a challenge where you want to go from neighborhood commercial, for example, to general commercial. Neighborhood commercial is meant to serve a neighborhood.

The Hearing Examiner is going to look at the surrounding land uses and say this is not a fit for example. A neighborhood commercial is typically your 7-Eleven, Plaid Pantry and some a little corner, not that you don't see that in highway commercial or general commercial, but neighborhood commercial is intended to serve the neighborhood. Community commercial gets you into - not that it's not neighborhood in nature - but it gets you into say Safeway, Albertson and other general merchandise type of commercial use.

So that's where we will be monitoring to see what is happening, not that even with the acreage requirement, I could still see the Hearing Examiner looking at that and looking at the need to make the change, but I think this will allow, if approved, it will allow this process not to come before the Planning Commission but rather go to the Hearing Examiner.

MORASCH: Right. Where it's more a legal approach versus when it comes to us and then goes to the Board, it can be more of a political decision and it's definitely more of a legal decision when it goes to the Hearing's Examiner.

Well, does that resolve your concern or are you still --

BARCA: Well, I guess I'm really looking at it just in the context of the way this part is written, though. It says so, if I look at there's neighborhood commercial which is generally less than five acres in size, spaced less than five miles from a similar use, serving a population up to 10,000,

located at a neighborhood collector or larger crossroad.

MORASCH: And that's existing language, right, that's not new language?

ALVAREZ: That's existing language that's currently in the comp plan and so we're moving it from the comp plan to the --

BARCA: Okay. I guess my point about this is we've gone to the trouble to rename it, but we didn't make it any different or better. And it just seems like if we're going to go ahead and go to the trouble to give it a new name, we should be doing something that helps add a certain amount of clarity and certainty to what the expectation is going to be.

ALVAREZ: I understand your point, and I guess what we are proposing is not -- is, I guess, providing a certainty in changing the venue for the process as opposed to it being having applying those same comp plan, that same comp plan language on an annual basis. We could definitely improve the language, but in this case, we're just looking at changing it from one process to another and that was all.

BARCA: So making it go to the Hearing Examiner?

ALVAREZ: Yes.

BARCA: That's -- okay.

ORJIAKO: And if I may add, you need those bookends. How will you define a neighborhood commercial? You define it by acreage, in this case by size, by the population that it's serving and other being on arterial, for example. And then you define community commercial differently by size and what market area, if you will, that it needs to serve. If you're going to the Hearing Examiner wanting to go from one zone to the next, what criteria would you use?

BARCA: And that is my point as well, Oliver, because going up to the next size in community commercial, it's between 5 and 20 acres, spaced between two and four miles apart for similar use, population 10 to 20,000 located at a minor or major arterial. We completely overlap them so there's an opportunity to fit into either one, and you might just ask for indulgence because I'm out of one of the many criteria. So if our intention is just to take it to the Hearing's Examiner and not have to do anything else but know that that's where you're going, then, okay.

ALVAREZ: The other rationale is that I think there may be one or two uses that are different between the community commercial and the general commercial. So essentially there's not much difference between those, and I understand that and that the overlap is reflected in the uses as well as the description of the zones.

MORASCH: And I think part of it is we want to -- we want certainty, but with a zone change, we also want flexibility, because otherwise, we get straight jacketed and we can't do things that make common sense.

ALVAREZ: Right.

MORASCH: Anyway, is there any other discussion or are we ready for a motion on this one?

BARCA: No, I'm willing to bundle it.

JOHNSON: Let's bundle it.

MORASCH: You want to bundle it with the rest of the zoning code amendments?

BARCA: Yeah.

MORASCH: All right. Is there any discussion on the rest of the zoning code amendments? If not, I'd take a motion.

JOHNSON: I **MOVE we accept Title 40, Clark County Unified Code Amendments Sections ii through is that --**

BARCA: x.

JOHNSON: -- x?

MORASCH: Yep.

BLOM: **Second.**

MORASCH: It's been moved and seconded. Any discussion on the motion?

QUIRING: I just will comment that I'll be voting no since I am going to be consistent with having voted no on the other upper items which I originally supported, but because of the plan being such.

MORASCH: Any other discussion? Sonja, can we have roll call.

ROLL CALL VOTE

BARCA: Begrudgingly AYE

BLOM: Just plain AYE

JOHNSON: Happily AYE
QUIRING: NO
BENDER: AYE
WRIGHT: AYE
MORASCH: AYE

MORASCH: All right. Passes **6 to 1**.

With that, we are turning to the Arterial Atlas, but it's 9:30. I think our bylaws require a motion if we're going to go overtime. Does somebody want to move to go overtime or do you want to adjourn for the night and come back next week?

WRIGHT: I make a **MOTION, Mr. Chair, that we continue and go into overtime and complete our task tonight.**

BLOM: **Second.**

MORASCH: It's been moved and seconded. All in favor? Or do you want to have discussion on the motion?

JOHNSON: No, I'm laughing.

MORASCH: All in favor of the motion?

ROLL CALL VOTE

BARCA: AYE
BLOM: AYE
JOHNSON: AYE
QUIRING: AYE
WRIGHT: AYE
MORASCH: AYE

MORASCH: Okay. I was waiting for you to say aye. All right. Opposed?

BENDER: NAY

MORASCH: One opposed. All right. The ayes have it. We are going to go into overtime and move to the Arterial Atlas. And do we want to go through these individually? Does anybody want to pull a few out?

WRIGHT: (Inaudible) presented to us at the work session we'd be able to take them as a group.

MORASCH: Anyone opposed to taking the Arterial Atlas as a group? All right. I hear no opposition.

So, Bill, do you want to start off with the discussion of the Arterial Atlas amendments as a group?

WRIGHT: Yeah. I think in a way this is a bit of a no-brainer in that many of these are simple housekeeping items; others are just the impingement upon or reality on past plans that require a change. In fact, I'd be willing to make a motion here shortly to approve them all.

MORASCH: Okay. Is there any other discussion?

QUIRING: I have a question about these revisions from rural to urban road classifications. Then will we use the rural, the funds that go to maintain rural roads for these urban roads?

HERMAN: Matt Herman, Community Planning for the record. The change from urban to rural was mainly a map cleanup reflecting those records that were already in --

QUIRING: In urban growth boundaries.

HERMAN: -- urban growth boundaries, correct.

QUIRING: They're within the boundaries?

HERMAN: Within the boundaries.

QUIRING: And so the road, once it goes into a boundary, it's considered urban. Is it urban outside of the boundary?

HERMAN: No.

QUIRING: Okay. Thank you.

BARCA: So, Matt, while you're there, please indulge me with these questions. By putting these revisions in place where we are saying we're going from a rural designation to an urban designation, that does not obligate any funds towards improvement of the roads; is that correct?

HERMAN: That's correct. It just changes the classification for our Public Works standards.

BARCA: So until such time as there's development that warrants it, all we will do is maintain

the road to its state?

HERMAN: You're correct.

MORASCH: Any other discussion? If there's no other discussion, then go ahead and make the motion.

WRIGHT: I would make the **MOTION we approve the Arterial Atlas Amendments as a whole.**

JOHNSON: And I would **second** that motion.

MORASCH: It's been moved and seconded. Any discussion on the motion? Okay. Can we get a roll call please, Sonja.

ROLL CALL VOTE

BARCA: AYE
BLOM: AYE
JOHNSON: AYE
QUIRING: AYE
BENDER: AYE
WRIGHT: AYE
MORASCH: AYE

MORASCH: All right. The ayes have it.

That brings us to Impact Fees, and we've already voted on c, d, e, f, g, h, i, j, k, l -- no, i, j, k. So unless there's objection, we're not going to vote on a because we don't want to revisit our vote that we did previously and we will move to b.

Does anyone have any objection to that or discussion on b, the Woodland CFP?

QUIRING: How much was it?

JOHNSON: Yeah. Did we ever see that information?

MORASCH: The Woodland, yes.

BARCA: It was sent to us.

MORASCH: It was sent to us. We can have staff review it with us real quick, if you want.

JOHNSON: No, that's all right. I probably seen it.

MORASCH: All right. Then is there a motion?

JOHNSON: I make a **MOTION we accept the Impact Fees for the Woodland School District.**

BARCA: **Second.**

MORASCH: It's moved and seconded. Discussion? All right. Roll call please, Sonja.

ROLL CALL VOTE

BARCA: AYE

BLOM: AYE

JOHNSON: AYE

QUIRING: AYE

BENDER: AYE

WRIGHT: AYE

MORASCH: AYE

MORASCH: All right. That passes. So moving on.

BLOM: I had one question. I know on Ridgefield, those actually changed.

ORJIAKO: Right. I was going to get to that because you voted for a much higher fee schedule. Now that they've lowered it, I don't believe you will vote no against it, but if you want to take a separate vote on that, that's your call.

MORASCH: Did you want to pull that for a second vote?

BLOM: No. I would just say I voted against it before, but I'm thankful they came back with a more reasonable number and I'm very supportive of that, so with that on the record.

JOHNSON: Can I make a **motion we pull that out and just revote on it for that reason. I don't know if it's a motion, but I'd like to pull it out separately.**

MORASCH: I don't hear a second.

BLOM: **Second.**

MORASCH: All right. It's been moved and seconded. Discussion? All in favor of pulling the Ridgefield out and voting on it again say aye.

ROLL CALL VOTE

BARCA: AYE
BLOM: AYE
JOHNSON: AYE
QUIRING: AYE
BENDER: AYE
WRIGHT: AYE

MORASCH: Opposed? NAY
Okay. The motion carries.

Karl, carry us off with the discussion.

BARCA: Did you vote nay?

MORASCH: Yes, voted nay. I do not want to revisit that.

JOHNSON: I was only joking for Commissioner Blom. I **move that we accept the new updated Ridgefield School District CFPs.**

BLOM: **Second.**

MORASCH: Moved and seconded. Discussion? No discussion? Sonja, can you give us a roll call, please.

ROLL CALL VOTE

BARCA: AYE
BLOM: AYE
JOHNSON: AYE
QUIRING: AYE
BENDER: AYE
WRIGHT: AYE
MORASCH: NAY

MORASCH: 6/1, it carries.

Okay. Now we will move to Parks Impact Fee. Any discussion on Parks Impact Fee? No discussion?

BLOM: I have a bit of a concern with raising the impact fees when we don't have currently in the budget to maintain building any new parks and we're collecting more money for capital development when there isn't money to maintain even what we have now. So I would -- I would like to see some language that these fees could be increased when the budget allows for the maintenance of building new parks, but until that time, adding more cost to housing when we're not able to actually use that because of limitations on the maintenance budget.

WRIGHT: I think it would be worthwhile to have staff explain. I believe that impact fees can only be used for capital and there is funding with the Metropolitan Park District to cover the maintenance costs, but you can correct me if I'm wrong.

BJERKE: Good evening, Commissioners. Bill Bjerke, Parks Manager.

HOLLEY: Who? I'm sorry, I didn't hear you.

BJERKE: Bill Bjerke, Parks Manager. B-j-e-r-k-e. I'll get a little closer.

So, of course, the impact fees have not been raised since 2003 and so we figured this was about the time with the comprehensive plan to take a look at those. Yes, we do have an issue right now with our Metropolitan Parks District parks. We're kind of strapped out because of the burden that we have for the general fund parks weighing on those, and so we're diligently trying to get our County Councilors to start shifting some funds back into general fund to support that, and so with that, then the rest of the parks can be built out, so...

It's a matter of time to do that. I think that having these fees increased will help us keep pace with purchasing properties because of the -- you know, we're trying to maintain our service levels and, you know, contend with the growth of the population, and so I think that if we lose our buying power by not having fees increased, then I think we're going to be behind the eight ball and have a much harder time trying to meet those standards.

BLOM: So to clarify with staff, this does not have to be done at the same time as the growth management plan update. We can do this next year when the maintenance -- I mean, hopefully the maintenance budget were to be resolved by next year, we can change these park fees next year. We wouldn't have to wait eight years to do it; is that correct?

BJERKE: That's correct.

LEBOWSKY: Laurie Lebowsky, Community Planning for the record.

The parks impact fee is implementing the capital facilities plan which has to be adopted with the comprehensive plan update. To clarify, you do not have to adopt the recommendation of the Parks Advisory Board as far as the amount of the parks impact fee. You can recommend

they not be increased. You can recommend that they be increased 20 percent a year gradually. As far as your recommendation, you can have any type of recommendation; however, just to clarify, parks impact fees are what implement the capital facilities plan unless the Commission recommends another financing mechanism for parks.

BARCA: And I guess I would like to just remind the Planning Commission that parks is considered one of those capital facilities items that we have designated a level of service that we will maintain and that is also in the capital facilities plan, and if we don't find a funding mechanism for it, the purchase of that land, then we will find ourselves in violation of our own level of service. I mean, yes, the grass might be tall and the swings might not be in place, but level of service is measured in the form of acreage per thousand.

BJERKE: Six acres per thousand.

BARCA: There you go. And so I think these are two distinct items and we should certainly encourage the County Councilors to understand their obligation to fund the maintenance of the parks, but this is specifically to the capital facilities.

BLOM: And I would just say there's also been some comments from the development advisory, Development Engineering Advisory Board with some concerns about the CFP, and I don't believe those have been fully resolved. I know there's been some back and forth, but I think they still have some valid concerns.

MORASCH: And I agree with that. I think they wanted it to be a more gradual implementation of the increases, if I recall their letter correctly.

LEBOWSKY: Commissioners, if I could just clarify on the DEAB, DEAB's concerns. Their concern is not with the capital facilities plan itself; their concern was with the calculation, the data going into the calculation for the park impact fees.

BLOM: Okay. Thank you.

QUIRING: So if we're voting for this, we're not voting for a specific fee, just the ability to extract one or exact one?

MORASCH: It says on our agenda item here, Park Impact Fees.

BJERKE: It essentially is to increase existing fees.

MORASCH: Yeah.

LEBOWSKY: Right.

MORASCH: So if we vote for this as-is, we will be supporting the capital facilities plan and the increase in fees. Now, we can pull those out and make a separate recommendation if we like the capital facilities plan but we don't like the fees, but that would require something other than voting just to approve the item now.

ORJIAKO: Right. And we provided you that, what the rates will be on Page 12 of the Issue Paper 8.1, if you have it. That's where the fees are.

BJERKE: What the Parks Advisory Board voted on was the increase to take place over a three-year period starting at 80 percent, 90 percent and then 100 percent the third year. We have -- we went to the BIA, listened to DEAB, listened to those concerns and the calculation was we worked again to take out the high properties that were there as well as the small acreages that had high value expense because we typically wouldn't buy anything that's under a half acre in size for park property. And then also listening to the recommendation to slow that increase down, you know, so that's probably within your prerogative to make that decision.

MORASCH: All right. Any other discussion or does somebody want to make a motion?

JOHNSON: I'd like to make a **motion that we accept the Park Impact Fees.**

WRIGHT: **Second.**

MORASCH: Moved and seconded. Any discussion? No discussion?

WRIGHT: 14 years, it's time to bump them. Let's do it.

MORASCH: All right. I'm going to put discussion -- I'm going to vote no but only because I think it should be graduated just a little bit more.

BLOM: And I would support Steve with that.

MORASCH: All right. Okay. Shall we have a roll call, Sonja.

ROLL CALL VOTE

BARCA: AYE
BLOM: NO
JOHNSON: AYE
QUIRING: NO
BENDER: AYE
WRIGHT: AYE

MORASCH: NO

MORASCH: So 4/3 in favor, Park Impact Fees passed. Item m, the last item on our worksheet, Traffic Impact Fees. Any discussion? I'd like can you explain it and can you remind us what the DEAB position was on Traffic Impact Fees.

ORJIAKO: I have Matt here. I don't think that DEAB had any objections, but you may chime in. I know we went to them. I can't recall whether they have an objection or not.

HERMAN: You're correct. Once again, my name is Matt Herman.

As you remember, this came before you in July of 2015 when we proposed an update to the overall TIF program. You recommended approval. DEAB recommended approval at that time as well.

MORASCH: Okay. So if we've already recommended approval, why are we -- why does it not say approved like these other ones up here?

HERMAN: Right. The reason why it's different this time is because you have an updated capital facilities plan that goes along with this comprehensive plan update.

MORASCH: Okay. So you're asking --

HERMAN: In 2015 the recommendation was based on the existing capital facilities plan. These fees that are proposed in front of you are part of the updated capital facilities plan to implement the comp plan.

MORASCH: Are the fees going up versus what we approved back in July?

HERMAN: No. As far as what you approved back in July, no, they are not. As far as what the existing ones are, the only one that is proposed to increase is in Rural 2.

MORASCH: Rural 2. Okay.

BLOM: Did the Board ever adopt what we approved?

HERMAN: No, they did not.

BLOM: So that's part of why it's coming back is we approved it --

HERMAN: Correct.

BLOM: -- so then they made no action.

HERMAN: Correct.

BLOM: Thank you for clarifying that.

MORASCH: All right. Any further discussion? If not, I'd take a motion.

WRIGHT: I make a **motion that we approve the Traffic Impact Fees.**

BLOM: **Second.**

MORASCH: It's been moved and seconded. Any discussion on the motion?

WRIGHT: I realize that a number of us are frustrated with the Board's actions regarding TIFs, but please don't make this another protest vote.

MORASCH: All right. Any other discussion? All right. Sonja, can we have the roll call, please.

ROLL CALL VOTE

BARCA: AYE
BLOM: AYE
JOHNSON: AYE
QUIRING: NO
BENDER: AYE
WRIGHT: AYE
MORASCH: AYE

MORASCH: All right. 6/1, that passes.

OLD BUSINESS

None.

NEW BUSINESS

None.

COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION

MORASCH: So now we are done. We have no old business. I don't think there's any new

business. Do we have any comments from the Planning Commission before we call it a night?

JOHNSON: Just a clarification on the schedule, Oliver, going forward as far as Planning Commission business.

ORJIAKO: Yeah. Planning Commission business with your recommendation tonight, there will be no follow-up on Monday, which is June 6th, so you're done.

We are not having any Planning Commission, Sonja, correct me if I'm wrong, in July.

WISER: Right. You're off for the month of July.

BARCA: When do we get to see tiny houses?

WISER: I'll e-mail you in August.

ORJIAKO: There may be something coming to you June 16th from Community Development. I'll have to check in with Marty on that.

WISER: Not until August. He agreed until August for the tiny homes.

ORJIAKO: Oh, he's pushing. That's why I will check, but I don't think you have anything in July.

What we do now is prepare your recommendation for the Council and send it up to them. They have requested that we have a work session with them, that will be June 8 from 11:00 to noon, so that we can prepare them for their own deliberation based on your recommendation. We're anticipating that the Board will consider your recommendation June 21st. As you know, they can accept, reject or modify that.

We also reserved June 22nd should the Board continue their deliberation. That's the schedule now, and if they are able to finish their deliberation on June 21st and advance a plan that we can submit or resubmit to the State, that's what we will do. Hopefully we will prepare adopting resolution and take it on consent to the Council and they approve it. And then we will issue what is called a Notice of Adoption and that will kick our appeal period. That's done for 60 days. If no one appeals within that 60 days, the plan is done.

MORASCH: All right. Anything else? All right.

Oliver, I'd like to thank you and your staff for all your work on this plan, particularly also for putting together a good work sheet for us. And with that, we are adjourned. Thank you very much.

ORJIAKO: Thank you.

ADJOURNMENT

The record of tonight's hearing, as well as the supporting documents and presentations can be viewed on the Clark County Web Page at:

<https://www.clark.wa.gov/community-planning/planning-commission-hearings-and-meeting-notes>

Proceedings can be viewed on CTVV on the following web page link:

<http://www.cvtv.org/>

Minutes Transcribed by:

Cindy Holley, Court Reporter/Rider & Associates, Inc.

Sonja Wiser, Administrative Assistant, Clark County Community Planning