private sector and the public sector have come together. Is it perfect, no, but as Matt have indicated they have come up and willing to pay their impact fee upfront and also to pay additional surcharge to give us a kickoff on how this is going to happen. I don't know how other way you are going to do it, either way the County has to pay our own public share to make this happen.

JOHNSON: Thank you. Any other questions? I would entertain a **motion.**

TORRES: I'll make a **MOTION** that the Clark County Planning Commission approve CPZ2019-00081 (sic), amendment of comprehensive plan and zoning maps to remove urban planning overlay as proposed.

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

JOHNSON: We have a motion and a second. Sonja, roll call, please.

ROLL CALL VOTE

SWINDELL: AYE
TORRES: AYE
BARCA: NO
JOHNSON: AYE
HALBERT: AYE

JOHNSON: Motion is carried 4/1. With that, we'll move on to the second item of our agenda.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS, continued

B. CPZ2019-00017 – Capital Facilities Plan Amendments and Traffic Impact Fees
Amendments to the Clark County transportation 20-year Capital Facilities Plan and associated traffic impact fees primarily to support the removal of the Urban Holding Overlay near the I-5/NE179th St. interchange.
Staff Contact: Matt Hermen at (564) 397-4343 or Matt.hermen@clark.wa.gov
Alternate Staff Contact: Oliver Orjiako at (564)397-4112
Or Oliver.orjiako@clark.wa.gov

HERMEN: Chair, excuse me, can I ask for a little bathroom break here.

JOHNSON: Yes. We'll take a five, ten, how about ten, we'll call it ten, we'll come back here about five till if we can. Thanks.

(Pause in proceedings.)

JOHNSON: Okay. I'd like to return to our hearing. With that, our subject is CPZ2019-00017,

Transportation Capital Facilities Plan Amendment. Staff.

HERMEN: Good evening, Planning Commissioners. Again, my name is Matt Hermen with Public Works. For this hearing I'll be presenting CPZ2019-00017, the amendment to the capital facilities plan and traffic impact fee update.

The proposal for this amendment is to update our 20-year capital facilities plan, CFP for short. It's transportation projects that the County plans on in the next, in the horizon for the comprehensive plan. The traffic impact fee is directly related to the capital facilities plan. When the capital facilities plan changes, so does the traffic impact fee rates, the two are in a symbiotic relationship with each other.

The criteria that you will evaluate with this proposal are consistency with the Growth Management Act, the Washington Administrative Code and policies and implementation measures of the comprehensive plan.

Throughout my presentation I'm going to go through the changes that we are proposing. There are several projects in the capital facilities plan now that we are not proposing to amend, delete or add, I will show those in the future, but for this presentation I'm going to strictly cover those that are changing.

So let's begin with the projects that you see here in red. I know it's a little difficult to see on the screen, but there are projects that either mostly have been completed. One of the big projects over the last ten years is the improvement to 119th throughout the corridor. Our last segment from 72nd Avenue to 87th has been constructed and completed.

The intersection at 47th Avenue and 78th intersection, that included a grade railroad that has been completed. 94th Avenue from Padden Parkway to 99th has been completed. Again, 119th and the bridge over Whipple Creek, 10th Avenue from 154th to 164th. One of our programs, traffic signal optimization has also been completed, so we are recommending deleting these from the capital facilities plan.

Projects that we're proposing to amend in the capital facilities plan are shown here in orange/yellow, orangish yellow. They include 179th from Delfel Road to 15th Avenue. This is a project that currently is in the capital facilities plan, it's slated at around $27 million. What we are proposing doing is adjusting that amount lower and then adding the project Delfel 179th to 189th.

As I mentioned in the previous hearing, there's an interchange replacement project that's happening with the State of Washington, we are in direct negotiation or coordination with the Department of Transportation and it has been concluded that the segment underneath the interchange is, can be, they can handle that while Clark County can handle the realignment of Delfel Road from 179th to 189th. So if you add those two up, 12 million for 179th and 15 million for Delfel Road you'll arrive at the 27 million.

The intersections of 179th, 29th Avenue and 50th Avenue, in the current CFP they're one line item, we want to separate those to be two separate projects so that when we apply for grants, we can apply for them separately. So we are proposing to split up that 15 million line item currently in the CFP to 9 million at 29th Avenue intersection and 6 million at the 50th Avenue intersection.

And then on 182nd Avenue and SR-500, this is a realignment shown in the picture, the photograph here, this is a joint effort also with the State of Washington. Fourth Plain Boulevard which runs west to east here is also known as SR-500, this is an intersection project that we want to complete and the cost of those have increased.

TORRES: So, Matt, what does that entail, that project?

HERMEN: So that project we're currently going through the design process of that, there's several different intersections that are up for consideration on that. It does involve coordination with WSDOT, but what we are currently looking at is a roundabout configuration with the 182nd Avenue to realign further it would be west of the creek. Currently right here I believe this is called China Creek or Fifth Plain Creek, I'm sorry.

ORJIAKO: Fifth Plain Creek.

HERMEN: Fifth Plain Creek and we'd like to take the intersection further away from that bridge.

TORRES: Okay. Thank you.

HERMEN: Here in green, I know it's confusing with the urban holding overlay, but these are projects that we're proposing to be added. This is just showing those projects in the Mt. Vista TIF district. So the Mt. Vista TIF district shown in the shaded beige, we would like to add 179th from 15th Avenue from 50th Avenue, from here to 50th Avenue. 179th from N.W. 11th Avenue to Delfel Road.

10th Avenue from 164th to the fairgrounds entrance. From the fairground entrance to north, that section has been improved to urban standards, we'd like to improve this section to add lanes, bike lanes and sidewalks and that would complete the section of 10th Avenue all the way from 139th to 179th. N.W. 11th Avenue is shown here from 139th to 149th, this is a road that does not exist, it's on our arterial atlas but we'd like to add it to our 20-year list for improvement. And then the intersection improvement at 10th Avenue and 139th right here.

Projects that we propose to add to the CFP in the Orchards district include two projects. One, the extension of 99th Street from 72nd Avenue all the way to 94th Avenue. Yes. Last year in 2018 the Planning Commission approved a realignment of this proposed road in our arterial atlas, this proposal would add this to the 20-year capital facilities plan.

Also proposed to be added is the extension of 137th/132nd Avenue from 99th Street to 119th Street. This project is proposed to be added as part of a Developer Agreement signed with Austin Heritage Development which is located in this section here. We have analyzed this road and concluded that there is public benefit to add this to the capital facilities plan.

Projects that are -- there are no projects proposed to be added in the rural area as well as in the Hazel Dell TIF district. The proposed capital facilities plan, should this be approved, it would show these improvements shown in blue, it includes those projects that are added as well as several projects that have been completed. There are projects in the rural area but not projects to be added in the rural area.

The proposed changes shown in matrix form are red are shown as deletions, cost amendments shown in beige, additions shown in green. So here we're showing the deletion of five projects, cost amendment and then the several projects to be added. This is not the entire list, it continues with cost amendments to 182nd at 500, the deletion of that intersection, the one line item to two line items and then that traffic signal optimization program.

At the September 19th Planning Commission work session, the Planning Commission asked for what projects in this 20-year CFP are in the six-year transportation improvement program, those projects are shown here with the costs in millions.

As a part of the amendment process, should the capital facilities plan be amended as proposed, the proposed TIF rates are shown here. Those TIF rates are based on an average daily trip. So for every average daily trip that a development adds, the rate shown in this proposed rate would be assessed to the development. You can see that across the four districts those rates do go up.

There are -- while I should address, that while we are not adding projects in the Hazel Dell or rural area, those rates do go up because there are several regional projects that we are adding to the capital facilities plan that benefit those districts.

BARCA: Can you give me an example of what that would be for Hazel Dell.

HERMEN: Sure. So Hazel Dell, let me move to the map. So Hazel Dell has 99th Street here, there are several trips that occur or would be added in the Hazel Dell TIF district that would benefit from this roadway as well as several projects, 139th to 149th and some of the projects in the Mt. Vista TIF district. In the rural area there's benefit from the improvements along 179th that allow them to get to the interchange and regional destinations quicker.

Yeah, that is worth mentioning. The projects, the significant amount of projects that are added in the Mt. Vista TIF district see the largest increase in the proposed rate from the current rate of $605 to $930, that's a $325 increase.

So based on the criteria of consistency with the Growth Management Act and Washington

Administrative Code as well as compliance with the comprehensive plan, we are recommending approval of the proposed capital facilities plan, of amending the capital facilities plan.

JOHNSON: Okay. Thank you, Matt. Comments? Questions?

SWINDELL: Question. On, I'm looking at the deletions, is it a fair assessment to say that we maybe said we want to shift our priorities so we're going to delete these projects and shift our priorities towards the Mt. Vista or the 179th Street area, sorry, is that why we deleted those are is it just other reasons?

HERMEN: No, those have been completed. Those projects, so the last time the capital facilities plan was amended was 2016, since that time these projects shown here have been completed.

SWINDELL: So all the projects that are being deleted have been completed?

QAYOUMI: Yeah. The construction is completed.

SWINDELL: Okay. I misunderstood the language there. Sorry. So it's actually been completed. Okay.

TORRES: So the only impact then is just to clean up the CFP by removing them because they're done.

HERMEN: Correct.

JOHNSON: On the same line, cost amendments, so explain to me that general process we just went over or --

HERMEN: Sure. So cost amendments, so projects in the capital facilities plan are in this 20-year plan, right, as projects start transitioning to being funded in the six-year plan, our engineering takes a greater look at those projects to reassess how much cost is going to be needed in order to complete those projects.

There is -- when we initially put a cost on the 20-year capital facilities plan, we don't dive very deep into the necessary cost, the real cost that are going to be associated with that project. So as those projects advance in priority, more detailed analysis goes to the actual cost that will be needed.

JOHNSON: So I'm going to follow up on that. So our 60 million in county improvements on let's say 179th could have an almost likely will or --

QAYOUMI: For that one because we're working on those project for about ten months, we looked a little bit closer and have defined a little bit better estimates on those than other projects where we do more like planning level estimate for capital facility plans and then go and

do a little bit more detail estimates after we looked a little bit closer, but for the projects that we have done for 179th, we looked a little bit closer than to make sure we get estimates a little bit better.

JOHNSON: Okay. Thank you.

TORRES: And just for clarification, the proposed rates are per developed unit; right?

HERMEN: No, per trip. So for and since single-family residents generates approximately ten trips per day, so the traffic impact fees that would be assessed to that would be multiplied by ten, by the ten trips.

TORRES: That's what I need clarification. Thank you.

HERMEN: But the TIF rates also in some instances when it's applied to commercial or job producers receive a benefit to those because they are creating jobs and generating taxes as a result.

JOHNSON: Any more comments? Okay. With that at this point, I know we had a lot of people leave, but I would like to turn this over for the public comment and I will walk down this list as quickly as I can.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

JOHNSON: So Del and Teri Nason, are you here, 189th Street? Is it Michele Doran? Tina Eifert. Jack Tichenor or is it Jan, excuse me, Jan. Ken and Cathy English. Dorothy Brown. Okay. Tom and Jeni Prew. Tom and Pat Underwood. David Koeltzow, is that how you say it?

KOELTZOW: Pass.

JOHNSON: Pass? Pass. Okay. David. Bill Puckett.

PUCKETT: Pass.

JOHNSON: Pass. Okay. Rob and Marcia Robison. Betty Thompson. This is getting interesting. Tracy already spoke. David, I want to say Lucky, it doesn't sound like that, 29th Avenue, 18607. Okay. Bob Mason. That was quick. Second page. Jamie Howsley. Should have made you go last, Jamie.

HOWSLEY: Yeah. Good evening again, Planning Commissioners. For the record, Jamie Howsley, 1499 S.E. Tech Center Place with the law firm Jordan Ramis. First of all, welcome Mr. Halbert to the Planning Commission, I neglected to say that prior.

I'm here tonight just representing various clients for the various CFP amendments in the two

TIF districts in particular, the Mt. Vista and then the Orchards one. And staff knows of my strong passion about trying to advocate for road projects and adding more to the CFP list even if that results in an increase into the traffic impact fees, and I want to be a little bit rhetorical here, you know, why does a developer's attorney want to have higher traffic impact fees effectively? It's a good question.

To me it's really about being able to spread the costs of development around a little bit more evenly so when a development comes in that may be needed there, that infrastructure already may be there rather than them having to do the full lift themselves or worse than that would be to start triggering moratoriums out in particular areas.

In the case of the urban holding instance in kind of a way it functions as a moratorium in a sense not allowing development to go forward until all of this had come together with the finance plan, but again by hopefully kind of having everybody feel the pain collectively a little bit we can get these road projects done and out there in the system. So I'm very supportive of what staff has come up with in terms of the Mt. Vista TIF area.

And then on the Orchards area, there's two additions to the CFP. One of them is related to a Development Agreement entered into by one of my clients and that's on the 137th area there. And, again, I'm supportive of both that and then the addition one over there at 99th and 72nd to the there and it results in a pretty nominal TIF increase and the Orchards district I think of only $74.

In the prior urban holding that we had out there many years ago, I think that the TIF rate was up in the 600-and-something-dollar realm, so having it in the $400 range isn't really that great as to what it's been historically and for the benefit of that we're getting two significant road projects that could create additional cross-circulation out there. So I just wanted to add that perspective.

Thank staff for bringing these amendments forward and would ask the Planning Commission to support the amendment. Thank you.

JOHNSON: Thank you, sir. Chris Brehmer.

BREHMER: I'm here and have nothing at this time. Thank you.

JOHNSON: Okay, thanks, Chris. Brent Ahrend. Is this Chad?

STEWART: Yes.

JOHNSON: Okay. Thank you.

AHREND: I think Chad actually wants to go first.

JOHNSON: Okay. So just state your name and make sure we're, you know.

STEWART: Chad Stewart, S-t-e-w-a-r-t, Hurley Development, 915 Broadway, Suite 300, Vancouver, Washington, 98660.

Brent and I are here tonight to talk about the bottom item on the proposed projects for the Mt. Vista district. This project as noted sits on the intersection of 10th Avenue and 139th where Hurley Development is planning to move forward with a commercial project on that intersection. The number of improvements associated with this project actually has quite a history, it goes back I think five years to an agreement between the County and property owners on five of the parcels out there.

At the time, the property owners agreed to have these system improvements required for any development on their parcels and a large factor, if not the determining factor in agreeing to those was at the time because of the Fee Holiday commercial project on those properties would not have paid any TIF. I can't speak as to why that development didn't move forward, but because of where we are today with TIFs now back in place because we're coming in with a planned commercial project on these parcels and because those system improvements are tied to the properties, our project is being asked to not only put in these system improvements but then on top of it, pay the TIF fees as well.

If you have -- do you have the letter from LeAnne in your public comment? That may be helpful just to highlight what I'm talking about. In the public comment is a letter from December 2018 that our attorney LeAnne Bremer submitted and I'm going to refer to the actual improvements I'm talking about.

So Numbers 1 through 4 are 4 of the 5 system improvements that were conditioned on these parcels. The fifth one is one that at time of development application it was determined was triggered by our project and we're moving forward with that one, it's going to be a new signalized intersection at 10th and 141st, the other 4 are system improvements that our project doesn't trigger.

Since the time of this letter from LeAnne a couple of things have happened. First of all, that Number 4, improvements at N.E. 23rd and 134th which is an intersection that actually falls under WSDOT jurisdiction, those improvements have deemed to no longer be desired by WSDOT or the County and so we're moving forward with a procedure to have those removed off the original condition from 2015.

The other 3, Number 1, 2 and 3, the County brought in a third party to do an analysis to determine what benefit they provided to the system as a whole and that analysis said that Numbers 1 and Number 3 in their opinion certainly qualified as providing system-wide benefit, that analysis had questions however about Number 2 and Brent Ahrend, our transportation engineer, reviewed that analysis and has submitted in the public record on the subsequent page a letter attesting to how some of the assumptions that was -- were made were incorrect.

And so in essence tonight we're coming here, not seeking a change in the dollar amount associated with that project that's found in the staff report to be added, simply looking for clarification that those three improvements, Numbers 1, 2 and 3 on LeAnne's letter are true system improvements and will be part of that overall project that's recommended to be added. So if there's any questions for me, I'll let Brent speak to his specialty.

AHREND: Okay. I'm Brent Ahrend, I'm a traffic engineer with MacKenzie at 101 East 6th in Vancouver, Suite 200.

HOLLEY: Spell your last name, please.

AHREND: Ahrend, A-h-r-e-n-d. As Chad mentioned, there was a zone change I believe it was in 2015, I actually worked on that project for a different developer and Chad had mentioned that at the time there was a Fee Holiday and so having these mitigation measures for the zone change, it kind of worked out to be about the same cost as the traffic impact fees would have been at the time.

That project didn't go forward, Fee Holiday ended and now, you know, we're looking at, okay, is there a way that we can add these improvements that makes sense into the capital facilities plan because they do serve a region-wide benefit and they provide the benefit for everybody.

And the other thing I want to point out is when the zone change occurred, you've changed from industrial that generate a lot fewer daily trips to a retail project which would generate a lot more trips, but there's -- and the net effect of that is the County will collect a lot more in traffic impact fees, but you haven't increased the number of projects that are being built, and this is one way that you can kind of help balance that out is adding these projects in now kind of balances things out. So you're going to collect higher fees after this zone change occurred but not require more improvements or not add more improvements to your capital facilities plan and your TIP, so that's kind of an equity issue there for making the case.

Then the other reasoning here that I want to speak to is, is the benefit, why are we asking for these improvements, and as Chad mentioned there were two that the County agreed to and they had their consultant Kittelson prepare the analysis, it was the right-turn lane and it was the southbound left turn improvements at the 139th and 10th Avenue intersection.

We're also required as part of the zone change to add a second northbound lane on 10th Avenue headed north towards the fairgrounds away from 139th, and the analysis that was done by Kittelson we believe came to the wrong conclusion, they said that there's no network benefit, but the reason for the improvement is for concurrency.

If you're familiar with concurrency, you look at what's the volume to capacity of a road segment, and even without this area being zoned subject to the zone change, changing to retail, because the analysis was done assuming it was still industrial, it showed that those

volumes still exceeded the threshold and you need that second lane for concurrency.

When we did the traffic analysis for the development application, we found that it's not needed for capacity to make the roadway intersections work, but it's based on the concurrency standard that the County has, and again, it's neither regardless of the zone change and regardless of the project, and it's for those reasons that we believe it's appropriate to add that third element in, that northbound lane on 10th because it does serve for the region, benefits the entire region.

So I'm happy to answer any questions. And like we said, my letter is in that public testimony along with the attorney's letter.

STEWART: And just to clarify one aspect, we're not asking today to add a new project, we're not asking to increase the dollar amount, we're simply looking to clarify the actual improvements that are part of this listed project, specifically we're looking to have the three items, 1, 2 and 3 in the letter from LeAnne Bremer dated December 2018 to be the ones that constitute that project.

BARCA: It does kind of sound like you are asking for them to be added. What we have in front of us is what staff has already vetted and told us the potential in both the improvement through concurrency and the aspect of the cost, that's what I see us looking at.

Your request which was put in in a timely fashion, we did have a chance to look at it, but not seeing it on the list for staff it puts us in an awkward position I think to either concur with your findings or to ask staff to even go back and revisit their work at this point in time.

We've got like $100 million for the Mt. Vista area over a 20-year period that we're looking at and it seems like a lot of things are going to get done, added, subtracted over this period of time. If it's your recommendation that your analysis says that those are important components and need to be brought forward, we do amendments all the time, but as I heard your request it really did sound like you needed us to consider those being added in some fashion and I don't think that that's something that we could entertain tonight.

JOHNSON: So, Matt, could you give us clarity on this for us first.

ORJIAKO: I think Commissioner Ron Barca is correct. I don't want our own civil engineer to come up and start debating this issue. I think it's more appropriate for Community Development, for them to deal with Community Development and deal with the issues as they develop their property, that's the appropriate venue to have that conversation. What we are asking you to do is to add the project we believe is necessary on the CFP. And I don't know if Ahmad needs to add something.

QAYOUMI: That's correct. I mean, I think this one there's a Developer Agreement that was part of the project and I'm not sure if this is the appropriate venue to make any amendments to

those. And also if the cost of that additional, that widening that's on 10th Avenue is not accounted on these calculation that Matt has done, correct me if I'm wrong, and if that continues that just that one lane expansion is not continuous and it's been from my understanding it's to benefiting the project and I understand it's probably driven by concurrency, but mostly it's going to be providing more access for the site, it's not continuous where it's going to be providing capacity on the regional significant basis.

HERMEN: So I do want to clarify that the County Council on December 18th asked us to consider these improvements on the capital facilities plan. We went out and hired an independent third party traffic engineer to do the analysis, the analysis that they concluded which is in --

BARCA: Are you speaking of the Kittelson report?

HERMEN: Correct. Right. The Kittelson report concluded that the requirements of the property did have public benefit, specifically those intersection improvements that we are proposing to add to the capital facilities plan, that one requirement to increase capacity from 139th to 141st, the analysis that was hired and done by Kittelson did not conclude that there was public benefit to that improvement.

JOHNSON: Counselor.

COOK: Thank you. The applicant for development here has been working with Community Development and went to hearing a couple of weeks ago I believe on this matter, not entirely on the matter of the infrastructure requirements, but that was among the issues that were addressed at the hearing.

And given that Matt has information about their request and that Public Works has taken those into account by hiring an expert who answered some of the questions for the County, I think that Public Works is probably, and this situation is probably not the best time or place, not the best venue for changing what Public Works has suggested and what the hearing's examiner might have approved, and I'm not exactly sure what the hearing's examiner approved because I don't work with Community Development, so I wasn't present at the hearing, I haven't read the materials, I don't know exactly what happened there, but...

JOHNSON: I think, gentlemen, it's best right now for us in the capacity that we're in to defer to our staff as far as the time and place and the merits are for us, I mean I don't know. Gentlemen?

SWINDELL: I understand. I think I understand what you're talking about, it's kind of you feel like you're getting double-dipped a bit, but I agree though with staff, it's not part of what we're here to talk about tonight, but I think staff is wanting to work with you and talk about it, go over it, so...

JOHNSON: Questions?

STEWART: Thank you.

JOHNSON: Gentlemen, thank you. Is there anybody else in the audience that would like to speak to the issue at hand that I have not seen on my sign-up sheet? Seeing none, I would like to bring this back to the Planning Commission. Are there any questions for staff that have not been asked?

RETURN TO PLANNING COMMISSION

SWINDELL: What if I want to ask it again?

JOHNSON: Okay.

SWINDELL: No, I'm just kidding. I have none.

TORRES: No.

JOHNSON: Seeing none. Discussion or I would entertain a motion.

SWINDELL: I make a **MOTION** we adopt CPZ2019-00017 as presented.

TORRES: I will **second** that.

JOHNSON: We have a motion and is seconded. Sonja, can we have roll call, please.

ROLL CALL VOTE

SWINDELL: AYE
TORRES: AYE
BARCA: AYE
JOHNSON: AYE
HALBERT: AYE

JOHNSON: Motion has been heard and carried. With that said, we move on.

OLD BUSINESS

None.

NEW BUSINESS

None.

COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION

BARCA: I'd like to make a comment about the hearing that took place tonight. In hindsight, I think it might have been a mistake for the residents of the area that came out for the overlay lifting to have not seen the capital facility plan because once we again present the fact that over a 20-year plan we're going to be adding another $100 million of infrastructure to the area, I think is really quite relevant for the people.

JOHNSON: Yeah, I agree. I just think based on the information that I had and trying to do the right thing. I think it's either way, you know, the chicken before the egg, the egg before the chicken, it's okay, I mean I'll take it on the chin.

BARCA: And my point about this is I just think sometimes to get a clear understanding you got to sit through and watch the sausage get made and so it's ugly and detailed but I think it may have been helpful for a lot of the people who left if they had seen the full impact of what is going to be the investment in the area over a longer period of time. That's my comment.

JOHNSON: My final comment will be glad to have you here, Bryan.

HALBERT: Thanks.

JOHNSON: And great, you did a great job tonight. So with that said, we're adjourned.

ORJIAKO: My own comment is to thank the members of the Planning Commission, this was a special hearing and you came out for it, so agreed to have a special hearing. I know you have busy schedules but thank you for holding this special hearing, greatly appreciate it, it help us too, we got a lot of projects, you've got a lot on your plate, you see our weekly update on what is on your docket, so thank you for the special hearing.

ADJOURNMENT

JOHNSON: Thank you. We're adjourned.

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
Television proceedings can be viewed on CVTV on the following web page link:
http://www.cvtv.org/

Minutes Transcribed by: Cindy Holley, Court Reporter/Rider & Associates, Inc.
Sonja Wiser, Program Assistant, Clark County Community Planning