



proud past, promising future

Clark County Planning Commission

Karl Johnson, Chair
Ron Barca, Vice Chair
Rick Torres
Steve Morasch
Matt Swindell
Bryan Halbert

CLARK COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF PUBLIC HEARING THURSDAY, OCTOBER 3, 2019

Public Service Center
Council Hearing Room
100 Franklin Street, 6th Floor
Vancouver, WA

6:30 p.m.

CALL TO ORDER & ROLL CALL

JOHNSON: Okay. I'd like to call this meeting to order for Thursday, October 3rd, 2019, of the Clark County Planning Commission. My name is Karl Johnson, I'm the Planning Commission Chair. May we have a roll call, please.

HALBERT: ABSENT
MORASCH: HERE
SWINDELL: HERE
TORRES: HERE
BARCA: HERE
JOHNSON: HERE

PLANNING COMMISSION OPENING STATEMENT

JOHNSON: And with that said, I'd like to go over this really quick Planning Commission opening statement. Are there any Commissioners that would like to disclose any conflicts of interest?

Hearing none, the procedures are as follows: We will begin the hearing with a staff report. The Planning Commission members will ask questions of the staff if there are any at that point. I will then open the hearing for public testimony.

Members of the audience who wish to testify on the hearing item need to sign in on the sign-in sheets at the back of the room. Members of the public wishing to give oral testimony are to come to the front of the room at the table facing the Planning Commission.

The Chair has the discretion to make the following statement if reasonable and appropriate under the circumstances, testimony on this matter is limited to X minutes per person. Your testimony should be related to applicable standards for this hearing item. The relevant standards are set out in the staff report, copies of which are available on the table in the back of the hearing room.

If you have any exhibits you want us to consider such as a copy of your testimony, photographs, petitions or other documents or physical evidence, please hand it into staff. This information will be included in the record for the hearing item, we will consider it part of our deliberations.

When you testify, you must testify at the front of the table in front of the microphone so the court reporter can hear your testimony. State your name and address for the record and spell your name for the court reporter. Please be relevant and concise and don't repeat yourself or others testifying.

I will then close the public testimony portion of the hearing. The Planning Commission will deliberate and ask staff to answer questions or make rebuttals. The Planning Commission will then take a vote on their decisions. Our recommendations will be forwarded to the Board of County Councilors who have the final decision-making authority.

GENERAL & NEW BUSINESS

A. Approval of Agenda for October 3, 2019

JOHNSON: With this said, I'd like to start with General & New Business. First, I'd like a motion for the approval of the agenda for October 3rd, 2019.

SWINDELL: Make a motion we approve the agenda.

BARCA: Second.

JOHNSON: Hear a motion and seconded. All those in favor?

EVERYBODY: AYE

JOHNSON: All those opposed? Hearing none opposed, motion's passed.

B. Communications from the Public

JOHNSON: Also, if there's any communications from the public on matters that are not on our docket tonight, please come forward. Seeing none, we will now take the first item on our public hearing which is Transportation Improvement Program for 2000 (sic) to 2025. Staff

report.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

- A. 2020-2025 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).** The TIP identifies public works capital projects including new construction, reconstruction, bridges, bicycle and pedestrian, safety, hot mix preservation improvements, and signalization construction to maintain and enhance Clark County's transportation system in unincorporated Clark County.
Staff Contact: Susan Wilson, Manager at Susan.Wilson@clark.wa.gov or (564)397-4330

QAYOUMI: Good evening, Commissioners. For the record, my name is Ahmad Qayoumi, Public Works Director for Clark County.

We're here before you about a very important document for us as transportation improvement plan that helps us in guidance for next six years in all the projects that we're going to be doing in term for roadways. We held a workshop with you a few weeks ago. So with that, I will turn it over to Susan Wilson, she's our Program Manager and managing the transportation improvement plan for the county.

WILSON: So as Ahmad stated, we are here to talk about our 2020-2025 six-year Transportation Improvement Program.

And so today on the agenda is we're going to talk about the purpose of the hearing, capital facilities plan to the transportation improvement program, how is a project put on to the transportation improvement program, the construction schedule and the next steps. So the purpose of this hearing is to ask for your support in recommending our six-year Transportation Improvement Program to the County Council. Can you scroll down.

The chart you're going to see on this slide, it looks familiar from last month. We talked about how a transportation improvement project gets on to the -- actually the -- how a capital facilities project gets on to the transportation improvement program.

First of all, it has to be in the comprehensive plan and then it goes to the six year and then it goes to the capital facilities plan, the 20-year plan, and then it's put into the six-year transportation improvement program. And all of those projects from the capital facilities plan are evaluated and ranked with safety, mobility, economic development.

And then our annual construction program is our first year of our transportation improvement

program and then we start to -- we start scoping the projects through a capital facilities project number. So this is our six-year capital transportation improvement program. It is the construction start of the program. It does not include all the right-of-way, all the plan -- the scoping and engineering and the design that we are doing. So we're working on a lot of, a lot more projects than what you see here, it's just the start of the construction.

So the gray projects are under construction or have been completed such as 10th Avenue where Whipple Creek from 154th to 164th. 119th Street east, that is almost completed. N.E. Blair Road, that's under construction but will not be completed until next year. Pacific Highway that was, Pacific Highway Culvert, that was the culvert that had failed, that was completed in two weeks.

And then Highway 99 Pavement Preservation, that is a overlay project with ADA ramps from 78th Street to 134th. We've gotten the ADA ramps installed and we'll do the asphalt treatment next year. Kline Sidewalk, that is completed.

The projects in yellow highlights, they are fully funded or grant committed projects. Some projects may look familiar to you. 99th Street or Lechner Landfill from 94th to SR-503, you have Highway 99 and 99th Street intersection, there's some intersection improvements to fulfill some capacity issues. We also have Manley Road, we're completing three culverts, some guardrail and an asphalt treatment.

We have a traffic signal optimization project from Bridges, Mason Creek Culvert, we received some grant money to complete some design and engineering on that. And then we have N.E. 68th Street Sidewalk which is a partnership with the City of Vancouver from Highway 99 to St. Johns, that one has about \$2 million of grant funding on it, so that's a very successful project, we'll also be seeking some transportation improvement board money on it. N.E. Munch Road is a preservation project.

The blue projects are the urban holding projects, these will be built in six years contingent upon the funding we receive that the Council has approved on August 20th per resolution. And then also we have the white projects and the ongoing projects also listed in white. The white projects are to continue the program.

We must have something in the hopper at all times to ensure that our program is continued. We're completing some traffic modeling to figure out what we're going to do on those projects. The ongoing programs have their own individual ranking, sidewalks, bridges, transportation safety, it's about \$89 million of this \$200 million program.

Today we're at the PC hearing. I met with DEAB earlier to do my presentation. We met with County Council on August 17th. We pulled advertisement on our SEPA. We met with you guys last month and we'll have a work session with County Council on August 9th (sic) and then

hopefully we'll go to hearing on November 5th before the budgets adopted, that is a State requirement.

Public Comment

None.

Return to Planning Commission

JOHNSON: Okay. Great. I don't have any sheets for public comment. Any questions for staff?

BARCA: I am looking at the document you have with the different colored codings for the six-year projects and yellow is fully funded, you've broken out the urban holding projects, what's the status of funding for each of those projects?

WILSON: The urban holding projects?

BARCA: Yeah, the blues.

WILSON: Currently, the Council has chosen Option 8. I don't know if you guys are familiar with that. It consists of real estate excise tax 2, county road fund, about \$11 million worth of State and Federal grants and then a large contribution from the developers.

QAYOUMI: I think last night, on Tuesday night actually, the Regional Transportation Council were also awarded some grants toward this project, about \$2.25 million towards those and as part of the planning we were hoping to get about \$11 million in grants, so we have a good start.

As Susan mentioned, there was several different source of funding for the area what we call 179th area projects. The step one was 68, almost \$67 million worth of project, so a lot of we already had dedicated so much money already from the part of the already adopted TIP was about \$23 million and then we're also getting \$6.8 million commitment from the development community. We're getting some funding from transportation impact fees, also REET 2 about \$12 million. So the goal is to get a lot of local contributions so we continue to be successful in getting more grants \$11 million or beyond.

WILSON: And we just, we applied for a State grant and we should hear about that next month, it's about \$3 million.

BARCA: So in the context of the designations as you've highlighted each of the colors, those are not fully funded yet but you're working on funding sources?

QAYOUMI: We consider them more like reasonably funded and that's what the -- allows us to

do the next steps or allows the developers to start applying through that. We have six years to make, see that commitment through.

Some of the projects has, maybe have more funding, some projects might have less funding for example.

10th Avenue from 149th to 154 there's a lot more funding that are available and we're going to be starting the construction on that one sooner than the other projects so that the other project might have partial funding right now, but the goal is to make sure that gets implemented within the next six years.

BARCA: Okay. Yeah. I'm trying to make the differentiation because in some cases we say fully funded and in some cases we say highest priority project to seek funding and I'm trying to clarify. Those don't seem to fall in either of those buckets.

WILSON: Yeah. There's only so much grant money per year that we can apply for, so that's the reason why, you know, we are -- they're still on the list to seek funding for. They only give so much money per year for example but we're still, we still want a six-year plan to, to show the funding partners that we are serious, we are designing, we are engineering these projects, we are just waiting for the legislature to come out with more funding packages to support these projects.

QAYOUMI: Chris, did you have some comments?

COOK: Yeah. I was just going to say that when you talk about, when you use funding, it sounded like it was in the context of grants, the blue projects. One of the things that needs to happen is that the Council needs to adopt its budget this year, that doesn't happen till the end of the year.

Given that the Council chose a funding option that contemplates that they will take certain steps in adopting the budget, we could conclude perhaps that there is, there is some -- step one of the decisions for having it fully funded has been made, but the last step hasn't been made but we have that scheduled and we assume that the same Councilors who voted to choose that funding strategy will vote for it when it comes time to vote for the budget.

BARCA: Okay. I hear you say that. I'm looking at the terminology and I'm trying to understand. So even though pink is the highest priority project to seek funding, it sounds as if County Council will prioritize the blue projects over the highest priority projects to seek funding and that's why I'm trying to make a determination.

They're not pink and they're not yellow, they're their own distinct funding cycle, their own distinct funding sources. We made a point of making a distinction between them and all the other projects that need funding and I'm just wondering as the color codes come out, what was

our point of doing that?

COOK: Well, I'm sure they can be in different colors.

WILSON: They could be. I mean, the blue projects could be pink projects.

QAYOUMI: I think the color coding was mostly for categorization and not so much like, well, this has to be done because there's different scoring criteria that we go for each project, it involves safety, capacity or economic development that we categorize them and prioritize them based on that, and a lot of those projects that for example they're under construction or not, they're fully funded, maybe some of the project gets a grant sooner than the other ones and there's a lot of other complex information that goes into this project.

So maybe the highest priority means, doesn't mean in terms of getting the project done but in terms of getting some funding, so make sure that gets done in the future. For example, 182nd and SR-500, it is a State facility but there is some -- we hear a lot from residents about the issues that are involved with that intersection, might not be a high priority for the State but it is on a local level.

So we're going to try to do some participation and push that forward like maybe do a 30 percent design that will help us get more grants and push the issue with our State legislatures and other ways that we can push that project to make sure that gets a higher priority.

So there's just there's a lot of other factors involved. So it might not necessarily the description might not be exactly what it represents, but there's a lot of other factors. If that actually creates some complications, we can probably take those recommendations out.

WILSON: I mean, they could also be yellow projects because we do have, you know, 15th Avenue, 10th Avenue, 179th Street is now grant committed based upon a decision that was made the other day. So I mean in all reality they could be yellow, they could cross with the 179th urban holding projects.

BARCA: Okay. I think that's helpful for me to understand because in the context of prioritization going after funding it's always the push of one project's priorities over another and to understand the terminology highest priority project that sounds like the most important ones.

QAYOUMI: Yeah, it's probably not describing the whole picture, so that's a good point, we can go back and maybe do a little better job describing them.

BARCA: Okay. Thank you.

JOHNSON: Any other questions for staff?

MORASCH: Sure. I notice there was a public comment from a David Rowe and it looks like it's probably a comment that's beyond the scope of the six-year TIP but he has some interesting ideas about broader transportation issues in the county and the heavy rail.

I was just curious to get your, get your general take on the idea of using heavy rail as an element for commuter traffic to Portland and if there's been any discussion with the railroad about whether they'd be willing because I don't think we can tell the railroad anything because they're, you know, federally regulated, but has there been any thought or discussion with them about whether they'd be willing to add more commuter trains during the commuter hours?

QAYOUMI: Well, one of the things for us responsibility is to make sure that we comply or deliver all the projects that have been committed through the comprehensive plan that's been adopted through Planning Commission and Council where they drive 20-year capital facilities plan to make sure that we stay on top of them and deliver them to make sure we meet the Growth Management Act requirements because we said these are going to be delivering these infrastructure in order to allow areas to develop and economic development as well.

But issue of the -- like for example, I-5 and those are more of like bistate kind of issues that we need to work with them and we're going to work with them, but for us on a local level, we have to make sure that infrastructure within our local communities are addressed first, then the next step would be to work with the two states on a larger project like we're working with them on the I-5 bridge project.

MORASCH: So is it an idea, is there some merit in that broader process you were discussing or --

QAYOUMI: I think all the ideas has a lot of merit. So I think for us to kind of go back and find out whether the County's role and who needs to take the lead on those things, but there are a lot of ideas that we continue to work with.

I know there's a lot of discussion at the higher level about the bridge, possibly building a bridge, but those are things that has to, takes a long time to explore, feasibility of them and get, buying from by -- two states, so that probably deserves a special and a separate kind of effort. By the same time we have to make sure we stay on top of commitment we have made and on our six-year plan and a 20-year plan to make sure that we continue to build our infrastructure for with the Clark County residents.

MORASCH: And in case Mr. Rowe's watching, who would you recommend he contact to get involved in that broader bistate?

QAYOUMI: I think their initial would be to get involved with Regional Transportation Council --

MORASCH: RTC.

QAYOUMI: -- RTC and then WSDOT and ODOT would be the two. I don't know what else to recommend.

MORASCH: All right. Thank you.

JOHNSON: Any other comments, questions? Okay. With that said, I would entertain a motion.

TORRES: I'll make a **MOTION** that the Commission approve 2020-2025 Transportation Improvement Program as presented.

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

JOHNSON: Motion's been heard and seconded. Roll call, please.

ROLL CALL VOTE

MORASCH: AYE
SWINDELL: AYE
TORRES: AYE
BARCA: AYE
JOHNSON: AYE

JOHNSON: The motion is unanimous and passed. Moving on to CPZ2019-00025, Complete Streets. Staff report, please.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS, continued

B. CPZ2019-00025 Complete Streets: A proposal to amend Clark County Code (Pedestrian/Bicycle Circulation Standards Chapter 40.350.010) by creating a complete streets program, Clark County Code 40.350.010, renumbering CCC 40.350.010 Pedestrian/Bicycle Circulation Standards to CCC 40.350.015, and correct scrivener errors.

Staff Contact: Gary.Albrecht@clark.wa.gov or (564) 397-4318

ALBRECHT: Good evening, Chair. Good evening, Council. Gary Albrecht, Clark County Community Planning. Here to talk about CPZ2019-00025, Complete Streets.

So we were here September 5th to go over the presentation and I'm going to have the same

presentation to go over this evening, it's basically for the public so they can understand what we're doing. There's the agenda. I'm going to recycle the same old jokes I used before. It's a road map of where we're going to go, what we're talking about this evening.

The background. So there's two key dates for the Complete Streets. In 2011 the legislature established the complete streets grant program. In 2015 the legislature designated a Washington Transportation Improvement Board as the complete streets granting agency giving them the ability to award funds ranging from \$100,000 to \$1 million, it's flexible money that can be spent on any complete streets projects.

What are complete streets? Well, complete streets are transportation policies and standards that enables safe, convenient and comfortable travel and access for users of all ages and abilities regardless of their transportation choice. Here's some pictures of past projects that we've done.

The picture on the left is N.E. 10th Avenue, Susan Wilson just mentioned that, that was built this year, so from 154th Street to 164th Street. Now the other part of N.E. 10th Avenue was constructed in 2013, that goes from 141st Street to 149th Street. And we're currently in design for 149th to 154th Street, so it will be a great corridor to bike on up to the fairgrounds. And the picture on the right is N.E. 15th Avenue, that was built in 2007, and the picture on the bottom was built in 2001, N.E. 137th Avenue, both of those streets are two-lane minor arterials with a center turn lane and bike lanes.

And then the other thing we're going to talk about this evening is Complete Street Guidelines. It's a summary document for the TIB, the Transportation Improvement Board. The document describes the steps that Clark County has taken, continues to take and envisions for the multimodal transportation system and the public. And what complete streets are not, they're not new to Clark County as I've demonstrated and it doesn't mean that there is a bike lane or sidewalk on every road in the county. It's not a mandate for a retrofit for bike lanes or sidewalks in Clark County and it's not a silver bullet, it doesn't mean there's unlimited funding for complete streets.

So the complete streets process that we have is a three-step process. The first step was the comprehensive plan text and policies that were approved earlier this year by the Council. And step two is the Title 40 amendments to 40.350 that will be consistent with the complete streets policies that were adopted earlier, and then step three is the adopting ordinance that's required by the Transportation Improvement Board and that will be done through the hearing on November 5th. There's a quick recap of the adopted comprehensive plan text policies.

And then for the Title 40 amendments, we're amending Chapter 40.350.010, the Complete Streets Program. So the complete streets program basically encourages street and road designs that incorporates safe access to all users with the goals of promoting health, improving safety,

protecting the environment and preserving community character. We've created some definitions as well for complete streets and users and the program has design guidelines and there are exceptions to the program as well.

And the next steps for the public process, so just recapturing, we were, we started in 2018 with a County Council work session, and this summer we went to the Commission on Aging, if they had some recommendations for improvements to the code. I believe it's in your, in the material that you've received so far, and Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee supported the complete streets text amendments and the DEAB, the Development Engineering Advisory Board, has seen these, has recommended approval as well.

So we're at the work session now and then we have a -- well, I'm sorry. We had the work session in September, we're at the hearing now and we'll have a County Council work session on October 9th and a Council hearing on November 5th and that's it and I'm here to answer any questions.

JOHNSON: Any questions from the Commission?

SWINDELL: So just to clarify. We were already, the County was already doing this, this is just a method for us to be able to apply for those grants, correct, we have to adopt the ordinance to be able to apply for those grants?

ALBRECHT: Yes, that's correct.

SWINDELL: That's why we're doing this to help fund these things?

ALBRECHT: Correct.

SWINDELL: Okay. Great. Thank you.

ALBRECHT: You're welcome.

JOHNSON: Any other questions or comments?

BARCA: Gary, is there any thought or effort working with the bicycle advisory group to be looking at the rural areas that are pretty extensively used for bicycle traffic now to try and come up with any designated routes or areas that we could deem the best opportunity to make a safer rural biking experience?

ALBRECHT: That's something that the committee is charged to work with, is making the community safer for everybody. So they've been working on -- recently updated the bike map, the Clark County bike map and the City of Vancouver bike map, so there's a great, it's not an

app but it's an electronic map that you can see on a smart phone that shows you the bike routes that are in Clark County.

BARCA: Right.

ALBRECHT: So it's not something specifically that has been done, but it's something that we're working towards looking at. So we're -- there's -- it's something that we're working towards doing with them.

BARCA: So there is active planning going on towards some sort of future consideration?

ALBRECHT: Yes.

BARCA: Okay. Yeah, I ask the question just because the volume of bikes that I see going out into the county now seems to have been growing significantly and I know that the roads aren't any wider than they used to be, but the volume of traffic is, so it would be nice to work towards the idea of maybe areas that we could call safer or actively pursue the concept of making some of those routes safer.

ALBRECHT: So, you know, we're working towards that. We've talked about in Clark County Public Works having a transportation system plan so that plan would look at all of the multimodal choices and look at how the bikes work and function as well, so hopefully the goal is to have a safer more functional system for the county.

BARCA: That would be great. Thanks.

ALBRECHT: You're welcome.

JOHNSON: Any other comments or questions? With that said, seeing no comments from anyone in the audience, I bring it back for a motion.

SWINDELL: Make a **MOTION** we approve CPZ2019-00025, Complete Streets as presented.

TORRES: **Second** that.

JOHNSON: The motion's been made and seconded. Roll call, please.

ROLL CALL VOTE

MORASCH: AYE

SWINDELL: AYE

TORRES: AYE

BARCA: AYE
JOHNSON: AYE

JOHNSON: The motion's been seconded and passed. And we move on to our third item of the evening, CPZ2019-00016, Arterial Atlas Appendix F. Staff report.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS, continued

- C. CPZ2019-00016 Arterial Atlas and Appendix F (NE 106 St to NE 112th St):** A proposal to delete the proposed NE 16th Ave from the Arterial Atlas and Hwy 99 Sub Area Plan.
Staff Contact: Matt.Hermen@clark.wa.gov or (564) 397-4343

HERMEN: Good evening, Planning Commission. My name is Matt Hermen with Public Works, H-e-r-m-e-n. Today I'll be presenting CPZ2019-00016, this is an amendment to the arterial atlas which is our long-range transportation circulation plan as well as an amendment to Title 40 Appendix F in our Development Code which is the Highway 99 overlay.

The proposal for this docket is to remove a future planned street N.E. 16th Street, N.E. 107th Street and N.E. 110th Street. On this map shown here is where those planned streets are located. Those planned streets, when I refer to planned streets I mean they are lines on a map, they do not exist, the right-of-way doesn't exist and there are no construction plans for those planned roads.

The roads are directly west of Highway 99 and east of I-5, north of 106th Street and south of 112th Street. From this map here you can see an aerial photograph of, well, you could have, you can see an aerial photograph of the development that is currently around those planned streets, there's a significant mobile home park directly where the planned roads reside as well as a used car sales and several vacant lots.

The problem that we are trying to solve with this proposal is to, we want to encourage redevelopment in the Highway 99 area. Currently the area has a large modeled wetland directly to the, it would be the west of the planned road, with this modeled wetland there are buffers that are associated with protecting that and restoring the ecological habitat should development go in. Because of that wetland, the constructability of this planned road does present a problem and increase the cost of that road, so we would like to remove that from the arterial atlas and encourage the redevelopment along this area.

In the Highway 99 subarea plan it's denoted in the Tenny Creeks Commons Activity Center shown here, this planned road would be deleted from that Highway 99 subarea plan. With the proposal to remove the planned road, the applicable criteria that you would review with your recommendation are these following guidelines, staff has reviewed this proposal according to

those guidelines and is recommending approval to remove the planned road from the arterial atlas and Title 40 Appendix F, the Highway 99 subarea plan. If you have any questions, I'd be happy to answer them now.

JOHNSON: Questions?

BARCA: Are we leaving the lines on the map for 106th Street that I guess down at the bottom runs into 134th below the wetland?

HERMEN: Yes.

BARCA: Okay.

HERMEN: That road does exist, it's substandard, but it would need to be widened in order for that to be developed to full urban standards.

JOHNSON: Any other questions? Once, again, I received no sign-in report so I will take a motion.

SWINDELL: I make a **MOTION** we accept CPZ2019-00016 as presented.

TORRES: **Second.**

JOHNSON: Motion's been heard and seconded. Roll call.

ROLL CALL VOTE

MORASCH: AYE

SWINDELL: AYE

TORRES: AYE

BARCA: AYE

JOHNSON: AYE

JOHNSON: Motion is passed 5/0.

HERMEN: Thank you.

JOHNSON: Thank you. And we will move on to our fourth and final item, CPZ2019-00028, Historic Preservation. Staff report, please.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS, continued

D. CPZ2019-00028 Historic Preservation: A proposal to amend Clark County Code (Historic Preservation Chapter 40.250.030) to increase the minimum number of commission members and to amend the appeals process.

Staff Contact: Sharon.Lumbantobing@clark.wa.gov or (564) 397-4909

KAMP: Good evening. My name is Jacqui Kamp with Clark County Community Planning, I'm presenting CPZ2019-00028, Clark County Code 40.250.030 amendments.

The County has interlocal agreements with the seven cities and town regarding the Historic Preservation Program. The last agreements were updated in '97 and reference an old ordinance. In 2018 County updated the Historic Preservation Code 40.250.030 to provide revisions and clarifications for the program's existing processes which created a new ordinance for the code. Now the interlocal agreements need to be updated to reflect the new adopting ordinance made to the Title 40 last year.

The County and the City of Vancouver are both certified local governments, so certified by the State which means that they have the ability to maintain a local Clark -- a local heritage register and administer a historic preservation commission, so they're the only two in Clark County, the county and the city, the other smaller cities are not CLGs.

So during the interlocal agreement update discussions, the City of Vancouver requested consideration to revise the current commission members that are appointed and allow the city council to appoint members of the commission instead of recommendations to County Council.

Currently, the current process is cumbersome and long for the applicants who are applying and volunteering to serve on this commission. So this change would require an update to the Historic Preservation Code and to be reflected into the interlocal agreements. An additional code amendment regarding appeals for properties is also included for those city jurisdictions which I'll detail in a couple of slides from now.

So to kind of see how the current appointment process is for historic preservation commission members, there's multiple steps. When applications are received, the Historic Preservation Commission as a committee that reviews and selects from that list to interview. They then have those interviews, they do a rigorous interview process where they have a case study, they apply or they give one of the applicant's something that they've reviewed recently and give them the criteria and kind of see how they would use that criteria for that test case.

They then select the candidates that they would like to move forward to Vancouver, first city council. So the application applicant pool all goes to Vancouver City Council and they have their own review process. So they'll review the recommendations but they have the option of recommending whomever they feel is appropriate.

They then forward a recommendation to the County Council who also as well will take the recommendations from the historic commission, the city council and can do their own appointment or recommendations and interviews and then appoint. So all in all very kind of cumbersome process for someone that's applying, they may be interviewed three times for a position.

So currently the code states that there are to be a minimum of five members, we have seven members currently and we've had for many years and it's been working out well. There are certain experience and knowledge criteria that is to be considered for members. We always must include at least two professionals that have specific experience in identifying, evaluation and protecting historic and cultural resources and they can come from a variety of professional and academic disciplines which you can see on the slide there.

So for the amendments, the proposals are to increase the number of members from five to seven. The -- they'll have or the text in there that the City of Vancouver is to say appoint two members and the County to appoint five members. We will also update the appeals process in the code for Historic Preservation Commission decisions to indicate that the city or town code will dictate that jurisdictions appeal process or default to the county process which is an appeal to Superior Court.

So with the amendments to the commission appointment process, the review of applicants by the decision-makers will be more streamlined. So the applicants will be reviewed first by the Historic Preservation Committee, they will perform their interviews and then they will direct their recommendations to either the City Council or the County Council depending on which seat it is for, so we'll be taking a big chunk of the process out for those volunteers that are applying.

So for our public process, we began back in June with the County Council work session, the Historic Preservation Commission reviewed it in July, had their hearing in August, so the memo that you have before you is their recommendation for these amendments. We discussed this in last September at your work session and are here for the hearing this evening. The County Council will have review this at work session on October 9th and our Council hearing on the 5th of November. I'm happy to answer any questions.

BARCA: Is the City of Vancouver going through the same process to validate this?

KAMP: They will do that after we complete our process.

BARCA: After we complete it.

JOHNSON: So just for clarity, a Vancouver candidate would go to Vancouver, a County candidate would go to the County --

KAMP: Right. We will have like --

JOHNSON: -- kind of like a separation?

KAMP: -- specific seats that would be City seats and County seats, so...

JOHNSON: That's the big change.

KAMP: Yeah.

JOHNSON: Okay. Any other questions? Okay. With that said, nobody signed up, so I will entertain a motion.

BARCA: I make a **MOTION** to approve staff's recommendation for CPZ2019-00028.

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

JOHNSON: Motion's been made and seconded. Roll call, please.

ROLL CALL VOTE

MORASCH: AYE

SWINDELL: AYE

TORRES: AYE

BARCA: AYE

JOHNSON: AYE

JOHNSON: Motion's carried 5/0. And now we move on to any old business or any new business? Finally, are there any comments from members of the Planning Commission?

OLD BUSINESS

None.

NEW BUSINESS

None.

COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION

I would like to make one for the record. We are serving with one, two, three, four, five

Commissioners, we are missing two at given times and that puts a tremendous amount of stress on the Planning Commission for our normal daily lives if in fact somebody needs to take a day for here or there and I know we do our best.

So I would encourage for the record that the County Councilors look at that and the importance of having us all seated, and I know that there's a lot of things that go with that, but coming from the Chair I think it's extremely important that we have all seven of our members seated. With that said, is there any comment? No, Ron?

BARCA: No.

ADJOURNMENT

JOHNSON: All right. 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 CTVTV on the following web page link:

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

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