



Clark County Planning Commission

Steve Morasch, Chair
Ron Barca, Vice Chair
Bill Wright
Karl Johnson
Richard Bender
Matt Swindell
Robin Grimwade

**CLARK COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF PUBLIC HEARING
THURSDAY, AUGUST 16, 2018**

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

6:30 p.m.

CALL TO ORDER & ROLL CALL

BARCA: Okay. Ladies and gentlemen, we are going to go ahead and get started. We'll give everybody in the back an opportunity to sign in if you wish to testify, please get your name on one of the sheets in the back. There is Ward Road and there's also 99th Street, both of them seem to have a lot of popular appeal this evening. So if you're intending to talk, please get your name on one of those lists.

So welcome to the Clark County Planning Commission for August 16th. Can we start with roll call, please.

WRIGHT: HERE
BARCA: HERE
SWINDELL: HERE
MORASCH: ABSENT
JOHNSON: ABSENT
GRIMWADE: HERE
BENDER: HERE

GENERAL & NEW BUSINESS

A. Approval of Agenda for August 16, 2018

BARCA: Okay. For the people just coming in, there is room in the back and go ahead and get

yourself signed in, we're going to keep moving. Can I have approval of the agenda this evening, please.

GRIMWADE: I would move a **MOTION** to approve the agenda, Mr. Chairman, subject to moving the item CPZ2018-00005, Manufactured Housing, to the end of the agenda.

BENDER: **Second** that.

BARCA: It's been motioned and seconded to adjust the agenda to put manufacturing housing at the end of the agenda. All those in favor.

EVERYBODY: AYE

BARCA: No opposed? Okay. That is our new agenda. We will be doing Ward first, then N.E. 99th Street Extension and then we will move to Manufactured Housing. Okay.

B. Approval of Minutes for July 19, 2018

BARCA: So we now will go through approval of the minutes from July 19th.

WRIGHT: **MOVE** the minutes approved.

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

BARCA: It's been motioned and seconded. No discussion? All those in favor of approving the minutes.

EVERYBODY: AYE

C. Communications from the Public

BARCA: Okay. And we're going to move to the component of the evening called communication from the public. This is not related to the agenda this evening.

If you have any items you want to bring forward to the Planning Commission unrelated to tonight's agenda, this is the opportunity that we put forward to the public. So if there's anybody that wants to come forward with an item unrelated to the agenda, this is your opportunity. Okay.

Seeing none, we're going to close that component and we are going to move into the public hearing items. We are going to start with CPZ2018-00002, Ward, and staff, please.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS & PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION:

CPZ2018-00002 Ward – A proposal to amend the comprehensive plan and zoning from Commercial Comprehensive Plan designation with Community Commercial zoning to High Density Residential Comprehensive Plan Designation with Residential zoning (R-30) on two parcels as follows: 104130000 and 104143000.

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

LUMBANTOBING: Good evening, Planning Commissioners. My name is Sharon Lumbantobing with Clark County Community Planning for the record. This is pertaining to CPZ2018-00002.

This applicant owns two adjacent parcels totaling 8.26 acres located at the intersection of N.E. 162nd Avenue and N.E. Ward Road. The applicant is requesting to amend the comprehensive plan designation and zoning from commercial with community commercial zoning to urban high density residential with R-30 zoning.

The history of this property is that this was urban low R1-6. In 2002 the County amended the comp plan and zoning designation from R1-6 to commercial to create an 11-acre commercial development site shown in white. The then owner had a commercial development site plan in two phases but only the first phase was built, the 2.74 acres to the north.

The applicant's narrative states that despite a decade of marketing efforts, the past and current owners have been unable to attract prospective tenants and/or buyers due to the access restrictions, the abundance of commercial retail space in the area and the emergence of e-commerce.

Less than a mile to the south is a major commercial node with a Safeway, there's a vacant commercial parcel just to the north and there's all the commercially zoned properties along Fourth Plain Road. The four-square mile area in the vicinity is predominantly zoned low to medium residential. There is no high density residential in this area. Both medium and high density residential zones allow duplex and multi-family dwellings.

The current commercial zoning allows integrated multi-family commercial or a mixed use structure, so residential could be built above the ground floor in its current commercial zoning. Staff finds that this request meets the applicable criteria and is recommending approval of this comp plan and zoning map amendment.

This is just a summary of the use tables from the commercial and the OR-30, this isn't all of the uses but you can just get a real quick comparison of the types of things that could be allowed in the two, the current and the proposed uses. That's it. Any questions?

BARCA: Do we have questions for staff?

LUMBANTOBING: I just want to turn it over to Laurie Lebowsky to speak about the transportation impact analysis piece.

BARCA: Okay.

LEBOWSKY: Thank you. I'm just going to speak real quickly about transportation impact analysis or the finding for public facilities.

The bottom line is that the applicant is proposing to change the zoning from commercial which according to the ITE, the International Transportation Engineering Manual, has a higher trip generation rate than what the applicant is proposing which is residential.

So what you have in your binder is that the existing community commercial zoning is expected to generate 8,310 daily trips, and you compare that to the proposed trip generation for residential which would be 1,640 trips.

I also want to add that the intersection of 162nd Avenue and Ward Road is under the jurisdiction of the Washington Department of Transportation. I did reach out to the representative from the Department of Transportation, in your binder there's an e-mail, and they're indicating they don't have issue, an issue with the proposed comprehensive plan amendment and zone change because it would be a lower trip generation rate.

That concludes my remarks and I'm here to answer any questions.

BARCA: It doesn't appear that we have any questions for you at this time. We'll reserve the opportunity to come back of course.

So what I'd like to do is read out a statement for our audience here and kind of set the ground rules for this evening. Okay.

So I'm going to start off by asking the Planning Commission if there is anybody that has to disclose any conflicts of interest? If not, we will go forward. Okay.

So we've just heard the staff report. And for the public testimony, anybody wishing to give oral testimony is to come forward to the front of the room, we have a chair and a microphone right there, we're going to ask you to speak into the microphone clearly, start off by stating your name and then spelling your name for the record.

Because of the crowd and this is a mix between people here who have the discussion about Ward and also the 99th Street interchange, I'm going to impose a three-minute time limit this evening.

We've received a lot of written testimony and I'm going to be asking that you don't read the e-mail or the letter that you turned in, but speak from the concept of what you really need us

to understand about what the impacts are to this project. Okay.

So if you have any exhibits you wish us to consider such as copies of your testimony, photographs, petitions or so forth, please bring them forward and hand them to staff. Okay.

And then when you get up here, be as relevant as possible, concise, don't repeat yourself or other people's testimony. If you agree with something that was previously said for the record, please state that you agree with that and we'll make sure that we are able to take that into account.

Once I have gone through and understood that everybody from the public has spoken on the particular matter at hand, I'll close public testimony and then we'll bring it back to staff for questions or for the Planning Commission to deliberate, and at that point in time we won't be taking any additional testimony from the public. Okay.

So with that being said, we're going to start with the proponents of the project and have them come forward and then we will move right into public testimony.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

HOWSLEY: Good evening, Chair Barca, Planning Commission members. For the record, Jamie Howsley, 1499 S.E. Tech Center Place, Suite 380, Vancouver, Washington 98683. Attorney for the applicant, Ward 162nd Avenue, LLC and GC Capital, LLC. My client is affiliated with the Gramor Development.

As the Commission may know, Gramor is a very large regional commercial developer doing projects from Lake Oswego to the Vancouver Waterfront down here as well as various other developments throughout Clark County. I think that staff summarized our request very well this evening.

Our client has been actively trying to market this site for commercial opportunities for well more than a decade and has not had any success at doing so. Given their expertise in the industry, if they can't make something work out there, it's doubtful that other commercial developers would also be able to do that.

Therefore, we came forward with this request trying to find what would be the best use of the property given its adjacency or given the fact that it does have commercial on it and what the surrounding uses would be, and we believe that a, that this type of density would provide a nice transition zone between the existing single-family residential around it and the commercial development itself.

As the Planning Commission may be well aware of, our region is facing a severe housing shortage. I can cite you a litany of statistics, but just last week for instance Portland State did a study showing that Multnomah County alone needed more than 30,000 units today to make

up for affordability within our region.

I had the opportunity to chair a housing affordability seminar back in February talking about the issues in Oregon and Washington and I can affirmatively state that, you know, part of the lingering affects of the recession, our country is about four million units under built and we're going to have a very long slough to come back and get those units into production and part of the outfall of that has been this affordability crisis that we are suffering.

And so if we're going to continue to be a good strong viable community that's attracting good employers, we need to have that other side of the equation balanced and we believe again more housing is needed and it's clearly demonstrated by the evidence and we believe that this is a great location for it given the lack of ability to put commercial there.

I did attend the Planning Commission work session two weeks ago on this project and I did hear some concerns from Planning Commissioner Bender as well as Planning Commissioner Wright related to some transportation concerns, and so with me this evening is Chris Brehmer from Kittelson Engineering and he'll be able to talk about the traffic impact analysis that was conducted on this as well as maybe alleviate some of those kinds of concerns in terms of how many trips would be produced by this change.

BREHMER: Good evening. For the record, my name is Chris Brehmer, I'm a licensed professional engineer here in the state of Washington and here on behalf of the firm Kittelson & Associates. The last name is spelled B as in boy, r-e-h-m-e-r. I have been engineer of record for this project actually dating back to the 2004 traffic study that was for the original commercial development.

What I want to do for your benefit as well as the public is just kind of walk through some of the history on this site and what we see as the trip implications of a rezone if it were to be approved.

You have a copy of the slides that I'm going to be walking through, and to keep this fairly basic what you're looking at first is an image of the property back in 2004 when we first looked at development of this site. You can see at the time it was vacant. At the time 162nd was a stop controlled intersection, single left-turn lane at the traffic signal here, Ward Road had a median down and our mission at the time was to figure out how to support commercial development of this property.

Through the traffic study that was prepared, there were a number of mitigations that we recommended that were subsequently constructed. These included the new traffic signal at 162nd that serves the commercial property, it included turn lanes on Ward Road, there was a physical interconnection of the new traffic signal with the existing traffic signals so that they could communicate with each other and be coordinated, there were frontage improvements provided on both 162nd and Ward that allowed for additional travel lanes, and all of those improvements were reviewed by the County, ultimately conditioned on the project and have

been approved.

We go back and look at that 2004 image and compare it to an image of 2007 after the development had been approved. You can see all the frontage improvements that were installed, the intersection was reconfigured and signalized, the frontage improvements were installed down here and the frontage improvement that were built along this portion of the site allowed the County to then install the second left-turn lane. Those improvements were all recommendations and delivered by the project on the assumption that there would be a commercial development there.

As you know, a portion of the commercial development was constructed, there was a large portion of the project that has not been constructed. What we've done is compared the trip generation of what has not yet been constructed to what could be constructed under the existing zoning. What remains undeveloped in the prior traffic studies is just under 80,000-square feet of retail space and at the time there was an assumption of a gas station with a convenience market.

What I'm presenting to you this evening is a comparison of the trips associated with that development that the infrastructure has already been provided for by the applicant to what would be generated by a 247 apartment unit building.

The transportation report that we submitted provided a side-by-side comparison and what we looked at is, first of all, the trip generation associated with apartments, these are based on national average trip rates for apartment buildings across the country and are recognized trip rates by the County WSDOT and transportation professionals nationwide.

We compared that directly to the trip generation of the shopping center, and as Ms. Lebowsky was referring in her opening remarks, there are approximately 8300 trips a day that would have been generated by that commercial development compared to the roughly 1640 trips per day generated by an apartment building.

Now, in the world of traffic engineering some of you may be familiar with what we call pass-by trips and internal trips where people passing by a convenience store, for example, or a gas station will stop there as a matter of convenience, so they're not new trips to the entire road network, and so we make a reduction for that which we refer to as net new trips.

So to be fair, we compared the net new trips at 3900 to the apartment trips at 1600 per day, still a significant reduction in total trips generated by the site. So from a transportation perspective there's a reduction in the total number of trips.

What you're now looking at is our projection back from 2004 where the commercial trips would go to. You can see that there was a portion certainly heading to the south and west, there was a portion heading to homes to the north and then a significant portion heading to the northeast and up 88th Street with the implication being that homes up in that area in particular

don't have a lot of commercial services and so would come down to this site for those commercial services.

If you think of that and compare it to a residential context, residential would have less reason to go to the northeast and up 88th Street, there will be some trips but we'd expect much more of the trip orientation to be towards the south, the employment areas, schools, other facilities, so there will be fewer trips, and of the trips that remain, we anticipate more of them going to the southwest.

From a Clark County concurrency code approval criteria there are operating standards for signalized intersections. We have reviewed how the traffic signals are working today at 162nd and Ward and it is well within the County's operating standards, the code citations are there, and there's additional detail in that report if you'd like to get into them, we can.

The bottom line is the signal is working today with a reduction in trips, the signal will have less demand on it than we had originally anticipated, so there will be less delay.

We reached out to the Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council and asked them what their 20-year projections for the roadway corridors are, they show those corridors operating under capacity in the 20-year future, and again, we would be now generating fewer trips than their models presume.

Final point to make is that this site rezone application is not the final word on transportation. If you were to approve the rezone, there would still be a subsequent traffic study for any site application to actually build homes, so the driveways, the operations would all need to be reviewed again and it would be subject to both Clark County, and as Ms. Lebowsky mentioned, WSDOT review. So this is essentially the opening stage of the transportation review.

To wrap it all up, the site infrastructure for this site as a commercial development with many more trips was already approved and constructed. The rezone will reduce the number of trips that could be generated by the property. There will be less impact to the northeast particularly 88th Street and some of the sections of Ward Road to the north that I know are of concern to the community.

The County Concurrency Code criteria can be satisfied and there will be further review if there was rezone or approved prior to any approval of a site plan application for apartments.

That concludes my testimony. I'm happy to answer questions, otherwise I'll turn it back over.

BARCA: Do we have questions?

WRIGHT: I had a question for Mr. Howsley. Has the proponent looked at single family at a higher density in the undeveloped commercial area, say 6,000-square-foot lots as opposed to going to the heavier density?

WISER: Get closer to your mic.

WRIGHT: Did you get any of it? Okay. I was asking Mr. Howsley if the proponent had looked at higher density single-family housing say 6,000-square-foot lots in contrast to going with the higher density UH-30 or Urban 30?

HOWSLEY: To be -- that's a good question, Mr. Wright. I think that the only thing that we had examined was the potential, for again, what we ended up submitting R-30 as well as maybe an R-22 designation.

Apartments are a funny animal I would say units in terms of doing rental pools. You need to have a certain mass to make it efficient from a management standpoint and I know Mr. Brehmer was kind of giving you the worst case scenario for the transportation analysis purposes and I think that that's, you know, justifiable, but just based on the site and the constraints and the fact that my client is, you know, a pretty well-known regional developer that likes to be conscious of surrounding uses, it certainly that that yield would come down and so that R-30 proposal was kind of hitting that sweet, sweet spot from the management standpoint.

WRIGHT: Thank you.

HOWSLEY: Thank you.

GRIMWADE: I just have a question here. Earlier tonight there was a slide that showed a different number of uses within the commercial zoning, from a trip transportation perspective, do every one of those uses within that list of those permissible within a commercial zone have the same trip generation and, if not, how do they compare to the R-30 proposal?

BREHMER: Would you pull that slide back up. So of the commercial uses you see listed there, the scenario that we've presented was what was the development site plan application that was previously approved and that was the basis for the trip generation that we used.

Looking at that list, certainly a church facility in particular would have a lower trip generation than a commercial facility particularly on a weekday, most churches have activities in the evenings but they're primarily a weekend oriented type of situation, similarly professional office space will have a different trip generation complexion than retail.

From a rezone perspective, the charge that I'm given as a transportation engineer is to look at that worst case condition to ensure that the level of infrastructure we provide is sufficient to support whatever the developer ultimately provides and typically these situations we're going the other direction where we're actually adding trips to the system and so we're needing to compensate with more infrastructure. This one is a little unique in actually reducing the trip generation.

It's possible that there's a retail scenario that could be different from what we proposed, but again, I thought the cleanest thing to do was compare it to what was actually approved back in 2004. Does that answer your question?

GRIMWADE: Yeah, that answers the question. The other question I have is, were all those commercial uses explored by the developer or did he just have one exploration which he was in the marketplace for ten years?

HOWSLEY: I'm sorry, could you repeat the first part of that.

GRIMWADE: Did your developer, your client, look at each one of those uses when trying to market the property or did he just say I'm particularly only seeking this sort of use of the land and therefore I'm only going to look at that in a ten-year period?

HOWSLEY: No. Again, Gramor is one of the largest regional commercial developers in Oregon and Washington and, you know, they're very sophisticated, do very sophisticated retail centers and mixed use facilities, you know, you may have been to the one in downtown Lake Oswego for instance that has commercial and retail and, you know, residential above.

They looked at a whole host of opportunities on this site and it, just for whatever reason, I think it probably has to do with some of the reasons we enumerated in our initial application, the visibility issues, some of the traffic issues, the dearth of commercial down on Fourth Plain as well as quite frankly the changing nature of commercial in the United States and moving more towards e-commerce and I believe we gave a whole list of citations to back that up from an evidentiary standpoint.

GRIMWADE: Thank you.

HOWSLEY: Thank you.

BENDER: Did the developer look at the current build-out that's going on within a mile and a half radius of that commercial site at all?

HOWSLEY: Yes.

BENDER: And my calculations are there's a total of nine developments within a mile to mile and a half of that center, approximately 800 homes either have been built or in the stages of being built, and using a factor of three individuals per home, that's 2400 customers for a commercial venture.

Seems to me that the nearest supermarket is Safeway, that's a mile away, the next one is five miles and that's Freddy Meyer, those people are going to want to consume gasoline, food stuff and there are also in the area every single commercial site that's a business potential is leased,

there's no leasing within two miles of your site for businesses, another opportunity. Was that explored?

HOWSLEY: Yes.

BENDER: And what was your conclusion then?

HOWSLEY: Again, the conclusion was that this is not a viable commercial site.

BENDER: Based upon?

HOWSLEY: Their expertise in the market.

BENDER: Okay. Thank you.

BARCA: Everybody satisfied at this moment? Okay. Thank you for your testimony.

HOWSLEY: Thank you.

BARCA: Okay. We are going to go ahead and start the list. This will be me calling up individuals one at a time. Please remember we're going to have a three-minute time limit, so be as concise as possible. Don't let this dissuade you from coming up if you're on the list and you'd like to talk or even after I exhaust the list, you have an opportunity to come forward. We're going to start with Sandra Yager.

YAGER: Good evening. My name is Sandra Yager, S-a-n-d-r-a, Y-a-g-e-r, and I'm here today as the superintendent of Hockinson School District.

Always we are welcome to have families and new students in our school, but I have a concern with this change due to the fact that we have three schools, we have an elementary school which has been with the last changes in education with K, you know, full grade, full day Kindergarten and the lower class sizes in K-3, we have a facility that is actually pretty compressed as it is.

And as you very well stated, there's about 800 new homes in stages of being built and we are actually currently placing portables in our school and work with the County obviously for those permits and we were told that we have one more set of portables to add, hopefully we will do that next summer, but after that our sewer capacity is done.

So even though we may receive impact fees and we may be able to buy more portables, we would not be able to place them in our schools. So this potential growth with the number of students, you know, as you say three people per home and assuming the growth, it would really put the district in a difficult position to house safely and appropriately students in a short near future.

So I am here to let you know that in the staff report I, you know, state in point E that there's adequate and sufficient public services, facilities and I am not sure that that is true for the schools.

Also, you know, we have looked through our facilities plan looking at land and it is actually very difficult to find land in the south end of our district that is actually not wet. So we've done a wetland mitigation in the high school and it took us about six years to get that permit, and then also the cost that it would take for our community that was just bonded to build a new middle school, to actually build a new elementary school, it would be very difficult.

As you know, Hockinson has very, very little commercial, if anything, so actually this would help the school district if commercial was developed if possible.

I also would like to state that if I heard correctly when the gentleman that was speaking about the traffic talked about not having trips to the north for the schools, all of our schools are to the north. This is the entire property is in the Hockinson School District and that Ward Road would be, I think that it would impact some traffic as well, so... And at this time I am done.

BARCA: Okay.

BENDER: Yeah. Did anybody from the developer contact the school district?

YAGER: No.

BENDER: The County?

YAGER: No.

BENDER: Thank you.

YAGER: You're welcome.

BARCA: Any other questions?

WRIGHT: Yes. Now, I understand you'd be collecting impact fees for all the units.

YAGER: Right.

WRIGHT: And you have a long-term plan to match your funding needs to your new school needs, et cetera, so this is it safe to say this is primarily a short-term problem or is it something that's going to put a crimp into your entire long-term plans for the entire area?

YAGER: That's a great question. As I stated, I mean the impact fees could provide that

short-term solution for purchasing of the portables, but it's not permanent housing for students, but certainly would, but without the sewer capacity we would not be able to place them in our current property, that's what -- then we would look at then how would we grow into a different property, but then in order to build a new school, you know, it's a process of a five year anyway assuming that the community could really every time we ask for a bond or a levy in our community it truly lands onto the backs of our property owners which is really a tough thing to ask in a district like ours that has so little or no industry or commercial.

WRIGHT: Okay. Thank you.

YAGER: You're welcome.

BARCA: Thank you.

YAGER: Thank you.

BARCA: Marnie Allen.

ALLEN: I'll pass.

BARCA: Okay. Charlotte Bruce.

BRUCE: I'll pass.

BARCA: Okay. Emily Edwards.

EDWARDS: Just Emily Edwards just in the neighborhood off of 81st, moved there about two years ago.

BARCA: Can you start by spelling your name for me.

EDWARDS: Spelling my name. Emily Edwards, E-m-i-l-y, Edwards, E-d-w-a-r-d-s.

BARCA: Thank you. Get closer to the mic.

EDWARDS: Over on 81st, just moved over there two years ago. My concern would be, like you, Richard, said, the surrounding area just so much development just to give it a chance and please just wait a little bit on this one because you don't know the impact yet, and that's it. Thank you.

BARCA: Thank you, Emily. Gary Pierce. Ready, Sonja.

PIERCE: Good evening, Planning Commission. My name is Gary Piece, G-a-r-y, P-i-e-r-c-e, and I live in the neighborhood directly to the south of this development in Shadow Ridge. And

I have several observations and concerns regarding what may happen to the surrounding neighborhoods and homeowners if this plan change and rezone is approved.

To start off with, many homeowners have had or have a significant investment in their homes and properties, most of all of which were purchased when there was more certainty about the future development of the adjoining property and that would be the commercial, retail, office, clinic and so forth.

The maximum building height, and these are just some of the issues, the maximum building height in our neighborhood is 35 feet in an R1-6 zone. The commercial zoning, should that continue, there is no restriction on building height but they do have some mitigating rules which are to either step the buildings back, increase the setbacks I think up to 40 feet, or I think there's a requirement to maybe step the buildings down in that case on the perimeters.

The maximum building height, or actually if the comp plan and zoning change is approved, the proposed is approved, the maximum building height would be 50 feet in the multi-family district that you would find yourself in. And then depending on the orientation of the buildings whether it be a front or a side or a rear, the houses to the south which is my neighborhood could find multi-story buildings as close as 10 feet to the common property lines.

This could create both an unexpected and unreasonable encroachment on the livability of the property and the future value of these homes.

Regarding Clark County parking requirements, and this doesn't come from the perspective of the ITE manual and I realize that, but just looking at what the Clark County requires for parking for commercial and for apartments, there are signs on the property now advertising 66,000-square feet of floor space, although I heard a different figure tonight, it was 70,000 something, but if we base Clark County's parking requirements on 66,000-square feet, that would require 189 parking spaces.

If there were 247 apartment units built there, the parking requirement would be 371 parking spaces and I think the reality is something a little bit different than what we all know that is, there's usually more than one and a half parking spaces per unit, that's the reality. And so that in effect if there's three cars per unit, that would generate or cause a need of 741 parking spaces and cars coming and going all day long and through the night.

And this has been partly covered I think due to recent nearby and proposed single-family development in the immediate area and the increased significant congestion that it has caused coming and going from the Shadow Ridge neighborhood, our traffic problems potentially will get much more frustrating and intolerable especially with the potential for apartments when we have planned, long planned on a less impactful commercial development.

BARCA: Mr. Pierce.

PIERCE: Yes.

BARCA: We didn't have the tone go off for the three minutes, but we're at about three minutes and 48 seconds, so if you could give us a wrap up.

PIERCE: I'll wrap it up. So in the event that you do recommend approval of this, I would just request, respectfully request the following. Well, not to approve the rezone first off; second, in the event that you do, consideration be given to restricting access into the neighborhood to the south in particular on N.E. 164th Avenue and that also consideration be given to proposing greater south and east perimeter setbacks and/or stepping of the building heights down to lessen the impact on the adjoining residential neighborhoods. That's all I have unless you have any questions.

BARCA: Questions?

BENDER: Yeah, I have a question. How did you derive the three cars?

PIERCE: Like I said, that was not from the ITE manual. I spent 37 years as a land use planner in Vancouver, Clark County and Sherwood, Oregon and this is just some of my impromptu observations, not technical, but probably more reality than not.

BENDER: Also, Adam's Glen Estates, the one just being developed by you, that's going to funnel partially through your neighborhood, isn't it?

PIERCE: Say again.

BENDER: Adam's Glen off of 88th.

PIERCE: Yes.

BENDER: That will be funneling partially through your neighborhood?

PIERCE: There is a road connection there now, yes, that's correct.

BENDER: Thank you.

BARCA: Thank you, Mr. Pierce. Sonja, can we have the timer be audible. Okay. All right. And we are at Dena Rawlings.

RAWLINGS: Hello. My name is Dena Vickery Rawlings, that's spelled D-e-n-a, Vickery is V-i-c-k-e-r-y, and Rawlings, R-a-w-l-i-n-g-s. I live also in Shadow Ridge south of the proposed land and I agree with many of the concerns that are brought forth.

One thing that I would like to raise in my concern is only talk about the traffic of commercial

versus the high density residential is the time frame in which some of this traffic would occur.

I am raising three young girls in the neighborhood next and I think about commercial property oftentimes like Walgreens closes at a particular time of day so as not to bring louder noises or concerns in the evening hours for my children, and I'm concerned that apartment living or higher density may change that, we may have more late hour noise and traffic that would be different for someone raising a family near there.

Otherwise, also concerned with what Sandra had said and the rural feel of our community, you know, small convenient store is the heart of our community and I think commercial growth would be incredibly well for our community as well if we were to go to high density it would drastically hurt our schools which would hurt our youth and our overall community.

One concern that I have that hasn't been raised is the drainage. In my home that is south of that property, I have a grade in my backyard. When I purchased the home in 2014, I was given the impression that that was because of the water or the wetlands or the concern of drainage in that commercial property that is near me.

I don't know the specifics on that, but I would want to bring to your attention that that is a concern that that would be properly drained and that that has been investigated and looked into because I would be concerned with commercial versus high density would change I would think the way that we set that up. The long-term planning that would have occurred maybe for the homes surrounding there wouldn't be adequately ready or prepared to handle the drainage that would be different for high density living.

Obviously those are not specifics that I'm fully educated on, but I would ask you to be aware of those concerns and really fully investigate those. As a homeowner near there I would want peace of mind that those have been thought through. Thank you.

BARCA: Questions? Thank you. Gerald.

BREZO: No.

BARCA: No? Yes?

BREZO: No.

BARCA: Okay. Emily Abraham.

ABRAHAM: Pass.

BARCA: Okay. Thomas Brezo.

BREZO: I give Gary my extra time. Okay.

BARCA: Okay. Diana Olson.

OLSON: Diana Olson, D-i-a-n-a, O-l-s-o-n. First of all, I appreciate every comment that everybody has made before me and I agree with them. I would also ask that you not approve the rezoning.

My concern is the property taxes that are continuing to go up, and with the zoning of an apartment complex, those residents in the apartment complexes do not have to pay the property taxes that we have to pay, and not to mention the bonds and stuff that come with overcrowding of schools and the different things that come with that.

When we first moved into Hockinson South, we were excited to know that there was going to be more commercial development there because we would have, it would be more convenient for us and our children and we wouldn't have to go all the way to Safeway or, you know, to Fred Meyer's and we would appreciate to have a store like a Natural Grocers or, you know, a Trader Joe's, something with, you know, more healthier organic type foods, and that's all I have to say. Thank you.

BARCA: Any questions? Thank you for your testimony. Dennis Olson. No? Dennis Olson. Okay. Linda Cole.

COLE: I don't know if I need to come up because I --

BARCA: Linda, if you want to talk you do need to come up.

COLE: Okay. I'm Linda Cole, C-o-l-e is the last name, and I live in Granton Park and I guess a lot of my issues have been already addressed especially the points that Gary Pierce brought up as far as the congestion and especially on Ward Road.

And then the other thing I'm concerned about is the Hockinson School District and the points that were brought up there. And I think that's -- and then just the value of our homes in Granton Park if there were apartment complexes in the area. Thank you.

BARCA: Okay. I do have one question, and this is somewhat of a general question for everybody involved here, but does everybody recognize that if we don't make any changes, the prediction is there will be more traffic than less. Okay.

PUBLIC: May I respond to that?

BARCA: No. You can come up when it's your turn though. I just want to be clear before we end up making a decision that everybody understands the way it's reported right now we're talking about the idea that the intersections would carry more traffic. And were you aware of that?

COLE: With the proposal?

BARCA: No.

COLE: With commercial?

BARCA: Yes.

COLE: How about some of the points that were made as far as the time of day?

BARCA: I think that's all relevant, but I just want to be really sure that all of the people that are here asking for no change they understand the way the staff report is written and what the proponents testimony is.

COLE: Okay. Thank you.

BARCA: Thank you. Jim Cole.

COLE: I'll pass.

BARCA: John Janzce.

JANZCE: You got my name right. John Janzce, J-o-h-n, J-a-n-c-z-e, and I agree with everything that's been said so far with the audience. One other thing I have, oh, a couple of things.

I know the Sheriff's Department is really shorthanded, and being a retired deputy sheriff, I know apartment complexes bring a lot more crime. We're already short staffed with sheriff's deputies. We had a neighborhood watch meeting where the Sheriff's Department said they only have six deputies throughout the whole county on nightshift, so unless there's plans to be any additional deputies added along with, let's see, adding apartments. Again, with the schools. And that's basically all I had to add except for everything else was said. Thank you.

BARCA: Any questions?

BENDER: Do you have any stats that shows apartment complexes generating more than a residential?

JANZCE: I don't have stats. I just worked the road for many years and we had more calls to apartment complexes in the area I lived and worked than any residential areas.

BENDER: Common sense I know. Okay. Thank you.

BARCA: Thank you. Edgar Feldman.

FELDMAN: I'll pass.

BARCA: All right. Thank you, Edgar. All right. One page done. Kelly Jones.

JONES: My name is Kelly Jones, K-e-l-l-y, J-o-n-e-s, and I just wanted to say that I am in complete agreement with all the things that have been said thus far and I want to reiterate the impact that it's going to have on the schools. We've had an inundation of development in our school district in the past couple of years, and although I recognize the need that we need housing for people, we have had a lot of housing built in our district.

My daughter was in a class of 28 last year and I assume that it will probably be about the same kind of class size as next year and we just need to be cognizant of the fact that we're putting a huge, huge demand on the schools. Thank you very much.

BARCA: Thank you. Dessi Armstrong.

ARMSTRONG: Good evening. Dessi Armstrong, D-e-s-s-i, A-r-m-s-t-r-o-n-g. I'm in complete agreement with everybody that spoke before me. I live in the neighborhood called Hockinson South to the north of the proposed development area.

I want to agree about possible increase of crime. When you have apartment units, unfortunately people do tend to move in and out more often which brings less care for the community. We're a community and it's not an affordable community, and I think that building rental apartments next to non-affordable community it's just a bad match for everyone that want to create a better area for our children.

I am concerned with the studies that the proponent has made, they have not contacted the school. When they made the proposals, they have not marketed, as you asked the question to for any other uses as opposed to the original proposed use. I will be much more agreeable with a grocery store.

If you go to Safeway, they keep talking about this big purchasing hub in the Safeway area, if you go there this store is empty. I don't know for how long this is going to stay on. Most people go to shop to Fred Meyer, Costco, Whole Foods and New Seasons which are miles away. I think that if we build a better shopping center with -- we have a huge community, these are expensive homes, people want to buy the better more expensive foods, healthy foods, I think that there is a market for us to have a better grocery store or to have a youth center for our children.

We have houses all over the place and not a park in sight that they can play basketball or baseball that's within reach, we don't have to drive our children to.

I will be up for professional offices use or anything besides a high density area because this brings a lot of issues along with it.

I also want to question the point that was made that there was a median on Ward Road, I have lived in this neighborhood since 2005, I do not recall ever having a median on Ward Road. I don't see how, you know, traffic whether it's commercial or residential use there is going to be traffic and this has to be addressed one way or another; however, I'm just questioning the studies of the proponent when they bring all these issues how everything will be nice and beautiful when I just want us to question more their studies.

BARCA: Sounds like you're time's up.

ARMSTRONG: Yeah. Thank you.

BARCA: All right. Any questions for Dessi? Thank you very much. Brian Armstrong.

ARMSTRONG: He said pass.

BARCA: Okay. Ann Caingcoy. Did I get it right? Get it close? Not even close. Fix it for me. Fix it.

CAINGCOY: Thank you. My name is Ann Caingcoy. It's A-n-n, C-a-i-n-g-c-o-y. It's okay, it was a good try. I'm here representing most of the owners of Granton Park neighborhood, I'm president of the HOA.

At this point most of our concerns have already been voiced, but I do want to let you be aware that we had several petitions that have been submitted that were canvassed around our neighborhood and signed.

There's one there, there should have been another one as well and there were quite a few written testimonies that had been sent in in opposition of this proposal. We are very concerned about our property values. This is a new development. It just recently finished and we have another new development coming in right next to us, actually two of them.

So these are all homeowners, a lot of people are retired, some are new families with young children that have saved to build these homes and we're concerned that our property values will be decreased, and should we decide we do need to move to move away from this, it will be harder to sell our homes and we won't get what we paid for them.

There have been other concerns in the neighborhood and one of the things that we would like to see, but maybe besides just regular commercial, but there's a lack of good daycare, so day-care facilities for children in that area would also be something that could possibly be looked into. Thank you.

BARCA: Questions? No? Thank you. All right. Let's try this one, Frank Caingcoy.

CAINGCOY: I pass. My wife said it all.

BARCA: Bill Rohrbach.

HOLLEY: What did he say?

BARCA: I have no idea. Are you passing?

PUBLIC: He said he concurs.

BARCA: Okay. Concurrence. Great. Ami Hamlin. Okay. Jessica --

SWINDELL: Hold on.

BARCA: Oh, I'm sorry.

HAMLIN: I got polka dots. Ami, A-m-i, Hamlin, H-a-m-l-i-n. I appreciate the opportunity to come and to speak with you and I also agree with the things that have been said.

I think for me the part that I'd like to bring up to you is what I feel, as a new Washingtonian, the incongruence of infrastructure and what I perceive as a long-term game plan, not that I have seen your game plan, but I don't sense it.

An example not relating to this is 117th by WinCo going down to the 500 going down to Fourth Plain, the other day, and this isn't the first time, an ambulance needed to go by, there's no room for that ambulance to go by, there's no median, there's no preparation for large traffic and I feel that same thing about 162nd.

I feel that some kind of a commercial use, a professional medical opportunity could be there if 162nd and Ward were more appropriately aligned. You can't get through easily both directions and I'm not sure if it's just the shape or having Walgreens taking that front position on that property, but I don't believe it was initially well developed and then that leaves a problem.

So I think if traffic were redirected, it would at least allow a better utilization of that piece of property, and I sense that throughout the county.

I feel like, and this is the emotional part, the ugly redheaded stepchild is this back area of Clark County. It's kind of Vancouver forgotten, even though I have a Vancouver zip code, I don't feel like it's given the attention and the true feeling toward having a relaxed growth opportunity.

I feel like -- I feel like we've jumped from a 40-year growth plan, slow growth, five acres, two

and a half acres to 10,000 acres or 10,000-square feet to 6,000-square feet and we're just kind of jamming it in. I don't feel like we've made an opportunity for this area. If this truly was the point to have a slow growth kind of feel, I don't feel like we've addressed that. I guess that's all I have to say. Thank you.

BARCA: Any questions? Thank you for your testimony.

HAMLIN: Thank you.

BARCA: Now I'm going to get this -- that's it. Okay. Jessica and it's Pumin or Rumin. Pumin, there you go.

RUMIN: Good evening. My name's Jessica Rumin and I live in Granton Park, my husband and I own a home.

I just submitted 104 signatures that I've collected Monday and Tuesday night. I actually was not aware of this rezoning proposal until recently, so I know that the Council will be making a decision soon; however, once I have as potentially postponing so we have time to collect more signatures.

I have spent many hours this week talking to folks. In collecting signatures, I think I've only had maybe three people in the neighborhood that have felt mixed or potentially fine with the rezoning, but by and large most folks are opposed.

Unprompted, many residents thought that it would be great to have a coffee shop or a restaurant. I can't speak to the commercial growth side of things in terms of the work the proponent has done with regard to those growth opportunities, but these are all new residents so it might be interesting to do a new assessment of that.

My concern with regard to the staff report is in regards to Criteria E, adequacy timelines of public facilities and services, I do agree with the proponent that we have an issue in Clark County and in Portland metro with regard to housing, with regard to housing prices, inventory and homelessness, I don't disagree with that. I don't know that the proposal application is appropriate.

When I called C-TRAN, I asked about bus line 74 which services this site, I was told that the bus comes from 5:00 a.m. to 9:15 p.m. every hour. When I asked the representative how that compares, she said many locations are served ten minutes an hour, so -- excuse me -- every ten minutes, I apologize. So my question is, does this proposed development actually serve a high density community the way that it is being proposed?

I'm also concerned with the school district, the superintendent and other parents have spoken. I think that it's important to recognize that we don't have other commercial and so the homeowners in our district are paying for the taxes. We are paying a new bond for the middle

school and the State has actually also increased their taxes to pay for teacher salaries. So my question is, is it really appropriate to increase taxes even more given the current burden?

So I guess in conclusion, I just wonder if we need to be really thoughtful about when we're talking about rezoning thinking about the impacts. When you read the staff report and when you read the application, 197-page application that Gramor presented, it says there is no impact to resources, this is I believe a non-project action is how it was claimed, and my concern is that when the staff are doing these reports and reviewing this that they actually are doing the proper research so that when they fill this criteria out it is accurate. So thank you.

HOLLEY: Can you spell your name.

RUMIN: Yes. Oh, excuse me. Jessica, J-e-s-s-i-c-a. Last name Rumin, R-u-m-i-n. Thank you.

BARCA: Thank you. Marilyn Green.

GREEN: Hi. I'm Marilyn Green, M-a-r-i-l-y-n, Green like the color, G-r-e-e-n. I echo everybody's sentiments against this proposal.

I'd like to draw attention to was briefly stated about the childcare. I'm a single mother, I put three kids through school there. I now have three grandkids that live with me. My daughter has been on waiting lists for four years to try and get someplace close to get childcare in our area. She even last year had to remove the children because of her job and put them in Mill Plain Elementary School because there is no daycare in that area available at all.

Anybody that works, we're not going to work right there, we're going out farther into the community and there also is no transportation from the school after hours. There's no school after programs there like there are in Vancouver.

I'd also like to call attention to one of the pictures that was shown by the proponent was not from 2004. My house was built in 2002, it was not on that picture. There was a statement also made that more housing or community commercial property brings more employers -- or not -- or excuse me -- not commercial housing or commercial property, but more housing brings more employers, that's not correct. Commercial property brings more employers. You might get more people, but that's not going to bring more employers to an area.

The study that was done on Multnomah County, why wasn't this study done on Clark County? I don't see, I mean, yes, there's a lot of homelessness in the area, but I don't think that's relevant to this issue. And just again would like to say that I totally agree with everything everybody else is saying and that's it.

BARCA: Questions for Marilyn? Thank you. Marilyn McGraw.

MCGRAW: Good evening. Dr. Marilyn McGraw, M-a-r-i-l-y-n, M-c-G-r-a-w. I'd like to begin my remarks by thanking you in particular Bill and Richard for your thoughtful questions of the applicant's representative, it gives me great hope that you are truly contemplating this very important issue.

That said, as an organizational psychologist I am very aware of the ability to creatively crunch numbers. To that point, I mean no disrespect to Mr. Brehmer, the applicant's representative when he talked about the traffic studies, but I think the sense that you are hearing from other speakers as well as myself is when we talk about the traffic perhaps becoming a higher number, I think we need to remain cognizant that commercial would distribute that traffic throughout the day and then has clear starts and stop timelines as has already been discussed as opposed to residential very clear early, afternoon, evening traffic issues.

Secondly, I'm very discouraged when the applicant's representatives were asked if the applicant had given thought to anything other than apartments, I essentially got the feel that the answer was no. From a market standpoint, I can understand why, and that wasn't clearly stated, but I think we all sort of understand why that might not have been thought out, apartments are more lucrative than other forms of high density housing. I am very opposed to this proposed event. I agree with all of the prior speaker statements.

If you were to consider a change, which I sincerely hope you will not, I would push for condos or town homes, this would increase the density but it gives stake in the game; i.e., ownership as opposed to renters.

Thirdly, as a prior city police officer I can only speak to the point that was already made by the prior sheriff's deputy, I have grave concerns for the crime in this area. Yes, I can only tell you my experience, but my range of calls for service was significantly higher for apartment complexes than single-family neighborhoods. The truth is, just the truth, and I apologize, I didn't bring statistics, but anyone can go on Vancouver City website and take a look at the maps, the blue dots don't lie.

And, lastly, a different issue, I'll probably be bending ears on this, 4th of July residue is still on our streets. I am a new resident to the area, I live on 81st Street and I'm deeply discouraged at the lack of services that I've seen thus far. Thank you.

BARCA: Questions for Dr. McGraw? Thank you. Jeff Learning.

LEARNING: I'll pass.

BARCA: Brian, 16309 N.E. 80th. I'm sorry, word documents are so much easier for me than handwriting.

FITZGEARLD: My name's Brian Fitzgearld, B-r-i-a-n, F-i-t-z-g-e-a-r-l-d. I live in the Shadow Ridge neighborhood, and I think, and I agree with most everything that's been said here

especially the impact of the cars. I did a little bit of calculations, I am in the insurance agency and we do have algorithms that actually pertain to a lot of cars in the apartments. So the gentleman was correct when he said two to three cars per apartment and you can actually go on to Allstate or whatever you want to or State Farm.

What I wanted to bring up was the impact of these cars are just going to be substantial. Just by figuring some of the, some of the calculations out, there's 449 cars for the apartment buildings, we have a new home development of 85 homes, that's about 170 cars there, another one over by the junior high, 78th Street, another 121 homes, 242 more cars there. We didn't take in consideration about the new elementary school being built on 164th and 35th, we're going to have another 600 cars for at least for an average of the elementary schools being built. So the impact on 162nd is going to be overwhelming.

I don't know what you guys start planning in the future. If this is going to be the case, they're going to have to start widening 162nd. It's been five years for me and I started in my agency in 2012, took me five minutes to get to work, it takes me almost 15 to 20 minutes to get from 80th Street to 18th and 18th Street which is that's a long time. And going back to home, I probably have to wait five minutes to get out of my parking lot for the commercial trucks coming through 162nd. So there is a very, very large consideration for the automobiles on that one.

And I think -- and also in that area where you're building apartments, have you ever considered a park? When's the last time that Clark County actually put some sort of a park together for all these children in the neighborhoods. We've got a lot of families around the Shadow Ridge area, maybe it would be a good consideration to donating the land. Thank you very much.

BARCA: Any questions for Mr. Fitzgearld?

BENDER: Yeah, I have a question.

BARCA: Please.

BENDER: On your actuary tables for apartment buildings, do insurance companies charge a higher rate for higher incident of theft or whatever?

FITZGEARLD: Correct. Correct. Yep. Yep.

BENDER: Thank you.

BARCA: Thank you. Katherine Lytle.

LYTLE: Good evening. My name's Katherine Lytle, K-a-t-h-e-r-i-n-e, the last name is L-y-t-l-e. Thank you so much for letting us speak to this issue tonight.

I agree with everything that's been said. The one thing I would like to add is that though the commercial property owner has been trying to do something with this property for ten years, they timed it poorly, there was a huge recession in the middle of that time.

So the first phase was completed prior and the second just did not make the cut. So if they could keep at it, they might get there. Thank you.

BARCA: Thank you. Danielle Sgranfetto.

SGRANFETTO: I'll pass.

BARCA: Wow. Okay. Two pages down. Leah Anaya, Anaya. No, not even close, huh. Gosh darn it. Well, at least I'm consistent.

ANAYA: Good evening. My name is Leah, L-e-a-h, Anaya, A-n-a-y-a. I was not planning on talking, so forgive disorganized thought but I wanted to talk a little bit more about the crime.

I am a medically retired Vancouver Police Officer and, sir, you were asking about stats, I would be more than happy to show you the report writing system, and she was talking about the blue dots, but let's talk about the types of reports that are generated in apartment buildings versus single-family dwellings of, for example, if you look at Battle Ground and you look at Meadow Glade versus First Place Apartments, they're our neighbor, let's look at their reports and let's see the types of calls police officers are being called to, the types of crime that's happening in that type of dwelling versus single-family homes and I think I speak for everybody that we don't want more crime in our small, small community and I don't want that around my children and in our schools.

BARCA: Are you done?

ANAYA: Yes. Do you have questions?

BARCA: Okay. Are there questions?

BENDER: I'll save it.

BARCA: Thank you.

SWINDELL: Thank you for your service.

ANAYA: Oh, thank you.

BARCA: Margot Rice.

RICE: You got that right. You did good.

BARCA: I'm on a roll.

RICE: Hi. My name is Margot, M-a-r-g-o-t, the last name Rice, R-i-c-e. And even though I live in the City of Vancouver, I'm still a Clark County resident as well.

And they say, well, gee, this doesn't impact you, but, oh, yes it does because I have seen what happens when you start putting in apartments. I live between 137th and 112th on 49th and we have lots of apartments on 49th and, you know, you can just see the difference between the neighborhoods of the apartments versus the single-family homes.

And it's not like Clark County I think is a very good comparison to Multnomah County, I think there's a lot of differences, and when you're using statistics on traffic from 2004, I mean I've only lived here five years and the traffic flow and the studies I'm sure have changed a lot on how many cars are up and down the roads.

I understand commercial versus residential, but when you have school buses that are going to be making that many more stops, you're already increasing your subdivisions, your homes, I mean as a county to plan the growth and which has already been established as more subdivision single-family homes and then start putting apartments in I think is a really big mistake.

And I think by the turnout you've seen tonight that most of the community sees it as such as well. At least for this location in this area, I certainly understand why they would want to do apartments. I'm sure it would be much more profitable than commercial development, but I can see where the commercial opportunity would grow greatly especially when ODOT puts in tolls down on I-5 or 205 I think there will be a lot more commercial opportunities wanting to move up here, so...

But there's I think really one of the best testimonies was the urban planner, and I'm sorry I forgot his name, but he's had years of experience and I think we should thank everyone who has shown up and spoken out because I'm sure this has got to be one of your largest turnouts. So thank you very much.

BARCA: Any questions? Thank you, Margot. Chris Mahoney. Did I say it wrong? How about Enn Mahoney? Douglas Smith. Bill or Jan Smith. Here it comes.

SMITH: I'm Bill.

BARCA: You're Bill. Well, you could have been Chris or Douglas for all I know. Okay. Great.

SMITH: It's a big family. Bill Smith, B-i-l-l, S-m-i-t-h. I just want to say a couple of things. I agree with everybody here, what they said and to not put in the apartments.

Several times a couple of retired or former police officers have come up here and talked about apartment complexes and call loads, I am currently a police officer. I've been a police officer for 21 years across the river. I work at an agency in a metropolitan area of about 120,000 people. I'm pretty sure that these statistics would apply to any law enforcement jurisdiction roughly the same size. So just last month the top ten addresses in my jurisdiction out of those top ten requiring police services, six of them were apartment complexes, out of the remaining four, three of those addresses were directly adjacent to multi-family housing apartment complexes.

So if people think that the crime rate is not going to increase, then, you know, I'm here to tell you it's probably going to go up which is going to be a burden on the Clark County Sheriff's Office, the fire department, AMR, so it's not just the police that's affected, it's everybody else.

The other thing I'd like to say too is that my wife and I moved into Granton Park about two and a half years ago with the understanding that the property in question was probably going to be developed into commercial property to assist the infrastructure of the neighborhoods that were going in and that's what we understood, and I kind of felt like that's a contract that I made with Clark County, you know, hey, I'm going to move here and they're going to develop that area hopefully into a nice wine tasting room, maybe a restaurant, you know, something good we can go to, but then to have to come here and say please don't do that and please don't put in a multi-family housing unit, I feel like, you know, I'm begging you guys to follow the contract that I made originally by moving into that complex.

The last thing I'd like to say too is that, you know, I love small government, I go to city council meetings all the time, I love it, I love hearing from the people, community members telling me, hey, these are the issues that we have and this is what you can do to fix it, well, that's what you have right now, you have the entire community out here that's going to be affected by this basically asking you please don't do this versus, you know, a manufacturer that wants to make money, somebody who is in business to make money versus us where this is our lives. So that's all I have. Any questions?

BARCA: Questions? Thank you, Bill.

SMITH: You're welcome.

BARCA: Joseph or Nadine Paddle.

PADDOCK: It was close.

BARCA: It was close. Close enough for you to recognize your name, I like that. Please come up here, sit up close, spell your name.

PADDOCK: Well, it's Adrienne, A-d-r-i-e-n-n-e, Paddock is the last name.

HOLLEY: I can't hear you.

BARCA: Yeah, talk into the microphone.

PADDOCK: Oh, Adrienne, A-d-r-i-e-n-n-e, and Paddock is the last name, P-a-d-d-o-c-k. And I wasn't planning on coming up and speaking either especially not after the standing ovation that was just came before me, but I just come up here speaking as a mom.

I have two young girls, I live in Shadow Ridge. We back up to the actual field that is going to be the proposed development of 247 high density housing apartment units that we would be, that would be towering over my property and we've lived there since 2004, we've been there 14 years.

When we, again when we moved in, it was understood that it was for commercial, it was going to be a commercial. We were excited when Walgreens came in, my girls we can go run to Walgreens, we ride our bikes to Walgreens and we're all for the commercial buildings, any coffee, you know, shops, anything that can be brought in, but that's my big concern is me raising my two young girls.

My school that they go to, Hockinson, the district is fantastic, but with all of those other surrounding neighborhoods being built all around us, to the east, to the north, to the southeast, I don't know how the schools are going to handle that population, I don't know how the roads are going to handle that population.

When I pull out of my neighborhood right now, I have to pull out of my neighborhood to 162nd there. I sit there for a good, there's no light, my choice is either to go right, head towards Padden and Ward or left if I'm going to go ahead south, but, you know, you have to sit there for a long time, you're sitting there, you're waiting, the light turns, I can only imagine how much more it's going to be when there's all of that traffic coming out of an apartment complex right there, already it's dangerous.

With the City, a lot of times I see my good neighbors out mowing the grass out there along those edges of the sidewalk because the grass grows so high sometimes that when you're pulling out of the neighborhood, you can't see, so you have to pull out really far. I think maybe it's the County or I think we're unincorporated Clark County, they'll cut those bushes down once a year or whenever they do that, but it's dangerous, it really would be dangerous, you'd be sitting there a long time.

But I mean that's what it comes down to for me mainly is the school, the crime, gosh, employment opportunities that could come from commercial buildings being there. I know that it was stated in that proposal about the short-term employment, that's not realistic, that's short-term.

Think of the long-term with the commercial buildings there, what kind of opportunities can be there for employment for our community members, so... I'm sorry, that's all I have. Again, I agree with what every- -- everything that was touched on before is I completely agree with.

BARCA: Thank you for your testimony.

PADDOCK: Thank you.

BARCA: Okay. The last one on the list, looks like it's maybe Anistacia Baylor. Am I close? Somebody Baylor? Well, good, they're not here to hear me butcher their name. That is the last name that is on the Ward list.

If there is anybody else that would like to come forward and testify on the matter of this request for zoning change, this is your opportunity to come forward; otherwise, I'm going to close public testimony.

Sir, in the back there, if you'd like to come forward please. Anybody else in the far back that wishes to come forward, come on, step up where I can see that you'd be next. Please state your name for the record.

SAUM: Good evening. My name is Greg Saum, G-r-e-g, S-a-u-m. I am a resident in the Shadow Ridge neighborhood that's immediately south of this where this proposed zoning changes is at. I'm also a teacher in the Hockinson School District.

And what I'm here to really talk about is something that Bill just very eloquently stated which is I purchased my home about two years ago in Shadow Ridge with the understanding that this property would be a commercial, it's zoned commercial, and when I think about that, I purchased this property not thinking that, oh, this is going to be the future home of a movie theater or a bowling alley, it's going to be something that is what I consider neighborhood commercial, something that people in my neighborhood could walk to, businesses that we could walk to. And clearly when apartments go in, that changes this, and I feel like that's, I mean for (inaudible) that's really unfair to us and dishonest.

And I also have to wonder those future residents in the Adam's Glen subdivision, which is going in just adjacent to this property, are they being notified that this is, that they're going to be buying homes that are going to be supposedly adjacent to an apartment complex?

Regardless of what the statistics say about crime and apartments, the perception is there, and when I go to finally sell my home, that's a perception that I have to fight against and that's a perception that my neighbors have to fight against and that is not something that again when we purchased our homes or built our homes, in many other cases, that was not the reality at the time.

Lastly, and I think somebody just mentioned this that as far as employment goes, this space

being a commercial space, I see it as an opportunity for many of my students when they're out looking for part-time work what a great place for them to be able to walk to instead of having to drive and fill up our streets with more cars, they can walk to this place or walk to these, you know, supposed businesses that would be built here.

We've already seen that, we've seen that at the Papa Murphy's. I run into my students all the time a Papa Murphy's. I see it further down the street at Burgerville and Safeway, but again, let's make this space or let's allow this space to be something that is welcomed by our neighborhood and welcomed by our community. It's a great neighborhood, it's a great community and that's what we deserve. Thank you.

BARCA: Thank you. Okay. Last call for anybody who wishes to come forward and testify. Ah, we have another one. Very good. Please spell the name on your name tag.

HELMES: I am Drew Helmes, D-r-e-w, H-e-l-m-e-s, and I work for New Tradition Homes.

I came here mostly ambivalent about this just wanted to see what the reaction would be, what people would think, and now after hearing everyone's thoughts, I am actually in opposition to the apartment proposal. And now that I think about it, we have a project Adam's Glen nearby to that project and we've already lost a sale because they received a notice that there would be potential for apartments being built there, so that affects our profitability and people.

A lot of people don't want to build single-family homes nearest to apartments because of increased crime rate like the police officers have said and that was mostly what I had to say.

BARCA: Okay. Questions for Drew?

BENDER: You're probably the man to ask because Mike Roth is the developer; is that correct?

HELMES: For?

BENDER: For at the Glen?

HELMES: Yeah. Yeah. Right. Yeah.

BENDER: Okay. There's a piece of property with some mobile homes and some barns on the corner of 188th and Ward Road --

HELMES: Yeah.

BENDER: -- are you familiar with what's been going to be done with that property?

HELMES: No, I'm not.

BENDER: I talked to the owner and the person that bought that is going to try and turn it into an overnight truck stop, that's a rumor, not verified, but that's what the owner told me that sold the property.

HELMES: Okay.

BARCA: Wait. Hold on. Hold on. Okay. So for some reason Richard decided to throw out some speculation.

BENDER: That's what I said, it was speculation, but I think it's the man that's trying to sell some homes.

BARCA: As the chair, I want to reel that back in for a moment and say that is not what we're here discussing tonight and please let's not turn this hearing into that proposal because I got nothing on that. All right.

BENDER: Never mind.

HELMES: I'll pretend I didn't hear it.

BARCA: Yeah. All right. Thank you. If there's no other relevant questions for Drew --

WRIGHT: I do, Mr. Chair. Is Adam's Glen, is that immediately east of the proposed rezone?

HELMES: Yes.

WRIGHT: And how large a project is that?

HELMES: I don't remember the number off the top of my head, but it's a few phases, and usually a phase is 20, 30 houses.

WRIGHT: Okay. Moderate size then.

HELMES: I handle mostly, I handle government affairs, so I'm not --

BENDER: It's 96 lots.

HELMES: 96, okay. Yeah, sounds right.

WRIGHT: Thank you.

HELMES: Thank you.

BARCA: Thank you. Hang on a second. I want to make sure that we're covering this. We

have a very full agenda this evening. I think everybody's had an opportunity to speak on the issues. Anybody who hasn't spoken that wants to come forward? Okay. Then I'm going to close public testimony.

If there is additional information that you want to get out, please you can go ahead and write down anything that you want to get it in front of the County Councilors.

As you may not be aware, what happens tonight is once we close public testimony and we have our deliberation, our vote is advisory to the County Council who will hear this same agenda item and then they will be the ones that will make the final determination.

So whatever happens here tonight is not the last bar on the song, right, there's still opportunity for you to get in additional testimony, you can come before the County Councilors all in the same fashion.

So I'm going to say last time, is there anybody that wants to come forward that hasn't? Would you like to come forward? So we're going to talk about Ward, we're not talking about anything else.

BARTON: I want to talk about the truck stop.

BARCA: Please come forward and give your name, spell it out for us.

BARTON: Christina Barton, B-a-r-t-o-n.

BARCA: Okay.

BARTON: Okay. So I think we're all thrown off by that last statement.

BARCA: We're not talking about that last thing.

BARTON: You're not even going to answer a question about it?

BARCA: We're not going to answer a question about it. It's not on the agenda. We don't know anything about it. You can --

BARTON: You're just going to leave us all reeling with that?

BARCA: No. I'm going to tell you that it shouldn't have been spoken about at all and that it's not admissible in any fashion for us to have any opinion on. You are always welcome to contact the County to discuss any matters of land use that you would like with them.

Okay. All that being said, I am going to close public testimony. I want to bring it back to questions for staff and then we'll go into deliberation.

RETURN TO PLANNING COMMISSION

GRIMWADE: I've got a couple of questions for staff. Section E is your report where we talk about public infrastructure, public facilities and services, in your finding, did you include the implications of increased demand or is it just purely the provision?

LUMBANTOBING: It's the provision.

GRIMWADE: The provision. Okay. In regard to increased development, new development, I assume public impact fees apply, and do we know that the amount of public impact fees make the level of provision the facilities or is that inadequate to address the public's needs going forward? So there is a gap which obviously delays the provision of public facilities, developers pay X amount, who fills that void?

COOK: Christine Cook, Senior Deputy Prosecuting Attorney with the Civil Department, and no, impact fees do not account for all of the cost of the infrastructure that is needed for development, and furthermore they are not intended or permitted to do so - I don't know what the deal is here, thank you - by State law.

The degree to which impact fees do cover those expenses is a policy decision made by the County Council pursuant to State law and the rest is what we call public share and another word for that is taxes. So those formulas, the extent to which public share meets a need and the extent to which other sorts of funding sources meet a need, are determined sometimes on a case-by-case basis, they're definitely determined according to the area in the county, where things are located. Of course there are sometimes grants that are available from State and even Federal government, those typically match other payments that are either private or public, but no, it's never just the impact fees.

GRIMWADE: Okay. The other question I have is, how far away is the closest park from this proposed site for development?

LEBOWSKY: That I do not know, yeah.

WRIGHT: There's a regional park up 172nd.

LEBOWSKY: Hockinson Park on 172nd. Thank you.

GRIMWADE: Okay. That's all.

BARCA: Other questions for staff?

SWINDELL: No.

BARCA: All right. Seeing no more questions for staff, I'm hoping for a lively discussion here about the testimony this evening and what's in front of us. So anybody can pick up the ball and start.

BENDER: Do you want me to go first?

BARCA: Sure, Richard, go first.

BENDER: Okay. Let's talk about traffic of commercial versus apartment. We have conflicting information. We have an insurance agent that turns to actuary tables and talks about the number of cars that an apartment complex has that generate trips versus the number of cars that the engineering report says generates trips, those are in conflict, but let's talk about what I do know.

Apartment building adds new autos to the roadways, thus new trips. Commercial or if somebody stops off for a Papa Murphy's pizza or goes to Walgreens or whatever, they live in the neighborhood, they're going to go by anyway, so commercial does not add that many new autos, thus trips to the road, number one.

Number two, calls to apartments for crime. I believe, and from my education, that a study called the Norway Rat study says as you densify a population, more and more deviant behavior occurs because there's a finite amount of resources being sought after; i.e., that's why you densify a population in apartment buildings, you get more calls for deviant behavior and I believe that firmly.

But really the coup de grace, I was a teacher and administrator for six years, worked in a school district that saw unbelievable growth, we had to go to a 45/15 program which means nine weeks of teaching, three weeks off, you can get four, you can get four sessions in, the kids were sharper, got better grades, it was the parents that torpedoed it because it interfered with their vacations, but it did lead to getting a bond passed, but let's talk about Hockinson.

Their growth is finite via sewer capacity and sewers are extremely expensive, and out in that area she indicated there's a lot of wetland that would have to be mitigated, that's also expensive. I don't want to have that on my conscious that I throw 35, 36, 40 kids in a classroom, not good learning environment. So I think you can tell how my vote's going to go.

BARCA: It would be better if we just got through this and then you can applaud or cry at the end. Okay.

GRIMWADE: I think for me the challenge is reconciling livability and urban growth. And urban growth brings a lot of issues and the problem with a number of those issues is its about perception and sometimes perception is correct and sometimes it's not, but perception is real when you're trying to make decisions.

It is possible - and I'm saying this based upon my experience in a number of jurisdictions in many locations - to have a very effective design of high density living next to single living, it has worked in other regions.

The question is in the back of my mind, do we have the impetus and the will to make that happen, and I can't answer that, that has to be answered by the County officials and the developers aside.

I'm very mindful about traffic, but I'm also mindful though I can sort of say no to this development given that all the other developments that have gone on are also adding to the problems, they're all potentially adding to the same social problems.

So it comes down to me based upon the information in this staff report tonight and I am not, I'm not a hundred percent for it. I'm wondering whether there is a better zoning and whether there is a need for the applicant to perhaps rethink that, because at the end of the day, the people coming into this area have to live with the people that exist here today and there needs to be community, not decision divisiveness in the community. So I'm probably leaning not to approve it tonight.

SWINDELL: I have to say, I don't know, I was born and raised in Ridgefield, Washington, that should probably be all I have to say. Growing up there the City started with 900 residents when I was a kid, and through annexation and development we're now at, what, 6,000, it's grown phenomenally, it's one of the fastest growing cities in the state of Washington. So anybody that's moved here in Clark County in the last 48 years, you've impacted me, just so you know.

Growth is inevitable. Sometimes growth is really good. I for one, we have an apartment complex being built in the City of Ridgefield right now and I'm kind of happy for it, we've needed it, something that our city has needed.

So for me, I'm sure there's people that aren't happy for it, but for me I have three teenagers at home, they need a place to live eventually when they can, I look at it from that standpoint as well, but I also see the impacts of growth from a school district as I was on the school board for a short period of time as well and understanding the difficulties and how that happens and the increased taxes, and believe me my taxes have gone up quite a bit in the last 20 years, so I understand that, you know, a lot of kids in each classroom how that affects everything.

I hate seeing my tax dollars go to portables, I want to see new schools being built, but there's a money and timing issue with growth. I think that there is a community around this development that wants to see it developed in the way that it was stated it was going to be developed. They're really asking for it. They're really saying please, please, develop this, we will go there, we will patronize, we will, you know.

Knowing that the impacts of traffic are going to be greater, I think everybody understands that, the studies show that and there might be some contradicting information with that. You know, at first blush I didn't see an issue with this change, but I was appointed to represent the people and there's an overwhelming desire for the people here that it not be changed. I'm torn. I think some -- growth is coming, you're going to get apartments, they're going to come, if not this, it's coming, so just know that it's inevitable.

I think the one testimony that really impacted me the most, and I feel I want to say this is that people moving into the area, new people moving into the area that are impacting the other people already living there and increasing the burden on the schools, I hope everybody understands that, that they are themselves burdening the schools, they were looking forward to this project being built knowing that this was going to be next to them or near them that they could use it and they, even though there's no promises being made, there's no promise made, but the zoning was there and they were hoping to see it happen. I think that testimony from everybody really impact me the most, so... But that's where I'm at on it.

WRIGHT: To me this situation is, narrows down to three items, and the first is the compatibility with existing land uses in the area, and correct me if I'm wrong, but it seems like virtually the entire area is some sort of single-family residential. I mean, there's probably some minor exceptions, but the great preponderance of the zoning is single-family residential and that is the character of this area.

And the second factor which is probably the greatest factor in my mind is that when people buy their properties and they go to the trouble to check into what the adjacent zoning is and they see that it's zoned commercial, that we should be very Lillith to break faith with the community in this regard.

I mean, the zoning's not chiseled in stone, certainly it could be changed, but we just went through a comp plan process a couple of years ago and we didn't hear anything about the need for housing out in this area in high density. And so I think it really does break faith to change the zoning in this area.

And then tonight we did hear about a new issue, how severe it is may be questionable, but the school felt the need to testify that there were problems related to the issue, to the rezone, at least short-term, and so I think that looking at those three factors I would have to vote against this. If on the other hand it was a rezone to any sort of single-family density, I would be supporting it.

BARCA: Well, a lot has been said here on items that I have written down myself. I think it's important for me to put out the idea that apartments by themselves are not usually desirable for those people that are in a different type of dwelling unit or structure, but the density of apartments is an important component of how we have our mix of housing stock in the county.

Clark County is still considered a highly sought after community for a lot of reasons and that

includes the idea of a variety of housing stocks that allows people of different incomes to be able to afford to get in on the ground floor of someplace.

We talked about crime, but we didn't talk so much about the idea that that's also the opportunity for somebody's grandkids or children to live close by to them. It's also an opportunity for people that have wage restrictions to be able to find housing in an area close to where they may work. There's a lot of different reasons why people end up in apartments and it isn't just because we're driving them to the fringes and need to put housing someplace.

The comp plan told us where we had intended to put apartments, this wasn't one of them, and because of that, when I look at the frenetic amount of growth that the area has had, I can understand why there's a certain amount of shock and bewilderment from the community about why we would come forward and propose some more density on top of what you're already seeing as you drive down the road each day, I get that.

The taxes, I think as we go forward, I think it's important for you to know that whether people are renting or they own, taxes get paid, taxes will get paid by a landlord, they'll get paid by property management, they'll get paid. So don't feel like because there's apartments that taxes won't pay their share. School impact fees get paid by apartments as well, transportation impact fees get paid by apartments as well.

The way that we divide it up, the impacts are passed along, but when we look at an impact that wasn't documented, that wasn't brought forward which I have here as the Hockinson School District's sewer capacity constraint, that's a significant burden that hadn't been documented or discussed. And I would feel like the Hockinson School District should be coming to the County with a clear understanding about how impacted they are because this area has had a lot of homes going in and it sounds like we're at the tipping point based on that sewer capacity constraint and I think that should be well-documented and investigated to the point that the County is not doing anything that tips the school district over, but the school district has to come forward with that information.

I think this commercial setting has a lot of potential based on how the growth rate has gone. Perhaps this isn't Gramor's best type of development, it's down to a fairly small amount of acreage, maybe some other development entity has a better opportunity to do something with it, I can't speak to that.

The change of zoning to a different or lesser residential zoning would not relieve the burden of the commercial opportunities that I heard so many people ask for, and I think as we go forward with this and it goes to the County Councilors, you should be really clear as to what you want, do you want just lesser zoning or do you want commercial opportunities.

I think when you ask for either one, it just sounds more like not in my backyard apartments, so I think be clear about what you really want. And at this time unless there's more from the Planning Commission, I think we're ready for a roll call.

BENDER: Motion. Don't we need a motion?

BARCA: Well, yeah, I guess we should do a motion.

BENDER: Yeah. I make a **MOTION** that we **DENY** CPZ2018-00002.

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

BARCA: Okay. It's been motion for denial and it's been seconded. Roll call, Sonja.

ROLL CALL VOTE

WRIGHT: AYE

SWINDELL: AYE

GRIMWADE: AYE

BENDER: AYE

BARCA: AYE

BARCA: And at this point in time, ladies and gentlemen, before we get to the next agenda item, we're going to take ten minutes, we will start promptly at 8:40.

(Pause in proceedings.)

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS & PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION, continued

CPZ2018-00007 N.E. 99TH Street Extension – Proposed amendment to the Arterial Atlas to add, delete, and amend proposed roads to improve neighborhood circulation.

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

BARCA: Okay. Thanks for coming back. We're going to carry on with the next agenda item which is CPZ2018-00007, N.E. 99th Street Extension, and staff will kick it off.

ALBRECHT: Good evening, Commissioners. For the record, Gary Albrecht, I'm a planner with Clark County, Washington.

I'm here to discuss CPZ2018-00007, N.E. 99th Street Extension Comprehensive Plan Arterial Atlas Amendments. This proposed amendment is to amend the arterial atlas to improve neighborhood circulation on N.E. 99th Street connecting between N.E. 87nd Avenue and N.E. 72nd Avenue. There's a map of the arterial atlas showing N.E. 99th Street, it extends from N.E. 72nd Avenue to N.E. 172nd Avenue which is not on this map.

This road segment is classified as an Mc- -- M-2cb, a two-lane minor arterial with center-turn lane and bike lanes, that's what it's classified as. Clark County Public Works is currently

working on designing N.E. 99th Street from N.E. 94th Avenue to N.E. 117th Avenue, construction in 2021 depending on funding.

The map on the screen is from the wetland mitigation plan, N.E. 72nd Avenue/St. Johns Road improvement project. The area highlighted in yellow for eventual construction of the roadway will not further impact the wetlands or likelihood of success of the mitigation proposed for N.E. 72nd Avenue/St. Johns Road, the contours were designed to match the created wetland.

The current alignment connecting N.E. 99th Street to N.E. 72nd Avenue does not have funding. It is not listed in the 20-year capital facility plan or the 6-year transportation improvement program; however, this connection is needed as identified in the 2035 regional transportation model to reduce future traffic congestion on N.E. 119th Street and N.E. 88th Street.

In 2018, Clark County received communication from the Washington Utility Transportation Commission that indicated when approving a new public railroad crossing, UTC considers public necessity, convenience and safety. Current State policies strongly discourages construction of new at-grade crossings unless no other viable alternatives exist. As a result of this new information, staff worked with HDR Engineering to analyze alternative east/west connections to N.E. 99th Street to N.E. 72nd Avenue.

The consultant analyzed four alternatives. Alternative F is the yellow line on the map. Alternative J is the blue line. Alternative D is the red line up above, it's got two options, an over and an undercrossing.

After evaluating each alternative per the criteria established in the consultant's memo and the staff report, staff supports the recommended Alternative F for the following reasons: Utilizes the pre-established corridor through Curtin Creek, thus avoiding new impacts; utilizes the County's existing right-of-way west of Curtin Creek; avoids the cost of grade separating Clark County railroad; grades are more easily navigated by pedestrians and bicyclists; least impacts to existing residential homes; grade separation from the intersection of N.E. 72nd Avenue and Clark County railroad.

Based upon the findings presented in this report, criteria for arterial atlas amendments and the consultant's analysis, staff recommends that the Planning Commission forward a recommendation to approve Alternative F as the proposed amendment to the arterial atlas to add future streets between N.E. 87th Avenue and N.E. 72nd Avenue.

And that concludes my presentation for the evening. I'm prepared to answer any questions.

BARCA: So, Gary, Alternative J, the blue line, does that run right through 99th Street as it is today, is that what I'm seeing there?

ALBRECHT: Well, it stops right here.

BARCA: 99th Street stops there.

ALBRECHT: Yes. Correct.

BARCA: Okay. So then there would be additional roadway that would include having to cross Curtin Creek.

ALBRECHT: For this option it would be, yes.

BARCA: Okay. And the section from the far right where the yellow and the blue intersect would also be new built and carry itself all the way across Curtin Creek to the middle of the subdivision, is that correct in what I'm hearing?

ALBRECHT: Correct.

BARCA: Okay. Are there other questions for staff?

BENDER: Yeah. Gary, the letter dated August 14th from the Department of Ecology, is that just an FYI letter, the one on contaminants that are nearby?

ALBRECHT: What's that?

BENDER: It's a letter that was authored by the Department of Ecology stating that there are known contaminated sites nearby the Proposal F.

ALBRECHT: Okay.

BENDER: So the question is, it's just an FYI that to be extra vigilant when you're doing your grading?

ALBRECHT: Well, so that so more or less because that would not affect -- so all we're doing is putting a line on a map. So their concern would be more addressed at the time of development. So when development occurs, they will address whatever hazardous site is on the property that needs to be worked with, so it wouldn't affect this proposal right now.

BENDER: It's a future FYI then. Okay.

ALBRECHT: Yes.

ORJIAKO: Indeed. It is. Oliver Orjiako, just FYI.

BENDER: Yeah, future FYI. Okay.

ORJIAKO: Yes.

BENDER: Thank you.

ALBRECHT: You're welcome.

BARCA: Any additional questions? Okay. Seeing none, we're going to open it up for public testimony. I have four sheets of sign up. We're going to continue to use the three-minute clock. When you come up here, please speak into the microphone, start off by pronouncing and then spelling your name. Okay.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Can we start with Scott Buchanan. Perhaps not. Can we go to Bridgette Cottral. All right. We're on a roll. Steve Dahl. Greg Brown. Emily Edwards. So I recognize she signed the last sheet as did Charlotte Bruce. This is working well. Reba Mabry.

MABRY: That's me.

BARCA: Right on. I got one for one right now.

MABRY: It's Reba Mabry, and it's R-e-b as in boy a, M-a-b as in boy r-y. My concern, I live at 88th and 99th Avenue or 99th Street and 88th Ave. and the map stops at 87th.

So my concern and questions are what's going to happen with this end of 99th Street? And they weren't able to tell us at the open house meeting what the speed limit's going to be. Is this going to -- because there were no studies, you know, of what kind of traffic is going to happen.

Are there going to be stop lights on the street? How is this going to affect, you know, the kids going to school? Because this is a major street in our neighborhood, kids play on the street. And looking at the map and illustration that they first sent out, they said they were going to put in sidewalks and a little border on the three-lane road in addition to the three-lane road, so that's going to take five or six feet of our property if that happens. So just trying to find out where it's going to, if it's going to end at 87th Street or if it's going to continue on down 99th Street?

BARCA: Okay. Just for my clarification, when you go like that --

MABRY: Just on the map.

BARCA: Yeah. Well, so my map goes like that way and I think your map goes that way, but I'm going to assume you're talking about going to the south.

MABRY: The east.

BARCA: The east.

MABRY: Well, it would be the beginning of the bridge I guess on the east side.

BARCA: Okay.

ALBRECHT: See where the hand is right here?

BARCA: Yeah.

ALBRECHT: Oh, here. So you're talking about this stretch here.

BARCA: Yeah. So where it intersects back to 99th and the 87th intersection?

WRIGHT: That isn't 99th, that's 78th.

ALBRECHT: Wrong way. Here we go.

MABRY: So it would be between 87th and 94th.

BARCA: And 94th, yeah.

ALBRECHT: Right here. Well --

BARCA: Okay. So if we can't answer the question --

ALBRECHT: Well, so it's currently classified as a minor arterial, so it's not built to standard and that's it. So it needs to be improved.

MABRY: So you will probably be taking five or six feet of my property to build a sidewalk.

ALBRECHT: Well, so the arterial atlas has that already out like that, so I'm not taking anything from your property, but I mean so in order for this segment to occur if that would have to happen, and I don't know how much that would take from anyone's property, I don't know where the right-of-way lines are at, but I mean it's designated as is currently right now. So we're not talking about changing the designation from east to 99th Street, to 94th Avenue, so that's already there, it's just not built to standard right now.

MABRY: That's all I have.

BARCA: Okay. Thank you.

MABRY: Thank you.

WRIGHT: Gary, I'm confused by that because I believe she's on the west side now of Curtin Creek.

PUBLIC: No, she's on the east side.

WRIGHT: Oh, is she on the east side. Okay. Then I stand corrected.

BARCA: Okay. We're looking at Doug Smith-Lee.

SMITH-LEE: Good evening, Chair Baracus and Commissioners. Doug Smith-Lee, the spelling is D-o-u-g, the last name S-m-i-t-h hyphen L-e-e. I'm at 10315 N.E. 86th Avenue. I understand we're just looking at amending lines on a map, the 1996 road atlas, but obviously where those lines eventually land impact a variety of folks.

My biggest question is, do we need to even have lines on a map? Basically questioning, is there a need based on the cost, a real cost and needs analysis. If you think about the need right now, you've got a major roadway, 119th which is being expanded less than a mile to the north and then you have Padden Parkway, and what we're proposing is a line to supposedly relieve traffic congestion, which isn't real clear what that congestion is now or in the future, that would cut through some residential areas and also a wetland. So that's my question as far as the need.

As far as the cost, my understanding at least as far as for this option it's just under \$16 million to develop for a pretty short distance of road if my reading of the staff report is correct, that's a pretty costly infrastructure and I'm sure private has to be with mitigating the wetland as the construction takes place.

As far as the cost, there's also the question as far as safety. Obviously a lot of children in these residential areas are going to Sunset Elementary which would be having to cross 99th Street. Also safety which my daughter brought up. Recently we've had a lot of wildfires, and even though this is a wetland, it's a fairly dry wetland right now, and if we have a fairly high bridge, I think it's going to be, what, 23 feet, 21 feet --

ALBRECHT: Yes.

SMITH-LEE: -- if a driver's going through that area, a fairly dry wetland, decides to toss out a cigarette butt, that will catch fire fairly rapidly right now and you've got a number of residences that are on both sides of that, it would be very difficult to fight that fire.

And then finally, I would just ask if the County wants to invest in this kind of infrastructure, if it's even really needed based on the two major arterials, eventually that area is probably going to be annexed by the City. Do we want to be spending that kind of money for an area that's

eventually going to get annexed probably by the City of Vancouver? That's what I had to say. Thank you.

BARCA: Any questions? Thank you. David Lane.

LANE: David Lane. D-a-v-i-d, L-a-n-e. I live in the Mountain View Estates and I'm looking at the Alternative F which is going to go through multiple green spaces through many areas and one of those areas that I am concerned about is off of 82nd Avenue.

There's a field there in the middle of that neighborhood, and that's a key part of our neighborhood, that is something that we looked at when we were purchasing our house, our kids can play there, we utilize it, our entire neighborhood utilizes it. We utilize it so much that in fact our neighborhood started mowing that field about seven years ago. And since then, the person who started doing that has moved on and now I take that responsibility and I volunteer my time to mow that field so that we can use it, so it does stay short because the County doesn't.

I think they mow it once or twice a summer and it gets pretty long and it's not usable. I'd like to keep that as a park. I know it's not the right size. We have spoken and it's not the two, I think it's a two-acre mark to make it a park for Clark County, but we can run equations and come up with certain amount of driveways and we need another road, why couldn't we make an exception for a place that is actually being utilized within a neighborhood, a quiet neighborhood. I'm fully supportive of everything that was just said and I thank you.

BARCA: Thank you. Kari Kjersti.

KJERSTI: Good evening. My name is Kari Kjersti.

BARCA: Kjersti.

KJERSTI: Nice try. It's K-a-r-i, K-j-e-r-s-t-i.

BARCA: Sonja. Excuse me just a second. Sonja, would you reset the clock please. I'm going to ask you to tell us what this is and then get it down so we can see the audience. Okay.

KJERSTI: Oh, sure. That is a crime map for the area of Mountain View Estates and Cedar 49 and also the surrounding area. I can turn it around for the audience to see. You also have that in the handout that I have for all of you.

So I have moved in the area into Mountain View Estates three and a half years ago and I am against this proposal and the staff recommendation of Alternative F. The crime is a concern of mine as Page 2 on the handout that I gave you, there's a lot of crime outside of our area.

We live in a community of cul-de-sacs, and if you look in the pink area that I've outlined, there

is nothing inside of it, and if you look on the outside, there is DUIs, there is burglary, there are all sorts of things happening. If you put this road in there, there is going to be an introduction of that crime through our neighborhood, so that concerns me.

The other concern I have is on the next page, like the previous person said, I also agree, we have green space. There are four sections of green space that Alternative F is going to go through. This proposal is going to affect air quality, there's going to be an environmental impact. There was a study done but I don't feel like the study was that thorough.

This is going to de-place wildlife that lives in these areas, runoff from roads is going to affect Curtin Creek, is going to impact all of the land that is there, there's going to be noise pollution, the property values are going to go down because of that. Cul-de-sacs are typically a very desirable place to live, it's not going to be quite the case if we've got a noisy neighborhood now that we're living in.

So what I'd like to ask from you is that you take everybody's feedback this evening and please vote for what the community wants. We're the ones that have bought houses in this neighborhood. We have families that live there and, you know, we're the ones that spend our time there. I love this area, it's like a little town, you know, I hear birds when I'm outside, I hear frogs, I'm friends with my neighbors, I love it. Thank you.

BARCA: I have a question for you. Concerning the alternative, you've said clearly you're against Alternative F, and this would go for anybody else that's coming up to testify, are there any of the alternatives that had been proposed as these are lines on the map that you could be in favor of? And if that's the case, I'd like to hear that, and if you're against all alternatives, then let's state that clearly. Okay. All right.

KJERSTI: I am against the 99th Street Extension and all alternatives, so everything.

BARCA: Thank you.

KJERSTI: Thank you.

BENDER: Question. What's the time frame for the graph?

KJERSTI: The crime app is a two month crime app that's, let me read the date on there for you, it's pretty tiny, it is from June 10th, 2018, through 8/10/2018.

BENDER: Thank you.

KJERSTI: And I do have a little italicized area, there was an incident of fraud in Cedar 49 that did happen and then there's a displacement of a noncriminal that does show up in the pink area, but due to privacy reasons, it's offset so it most likely did not happen in our area.

BENDER: Thank you.

BARCA: Thank you.

KJERSTI: Thank you.

BARCA: Okay. Ranos-Carole Meeks.

MEEKS: I apologize for my writing. Randy, R-a-n-d-y, Meeks, M-e-e-k-s.

BARCA: I apologize for the way I read it.

MEEKS: First of all, I moved to Cedar 49 in 1995, I escaped L.A. and I love Cedar 49, moved in as a renter. About three years later I moved away and couldn't wait to come back as an owner. My wife and I did buy a house on 80th Avenue three and a half years ago, one block you might say off of Cedar 49 neighborhood.

We live two houses to the end of a dead-end street, 80th Avenue, our backyard is that field extending out to Andresen. Love the quiet. Love the peace and quiet.

We've seen coyotes. Someone was talking about animals, we got coyotes, not coyotes, coyotes, rabbits, deer, raccoons, it's a real peaceful place. It's a great neighborhood. I don't like speaking in public, but I got to get up here because I got to share my heart, okay, just a few notes.

First of all, I live and work in Vancouver. All the times I've lived there, I've never seen a train go across the (inaudible) Express, so I don't know how often the trains do use that railway, but I'd like to know what that activity might be, maybe that's something we need to talk about how, you know, how much business is there.

Someone talked about the wetland behind us, it's six feet from our fence line. During the wintertime we have the stream, it does dry up during the summertime. So I don't know about that wetland how it's going to be invaded upon.

Right now there is a new sewer line going from a development off of Andresen to 80th Avenue, you talk about road noise already with the trees that have been eliminated and how much more is that going to be with all the trees that are going to be cut down if this three option road is going to be put in.

And you know what, that 119th Street was improved upon to the east to 117th Avenue and it's still going on and on and on to the west. I don't see that road being overly utilized yet. So why do we need something between 119th Street and Padden Parkway? I don't see the need personally.

Like the gentleman said earlier about the cost and the road need for the traffic flow. Anyway, I'm here just to give my heartfelt opinions, there you go. Thank you.

BARCA: Any questions for Randy? Thank you, Randy. Kallie and/or Dan Williamson.

WILLIAMSON: My name Kallie Williamson, K-a-l-l-i-e, the last name Williamson, W-i-l-l-i-a-m-s-o-n. Don't worry I answer to all sorts of things. We live at 10015 N.E. 82nd Avenue. Our home sits directly behind the easement road where the bridge will begin to go over Curtin Creek.

When we moved to our property in 2013, we were very specific in what we were looking for. We moved from the Seattle area for my husband's job and we were very specific in looking for a home that gave us some privacy and some space and nature. We came from a similar neighborhood full of cule-de-sacs that we loved and we were thrilled to find this home.

We have a child who has autism and his safety is a concern. And so when we're talking about putting a road directly behind our home, very concerned about that. Currently we can allow him to ride his bike, he and his brother are out riding their bikes, they are able to walk the dog and we don't worry. In a neighborhood that's consistent with or consistently just cul-de-sacs and two ways in and out, we don't worry about the crime statistics as was discussed earlier. We feel safe letting our children outside to play.

And with this road coming through, it wasn't marked on the map how the intersection mirror at 82nd where it will connect with the easement, it wasn't marked on the map how that will be handled. Will it be a four-way stop? Will it be a roundabout? Do you know?

ALBRECHT: No.

WILLIAMSON: Okay. Yeah, because that's definitely a concern. My other issue is our property values. So I'll be perfectly honest from a very selfish standpoint, my property value is going to be zilch. When that bridge starts, you will be able to see in my home, in every main living area which we have.

So my main living area is on our home on the backside, our bedroom, master bathroom, our kitchen, our dining room, our living room, everything will be on display for anybody driving by and that will force us to move which presents a hardship because currently there is not a lot available for a similarly priced home for what we could sell it for today, and so that is a big concern for me.

The safety for my children, the destruction of our neighborhood and I also question whether this road is actually needed. Currently there is not a lot of growth neighborhood-wise going on around us. We're pretty much stuck. There's not a lot of ways to push. So connecting neighborhoods isn't really a concern, you're just going to be connecting two main arterials in a kind of willy-nilly pattern that doesn't seem fiscally responsible in my opinion. And that's all I

have to say. Thank you.

BARCA: So before you go, there were three alternatives given.

WILLIAMSON: Oh, and I am not in favor of any of them because two of them will directly affect us by eating up that easement road behind us which also does take away from the easement access we have to the backside of our property.

Currently we have a gate, we have easement access from the County to use that driveway-ish along with the Wastewater District I believe has a pump station directly across from us which would be a question I would also be curious to know is how that wastewater pump station would be accessed for those folks if there's a three-lane road going through there, how would that be safely accessed because they are back there backing their trucks in that little driveway very often, so...

BARCA: Yeah. I believe if the road got built, the engineers would take that into account.

WILLIAMSON: Sure. Move it I'm assuming so they can get in there safely.

BARCA: Something safely would happen. Okay. So --

WILLIAMSON: I'm not in favor, no.

BARCA: Of any of them?

WILLIAMSON: No. The blue line would take up homes out of our neighborhood, we have a lovely neighborhood, and the other two would directly impact the safety of my children and the property value of my home and destroy our neighborhood.

BARCA: Okay.

WILLIAMSON: Thank you.

SWINDELL: Excuse me. Can I ask?

WILLIAMSON: Yeah.

SWINDELL: When did you buy your home?

WILLIAMSON: We bought our home in July of 2013 with no knowledge that this was on the docket whatsoever for the planning. Thank you.

BARCA: Okay.

WILLIAMSON: Thank you.

BARCA: And is Dan wishing to speak?

WILLIAMSON: Sure. Hello. My name is Dan Williamson, D-a-n, Williamson, W-i-l-l-i-a-m-s-o-n. Well, my wife kind of stole a lot of my thunder, so I don't really have too much. I agree with everything my wife has to say by the way.

BARCA: Okay. That's a good position to take.

WILLIAMSON: Right. I agree with everything she had to say. Being a security manager in the security industry and having a law enforcement background for over 19 years, I'd have to say that there's no way to avoid the criminal element that will be introduced into our neighborhood with the building of all these alternative routes into our neighborhood.

So what I would like to say is that my major concern is with my background is that inevitably crime will increase, property crime, personal violent crime, there's no way around it. And what I'd also like to add is the fact that why are we doing this? What is the reason? I don't personally see a need for it. The traffic isn't as bad as, I mean I don't think that it's really going to really help things at all. There's a saying that I kind of want to end with is, is the juice worth the squeeze and I don't think it is. Thank you.

BARCA: Okay. Sandra Wall.

WALL: Pass, but I agree with everything that was said.

BARCA: Thank you. And Pam Morlan.

MORLAN: Hi. My name is Pam Morlan, M-o-r-l-a-n. I really didn't plan on speaking today, but I do agree with what has been said already. I am concerned about the environmental impacts on Curtin Creek. I live at --

PUBLIC: Your mic's not on.

MORLAN: All right. I live at 8812 N.E. 99th Street, so I am just east of the bridge, the first bridge plan. Currently on a one block just west of me there's been seven or of seven houses, three houses have been put on the market and they have all been sold and two of them I know for a fact because families don't want to be there with the road connected. Like I said, I'm against all the options and I just don't see the need.

BARCA: Thank you. All right. That's one sheet down. Harold Bauder.

BAUDER: Harold J. Bauder, H-a-r-o-l-d, J., B-a-u-d-e-r. I have a concern about this because all of the alternates end at 99th Street and we live just one block north from that. 54 houses

were placed there 12, 14 years ago and everybody came to a kind of a quiet nice place and this would really disrupt that.

Somebody else said before that the kids and the other go across to the school, in the summertime they go over there to play back and forth and that would really impact that. The other thing I don't understand yet, and I need to ask a question, is the new proposal two lane, three lane, four lane, what?

ALBRECHT: It's a two lane. Two-lane road with a center-turn lane with bike lanes and sidewalks. It's a minor arterial as already classified in the current arterial atlas which has been in place since 1996.

BAUDER: When we came there 14 years, 13 years, 14, excuse me, 12 years ago, there was a sign at the end of 99th Street where it ends going west and there was a sign there that this could be a through street, that sign was taken down, we were told that no, no streets, through street's going to go there, they've changed their mind and I don't know where this proposal goes with the wetlands, but I know they took out hundreds of thousands of square yards of soil in 19- -- 2010 and 2012, '11, and it seemed like that was a plan to make that a permanent wetland.

The other thing I have is I don't understand how a bridge can go in there without seriously impacting the wetlands. Just the construction of it would terribly impact that wetlands. The traffic, other things would also. So it seems to me that that's a poor plan no matter which way you go.

They're going to put four lanes through 119th Street and that should take up an awful lot of the traffic that is now on Padden Parkway, that's just a mile up to Padden Parkway and a little less than a mile to 119th Street from where 99th Street is, so it doesn't seem feasible to put more road through there at this time. Questions?

BARCA: Questions? Thank you. Tom Leeson.

LEESON: Good evening. I'm Tom Leeson. It's Tom, T-o-m and Leeson, L-e-e-s-o-n. I live on the east side of Curtin Creek on 99th. This evening as I drove here just past my house on, one was on each side of 99th Street are basketball hoops, they're standing alone, kids play there all the time, there aren't a lot of options in the area for kids to play and they play in the street, they skateboard past my house, ride their bikes, having a lot of traffic through the area is just going to gut the neighborhood in a sense and is not going to -- I have lived here in Clark County, in fact I was born here, and have lived here for over 60 years in the Sunset neighborhood, I've lived there since '92.

And, you know, I understand that things about growth and need for transportation and stuff like that; on the other hand, in the 60 plus years I've lived here, the quality of life has been going downhill and, you know, the quality needs to be, the people that live here currently, a

person needs to have a feel that you count too.

Sometimes it's all about the growth and whatever and sometimes you have to think about the quality of life with the people that already live here and I don't see this adding to anything in our neighborhood and that is my point.

BARCA: Thank you. Vince Scopacasa. Vince. Okay. Laurie Dalhover.

DALHOVER: Hi. Spell my name L-a-u-r-i-e, D-a-l-h-o-v-e-r, Laurie Dalhover. Hi.

HOLLEY: Spell that one more time a little slower.

DALHOVER: Sorry, I talk fast. D-a-l-h-o-v-e-r. I wasn't planning on talking, but I thought I would because a lot of people left because of various reasons, babysitters and stuff. So I live in Cedar 49 and I've lived there since 1990. It's beautiful.

When Costco moved in, they created the wetlands, the Curtin Creek wetlands because they took all the wetlands from where Costco was, it was like a deal for Costco, and it's the most beautiful place you've ever seen, but we're not allowed to touch it, you can't go in there. There's no park in the area.

I don't know why this is even proposed. The traffic is much more now because 119 is being created and has been closed for, oh, my gosh, probably a year and a half, so everybody's going, you know, up the other street. So I think it's not necessary and I don't know who would even be going through there.

One part of Curtin Creek is Sunset Elementary School, that's where my kids went to, and maybe my grandkids will go to, and I mean it's right there. So why would anybody want to put in a humongous street right in front of a really nice elementary school and there's no other way to get there but to cross the street because all the houses are on one side and the elementary school is on the other. And we don't have money. I don't know where they're trying to get the money from, but I think a park would be wonderful in that vacant area. And I just would like to ask you, can you tell me why this is being proposed?

ALBRECHT: So the current 2016 arterial atlas has this road going through here, if you look at the map up here, it's already there.

DALHOVER: No. I'm asking you why it's being proposed?

ALBRECHT: So why, so the why the proposal is because this current line crosses the railroad so and this it's a regional significance for this, for this road to be on the map, that's why, so...

DALHOVER: No, that's not why. What is the impact and why is it being built? Why do you want to build it?

ALBRECHT: Well, it's for to relieve traffic congestion that's why, it's on the map.

DALHOVER: There isn't -- that would create traffic congestion. I'm just saying it would create -- we have the most peaceful beautiful neighborhood, we all know one another. I can't imagine.

BARCA: Hold on for just a second. Hold on. Sonja, stop the timer for a second. Okay. Perhaps we need to try and level set what this is right now.

So this is the Planning Commission and we're trying to do long-range planning. Okay. What we're doing right at this moment is we're not talking about a road that's funded, we're talking about the potential need of the future in which we see continual build-out of already designated zoned land where housing and commercial development could go which would generate additional vehicles on the road and additional trips, so...

PUBLIC: Do you have money for that? Is there any timeline for that?

BARCA: So the timeline that comes with it has to do specifically within the guides of how much development gets done over a undesignated period of time, but when we talk about the atlas, this is nothing more than the proposal about what infrastructure would be in place at the time that those build-outs occur, and I'm going to let Oliver pick it up from here because he's here for that purpose.

ORJIAKO: No. Good evening, Planning Commission members. For the record, Oliver Orjiako, Community Planning Director. I think you stated it very well. This is a 20-year plan, and as Gary has indicated, this has been on the arterial atlas for quite some time. This map represents the current proposed alignment when this is built.

The reason we are looking at it is the issue that Gary pointed out as this is proposed on the current arterial atlas, you can see it crossing the railroad which as we know it's not something that we normally do putting a road near a railroad, and for a variety of safety reasons we try to avoid that. So when we were asked to take a look at this, that was what prompted us to look at what will the future alignment look like.

In addition, it is true that 119th is being widened and constructed. If you look at the distance from 119th to Padden Expressway, you can see that there is a huge gap, and when you talk about neighborhood circulation, this is one area that with that gap there's a need to have an east/west circulation plan, if you will. So the purpose of this is looking at a 20-year plan.

If you look at the aerial, you will see that there is huge areas still yet to be developed. So in terms of neighborhood circulation plan and Bill, who is a transportation expert, will agree that an east/west access is needed between 119th and Padden Expressway. And I have nothing more to add.

This is going to be on the 20-year capital facilities plan, it's not going to be built tomorrow, but we have to show on the map what the neighborhood circulation plan will look like when the area is fully build-out.

BARCA: Does that help answer your question?

DALHOVER: Yes, but I do not agree with it.

BARCA: Okay. Fair enough.

DALHOVER: And just to say, yeah, if you guys want to come out and see this beautiful neighborhood, it's wonderful and I can't even imagine if we had that three lane, sidewalks, how much property people would lose, it would be terrible. It would bring in a lot of crime. We couldn't ride our bikes through our own neighborhood and just think, you know, we really love our neighborhood and want it to stay nice and if there's anyway that we could erase that from that map, that would be great, but I've lived here since 1990 and I never saw that, so...

BARCA: Thank you.

WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, would it be possible for me to address a comment to Oliver.

BARCA: Absolutely.

WRIGHT: Oliver, you can probably remember all the years of planning to build the Padden Parkway. The right-of-way was begun to be set aside for the Padden Parkway in the mid '60s --

ORJIAKO: Yes.

WRIGHT: -- and it was 35 years later before the first section of that road was built and there was all sorts of cries to sell the right-of-way to let people plat it, et cetera, et cetera, but the County persevered, kept that right-of-way intact and where would we be without that road now, we would be in very, very much trouble over that.

And these roads don't fall out of the sky totally built, it takes years and years of planning and funding and persistence in order to develop and get them built, so...

ORJIAKO: I couldn't agree more. If we can show, and I think the neighborhood have made a good observation, I agree with their concerns; however, if Gary can show you the right-of-way have already been reserved.

ALBRECHT: Do you see the hand on the cursor, so this is already dedicated right-of-way, so it's in the plot of the subdivision that went in since 1992, the plat itself says it's dedicated for a

future roadway, so it's been there all along.

ORJIAKO: But to your point, I agree, prior to building Padden Parkway the only east/west road that I'm aware of was 78th or 76th and 78th until Padden Parkway. I remember the struggle in reserving that right-of-way, but now it's one of the best east/west access in the county, so thank you for that observation.

BARCA: Okay. And with that we're going to get back at it. Lauren Drew.

DREW: I'm Lauren Drew, L-a-u-r-e-n, D-r-e-w. I live in Cedar 49 and have for 28 years. Obviously I've seen a lot of changes in the area surrounding Cedar 49, but within the neighborhood not that much has changed. They added some condos at the end of the road on 82nd, no big deal.

I walk my dog every single day just about and it's a 2.10 mile walk from the beginning of my house which you enter on 88th Street onto 82nd Avenue, my house is just a few doors down from there, and we walk 2.10 miles a day and I see a lot of horrible traffic already. It's not that we have bad traffic, it's that people drive badly.

And on 82nd it's a, people think it's a freeway instead of just a neighborhood street and I foresee that if we had any other access into that neighborhood, it would be pure chaos, pure chaos. And I'm going ask the County fellow, what is the real impetus for this plan? What kind of money is the County going to gain from putting a road in and then sewers and then having houses and taxes and so forth, isn't that the real impetus for this rather than traffic congestion?

ALBRECHT: No. No. So this is the arterial atlas is about a transportation system, we're talking about the system network. We're not talking about anything, any other infrastructure, we're talking about that's it, that's all we're talking about is a whole transportation system, it's a regional network we're looking at. So as Planning Commissioner Wright already mentioned, the Padden Parkway it took 35 years to build, so the dedicated, the right-of-way has been there, so this is the same thing.

DREW: Well, it isn't because it affects our neighbors.

ALBRECHT: And I understand that. So I don't have anything else to say.

DREW: Okay. Thank you. My time shouldn't be up because he talked. Well, but what I will say is, and by the way, I had my lung lobe, lung removed last year so I don't have a lot of breath to waste and that's what I'm afraid is going to happen here, that we're all going to ban together, we're going to become angry, we're going to say we don't want this, and I don't want it, I agree with everything that everyone else has already said, but you're going to do it anyway.

It's just like we had swampland, we had wetland, and what happened, Padden Parkway goes in,

they put in a token pond that's so choked up with cattails a duck couldn't swim in it. Costco wanted to build, they put in a token pond. The shopping center on Andresen and 88th Street and Home Depot was swampland, every winter we had a lake out there, they've got a gas station, but they put in a token pond, and that's what I'm afraid is going to happen.

All these planning things look good on paper and everybody says, oh, yeah, that's a great idea. I worked with bureaucracy for a long, long time, I understand how things work. I also worked for an advertising agency and you wonder how the stupid ads come on TV, you should work for an ad agency to find out. But in any case, okay, I'll be done.

I am against any sort of new access into our neighborhood. It doesn't make sense to put a bridge. The railroad is more likely to fail before any road is put in there. It's only used twice a day, at least that's the only time I hear a whistle blow. So let's not worry about the railroad, let's worry about the neighbors losing their property, losing their privacy.

BARCA: Thank you Mrs. Drew.

DREW: Thank you.

BARCA: And it's Randy Cochenour. Was I close? Randy? Close enough. Cheryl Pederson.

PEDERSON: I'm on the list?

BARCA: You are on the list. You can choose to come up and talk or pass. There we go.

PEDERSON: I didn't know it was signing in to talk, sorry. I'm Cheryl Pederson, C-h-e-r-y-l, P-e-d-e-r-s-o-n. And I do have a question about you were saying about it going, you know, east and west being a thoroughfare. Well, is it going to go beyond east, beyond 94th through the where the garbage, whatever, landfill is?

ALBRECHT: Yes. It's currently in design right now to go past that to connect.

PEDERSON: To go past that?

ALBRECHT: Yes.

PEDERSON: Okay. Because that was my, I thought why would you put a road in there if it can only go to 94th and it seemed kind of silly to me. So I drive 88th all the time which is just a two-lane road with no sidewalks, no curb, no bike lane and that would much better be served being developed than putting this through 88th and then you have 119th and we just don't see a lot of, I don't see a lot of need for traffic to go through there when there's two other roads. Thank you.

BARCA: Thank you. Brad Pederson. He'll tell you.

PEDERSON: Good evening. My name is Brad Pederson, P-e-d-e-r-s-o-n, and I agree with everything my wife said. Well put. The proposal or I guess you could say the Alternative F to me is -- would definitely have an impact on our area as far as neighborhood. I guess if I had to choose an alternative I would choose J as a viable option compared to wheeling this road up and down through the, through the neighborhoods. That's all I have to say.

WRIGHT: Is that the blue one?

PEDERSON: Yes.

BARCA: Yes.

PEDERSON: Thank you.

BARCA: Thank you. It looks like Andrew or Donna Gregg.

GREGG: My name is Donna Gregg, D-o-n-n-a, G-r-e-g-g. Good evening. It's been a long night for everyone so I'll be as brief as I can. I realize that the road segment has been there for since '93. There is one alternative that wasn't considered on these on here and that is not to do anything, to take it off the map.

There's a finding that the road segment from N.E. 99th Street of N.E. 99th Street from 72nd Avenue to 94th Avenue has been on there since '93, but there was a segment of 99th Street from St. Johns to N.E. 72nd that was removed from the atlas in 2016 due to development that precluded the construction of the future M-2cb. So there was a segment removed so that there could be development there.

Now, we have development in our neighborhood and I am about four houses, that would be north I guess, of Alternative F and what it is doing is you are coming right through a neighborhood that has already been developed. Now, I realize the right-of-way was there. The County does not maintain it. It's maintained by the people who live in the neighborhood because we got tired of the weeds growing.

I realize that if you had to do an alternative, which I'm not sure why since I'm not sure how much more development really is going to be done, I haven't seen any numbers about what's projected so I can't comment on that. 72nd crosses the railroad, so if we're trying to divide the railroad, why are we -- what are we going to do with 72nd? We have to turn left or right onto 72nd and the railroad tracks are right there as you go across 72nd. Let's see.

One other thing I wanted to point out was when you do something like this through a neighborhood, I would like to know how when I come down 82nd Avenue I'm supposed to get through the traffic of this new thoroughfare. Because even though it's only two lanes, people

drive very fast out in that area. 72nd the speed limit's 45, but if you clocked people, they're probably doing 65, so I can foresee people cruising right through there, and there are children in that neighborhood.

As far as saying that C-TRAN and the transportation, I never see a C-TRAN bus out our way. I don't know that they even go out there. So to say that this is to help that, I'm not sure that that's a true statement. As far as biking, I am a biker and I really don't mind riding along the bikeway that's there on Padden Parkway and now we'll be able to go from Padden Parkway and riding, we have to ride up over I-205. So to say, well, it's better for that, I think that might not be an issue. So thank you.

BARCA: Questions? Thank you. Ashley McWatters. Oh, what does this one say? I'm sorry, I'm going to read your address because I just can't make out the handwriting. 16711 N.E. 98th Street. Is it Sabrina? Okay. I apologize if you're at the end here and I didn't call you up, you can sure come up. Jane and Evan Dudik. Christine Bitner. Bitner? No? Kristen Riggs. David or Dorene --

SWINDELL: Hold on.

RIGGS: I was in the back.

BARCA: Oh, and you're Christina?

RIGGS: I'm Kristen, yeah. And it's --

BARCA: Any one of those microphones works.

RIGGS: Okay. So my name is Kristen Riggs, K-r-i-s-t-e-n, R-i-g-g-s, and I am not in support of Alternative F, but I do support Alternative J and Alternative D primarily because Alternative F does impact so much of our protected land and existing developable land.

The value, I understand that we've recently seen a big review of all railroads and that probably has driven the Alternative F, but ultimately this railroad in 20 years, the majority of people who are currently residing on these properties probably will not be residing in these properties, but the impact of the developable land does impact the value of those property owners.

The railroad most likely will not be in use, so the value of the land that is impacted by Alternative F is greater than the railroad that's currently very rarely used and in forecast doesn't truly connect to many transportable spaces that will be used in 20 years.

BARCA: Any questions?

RIGGS: One other comment is that the existing street of 99 is not improved and the focus of improving by using 99th Street and widening it creates the least amount of impact other than

the railroad crossing 72nd which most likely would be addressed in some other transportation valuation.

BARCA: Okay. Thank you.

RIGGS: Thank you.

BARCA: Okay. David or Dorene Rau. All right. Sheet 2 done. Tom or April Gredvig.

GREDVIG: Hi, Commission. Thomas Gredvig, T-h-o-m-a-s, Gredvig, G-r-e-d-v-i-g, Gredvig. I believe I've e-mailed Gary I was in opposition to all of these proposals and I'm just here to reaffirm my opposition and to agree wholeheartedly with a lot of these folks that have already spoken about an east/west alternative that makes no sense. I mean, we don't need to connect to a neighborhood that's not in our neighborhood and they don't need to connect to ours. I see no logic in this at all.

And it's already been spoken that 117th, at 119th and Padden Parkway are both pretty squared away on covering traffic east and west and putting one in the middle of them just because there's lines on a map makes virtually no sense. Okay.

So we have livability issues is the biggest part. I've got no park in my neighborhood that I can walk to, there's zero parks, either city or county. There's no bike lanes, no curbs on most of these streets. And then the increased amount of traffic, you're just, you got a bunch of traffic including Gulick Trucking and - what's the other one down there right by us? - VanView, so all these 18-wheelers are going to hang a left to go through our neighborhood because it's convenient for them, makes no sense.

I'm just, I'm aghast at the proposal, I really am, and I don't know who tailored the transportation map. Also the railroad, how often is it used, once or twice a day? I'm retired now, I walk my dog every day and I hear that train once, these guys say twice, but I only hear it once a day. So you got this railroad that's obviously pulling some strings here. I don't understand it. So I could rant on and on but you guys get my drift.

I'm thoroughly opposed and I agree with everything that everybody said. And that park would be a great park, I'm telling you. You could spend a hundred grand, put a nice fence around it, make it a beautiful park. Why put a road through there into a -- so that we can get to another community? Makes no sense.

BARCA: Questions for Mr. Gredvig? Nope, I guess not. Thank you. Mike Hewitt.

HEWITT: I pass.

BARCA: Okay. And Sarah Hewitt.

HEWITT: I too pass.

BARCA: Thank you. Ray Bloomquist. Nancy Cann.

CANN: I'll pass.

BARCA: Passing. Is it, it looks like Michele.

SWINDELL: Marcie. I don't know.

BARCA: Marcie? I don't know. I'm sorry. I'm going to say Marcie Bets. All right. Here we go, address, 10014 N.E. 82nd Avenue. Okay. Quite embarrassing because we're on TV and I'm doing this. Sabine or Troy Summerhill. All right. Got one.

SUMMERHILL: Troy Summerhill, T-r-o-y, S-u-m-m-e-r-h-i-l-l. So I own the property that is just north of the cul-de-sac where the road, it's not just going to impact me, it's literally going to go through my house so I'm probably getting the most bang for the buck for anybody.

I came home from the hospital in 1969 to this piece of property and I've lived there until today. It is a gorgeous piece of property. I have a wonderful garden. I raise chickens. I've raised my daughters there. Cedar 49 didn't exist, but they built a beautiful neighborhood down there. This would not be good for it. It's a shame to see my daughters pool with a road running through the middle of it. It just disgusts me.

How can you just put, you, put a line on a map and destroy someone's house that's been there for -- well, when they bought it, it was an old house then, I've lived there for 49 years. I don't support any of these. I think it's going to be horrible for the neighborhood.

I don't know why anyone doesn't look at 88th Street. It would be easy to improve and from 94th Avenue across the old dump would not be an issue, there's no houses there, that would impact so fewer people than any of these proposals. Any questions?

WRIGHT: Would you care to talk to the folks on 88th Street about that proposal?

SUMMERHILL: Well, they don't live right on the road, there's a field there that you could easily expand to four lanes if you wanted to. The road is in horrible shape and needs fixed as is.

WRIGHT: I think you'd find the folks would be very reluctant to have a road go through their properties.

SUMMERHILL: Well, it's not through their property, you could expand it to the north. It's a pasture right now and you wouldn't have any wetlands to deal with because it already crosses Curtin Creek where Curtin Creek is a tiny little trickle instead of an entire wetland where it is

lower.

WRIGHT: I'm sorry, I shouldn't have gotten into a debate with you. My point was folks are going to object to any alignment, they're just not here tonight.

SUMMERHILL: Most likely because it's not needed as has been stated tonight. And these two neighborhoods, the kids over here go to Evergreen schools, and these kids go to Glenwood in Battle Ground, there's no reason to go across the field. This road would not be used for any of that, they're going to go the same way they're going now.

BARCA: Thank you, Mr. Summerhill.

SUMMERHILL: Thank you.

SWINDELL: Actually, can I ask just a quick question. Can you clarify where you were saying that the road is going to go through a swimming pool.

SUMMERHILL: Yes. Do you see this cul-de-sac?

SWINDELL: I see a couple of them.

SUMMERHILL: No. The turnaround.

SWINDELL: The roundabout?

SUMMERHILL: Yeah, the roundabout.

SWINDELL: Oh, in the yellow, right there.

SUMMERHILL: You have to go an inch up, do you see that blue dot, that's our swimming pool.

SWINDELL: Okay. Thank you.

BARCA: Michael Thompson.

THOMPSON: Good evening. My name is Michael Thompson, M-i-c-h-a-e-l, T-h-o-m-p-s-o-n. How can you put a road through a man's swimming pool?

BARCA: We're very practical.

THOMPSON: Anyway, I agree with most of the folks here. What's the need? Just because you have a right-of-way doesn't mean you need to use it. This right-of-way was made, I don't know, what, 30 years ago. I moved into the neighborhood five years ago and this, you know, just came up at the grange meeting with me, so... I'm thinking like the last gentleman, there's

alternatives that can be used. 88th and 94th.

My house is, butts up right against that blue line, so basically you'd have to buy my house I imagine or do whatever you do, but I'm against all the proposals. Because the wetland area is really going to be, you know, affected by a road that goes through it. It's fairly new and right now we're seeing wildlife, we're seeing birds. I have a feeling if a road went through there, the wildlife would disappear for a while and take a long time to come back. Thank you so much.

BARCA: Thank you. Brenda Lee. Loretta Kalmbach. Pauline Elder. Bob Winston. All right. Kathy Lindman. And Larry Gibson. All right.

GIBSON: I'm Larry Gibson, L-a-r-r-y, G-i-b-s-o-n. I own the property that at on the south side of 99th Street there at 72nd Avenue, and my question is, when I was looking at this proposal, it looks like the cheapest way is going to be to do the yellow arch and I don't understand that. It seems to me like the cheapest way would be to do Option J which is the blue line. Can you explain that to me.

BARCA: Sorry, Gary, but you're the guy who put the line on the map.

ALBRECHT: Okay. So the consultant's study, so which line are you talking about, you think the blue one is cheaper?

GIBSON: Well, because it's mostly there already.

ALBRECHT: Okay. So the blue one is, let's see, so 40 parcels with 35 acquisitions are required, 9 potential residential displacements will occur, requires an estimated total of 3.7 acres, .07 acres in fee and .41 acres in temporary easements, so there's a lot of, there are a lot more constraints on the blue line going straight across.

And as far as crossing Curtin Creek down here, this area up here has been prepared by Public Works in 2012 for a road to go through here, this segment has not. So we've already heard earlier what it costs for environmental mitigation, so that would take into effect down here. So all this would have to have a lot of environmental mitigation to occur, this site would not take a lot of mitigation to occur.

GIBSON: And if the blue line was done, I think that was J, if that was done, would that -- would current 99th Street be widened?

ALBRECHT: Well, so, yes. If it was to happen it would be widened over the same standard, the same classification, the minor arterial, the M-2cb. So all of these alternatives would be widened to that classification.

GIBSON: Okay. But since I'm a lay person and don't understand all that, some of my

property was purchased when 72nd was widened and there was an easement purchased on 99th Street, is that easement going to be, need to be wider?

ALBRECHT: I don't know.

GIBSON: I don't either. I was, I'm planning on building a building there and I just want to know if I'm going to have any room to park in front of the building.

ALBRECHT: Have you submitted a pre-application for it?

GIBSON: Oh, yeah.

ALBRECHT: Okay. Well, a development trumps the whatever happens now going forward, so I'm not sure what will happen, so I don't know.

GIBSON: Okay.

WRIGHT: You know, it might be useful to have Matt come up and talk a little bit about the issues of 99th Street and 72nd as proximity to the railroad track because I know that was a big factor in the alignment.

GIBSON: Okay. And the railroad track is another question I have because it's not used very much, why are we trying to align everything with the railroad track?

BARCA: We'll get to that, yeah.

GIBSON: Okay. Perfect.

BARCA: Okay. Yeah. Okay. So I have Harvey Nicholson.

NICHOLSON: I'll pass.

BARCA: You'll pass. Richard Gordon. And Richard was with Michele Gordon. Okay. Clint Nelson coming in. And Clint is the last one on the sign-up sheet, so if there's anybody else that wishes to testify, you're welcome to come forward after Clint, you can just raise your hand and we'll get you right up. Okay, Clint.

NELSON: Hello, gentlemen. I'm not really a great speaker, but I have a few questions.

BARCA: Can you start by speaking your name and then spelling it for us, please.

NELSON: Like I said, I'm awful simple. So Clint, C-I-I-n-t.

WISER: Can you speak in the mic.

NELSON: Clint, C-l-i-n-t, Nelson, N-e-l-s-o-n.

BARCA: Thank you.

NELSON: In looking at your map, my house is covered in yellow, so I have a slight question of if the house or if the road does go through, obviously I won't be living there anymore and I'd probably want to sell my property, will it still be zoned the same way it is right now, residential?

ALBRECHT: Where is your house at on the yellow line?

NELSON: You see the green dot where the swimming pool won't be, I'm on the other side of the road.

ALBRECHT: Okay. So I believe that is light industrial property.

NELSON: No, it's not. Anyway --

BARCA: We can get you that answer, it might be offline, but we can get that answer to you.

NELSON: Okay. The fact that I live so close to a new Padden Way, and I wouldn't want to live there anymore, it would also affect all the wildlife. Right now I have ten deer that come out to my apple orchard, I put out salt blocks, the kids really like to watch them. I was wondering what will happen to those green areas, will they be moved? Because in 20 years, you know, the green areas are going to be a lot smaller than they are now.

BARCA: And if I understand your question, I believe some of those green areas are already purchased right-of-way that the County owns. So it sounds like those portions would get converted into the road and other portions of the greenway such as what happens in Curtin Creek would be remaining protected as it is today. So without knowing which green spaces you're referring to, I think there's a variety of answers, but let's be clear, until there's a road development, then there's not any kind of change on the ground.

NELSON: Okay. So I go to try to sell my land right now and everybody looks that there's going to be a road going through it, what does that really do with my next 20 years until I realize if there is going to be a road or if there isn't? I'm almost to the point now where I don't want to buy green bananas because I don't know if I'll be around that long. So what can I look for as a future?

BARCA: Well, there's no road plan, there's no funding, there's a line on a long-term planning map and that's what this hearing tonight is about. So when you want certainty, the only thing we can say right now is there isn't a project at this moment, there's only a discussion about what the project would consist of.

NELSON: Okay.

BARCA: Okay. So as I stated before, Clint was the last one up on the list, and if we have -- all right. Just one moment please, sir. Did you want to come forward and speak as well? Okay. You'll be right after her and then you in the back there behind Mr. Wilson. Not Wilson, sorry --

WILLIAMSON: Williamson.

BARCA: -- Williamson, I was really close.

WILLIAMSON: You were close.

MEEKS: Hi. My name is Carole Meeks, C-a-r-o-l-e, M-e-e-k-s. So what I learned tonight is that I didn't do my homework before we purchased our house, that's what I learned. We got our house three and a half years ago and now I regret not doing my homework about what this property was planned for.

My challenge right now is that I haven't heard anybody come forward saying we want this. There's been no positive people saying we can't get across this area because it's all congested. I get the fact that you're doing this future planning, I totally understand that and that's what I understand now, I didn't know that when we bought the house, but now that we're there, now I feel like thanks for giving me the head up that I need to sell, that's where I'm at right now, that's what's depressing.

And, yes, my husband and I bought that property because it's beautiful, it's an amazing neighborhood and there is no place in Vancouver that I've seen that is anything like that and now I'm regretting it which is really sad.

I don't know what -- I get it that you're doing this future development, totally get it, but what I saw on the map when you showed it before was a bunch of squares and they all seemed to be very uniform in size and this happened to be one of those lines.

I don't know what the alternative is. If I was to choose one, I guess I would choose the red. I am not in favor of any of them at all because I hear all my neighbors talking about how they're affected. So one of my things that I wrote to my husband as I was making my notes is I would feel guilty about choosing something that would be good for me if it's going to affect one of them. That's all I have to say. Thank you.

BARCA: Thank you. Sir.

NICHOLSON: Harvey Nicholson, H-a-r-v-e-y, N-i-c-h-o-l-s-o-n. My question is I live right on the right-of-way, I knew that when I bought the place, so that's not an issue. My question is, isn't the red line in reality the true easement area?

ALBRECHT: Well, so that's the existing arterial atlas is through the red line.

NICHOLSON: That's right. And the gentleman with his pool and the other gentleman that talked about cutting right through the middle of his property, all that and the S-hook is new?

ALBRECHT: That's a proposed, a proposed alignment, yes.

NICHOLSON: So you aren't following the right-of-way, you're just going where you want to; right? Isn't that what I'm hearing?

BARCA: So, no, to clarify, there's a proposal to change the direction of the line on the map. Right now there is a line on the map and it's the red line, so...

NICHOLSON: But lines don't mean anything. The atlas doesn't mean anything. That's all I want to say. Thank you.

BARCA: Okay. Let's see. Yes, you come forward and then there was somebody back there, yeah, you can come up after her, please. Please, go ahead.

HARWOOD: Sarah Harwood, S-a-r-a-h, H-a-r-w-o-o-d. And if I could just get clarification on Page 8 in the paragraph where it says construction in 2021 pending funding, it's the second paragraph.

GRISWOLD: Is that for 99th to the east?

HARWOOD: So does that, does this paragraph mean that you do have funding for that portion of this project?

GRISWOLD: We have funding I believe for the intersection of 94th and 99th and we're going after funding for the portion east of there to 503.

HARWOOD: Okay. So --

BARCA: Pardon me, you haven't introduced yourself, we don't know who you are.

GRISWOLD: Oh, I'm sorry. Matt Griswold, I manage the traffic engineers and operations.

HARWOOD: Okay. Thank you. So I live in Mountain View Estates and I don't like any of these, but I understand that you do need to have something on a map for a long-term plan.

So I know we have all said no to this. So what might be better is to spend our energy in going towards 117th to where there aren't all these houses already built and making it so that when the development is put in at the end of St. Johns where that traffic light is and you run the road

east, then in 20 years you're not going to have a room full of people objecting to all the work you all have already put into it.

There's got to be a different way of doing these maps and building up neighborhoods so that you don't run into 100 people telling you all no. So I think it's time to go back to the drawing board and make sure that as you build St. Johns Way that you allow for it not to go through someone's swimming pool or you don't interrupt our elderly gentleman who walks our neighborhood and whistles throughout the entire neighborhood and everybody knows who that is, it's Owen, there's got to be a better way to do this so we don't run up against this.

And I know you have worked really hard on this, just move those lines where there's not construction yet. That's all.

BARCA: Thank you.

COE: My name is Brenda Coe. Brenda, B-r-e-n-d-a, Coe, C-o-e. We bought our house - our house is on the blue line - five years ago. It's a beautiful house, a retirement home, didn't know about this easement.

I'm wondering why we don't have public transportation that could take care of a lot of traffic that is foreseeable in the future. I never ever see a bus ever. And the up and coming generation I think would really benefit from a bus going north and south on 117th and 99th. I mean, thousands of people could ride that bus and we could probably save \$15 million.

I just I don't even understand in my mind why we don't have more public transportation taking care of some of this car traffic. I for one live in Vancouver and work in Portland and I just feel like people would benefit from a bus system that could go north and south and take care of thousands of people that could benefit from it instead of \$15 million on thoroughfares that I don't even see that it needs happening of. Thank you for your time.

BARCA: Thank you. Well, that is the end of the sign-up sheet and the hands that have gone up, so there's one last call for anybody else that wants to come forward on this issue.

RAU: I spoke earlier, but which one I opposed I just want to say that I oppose all of them.

BARCA: Okay. We'll get that into the record. Okay. I was going to get there. Hang on. All right. Yeah, David Rau. Is that right? Okay. So we're going to close public testimony, we're going to bring it back to staff and then deliberation.

RETURN TO PLANNING COMMISSION

WRIGHT: I asked Matt if he could come up, I think a lot of the folks might be interested in the blue alternative of the ones that would allow any road, that seemed to be the most favored, and I don't think all the issues with that road have been fully disclosed in the hearing tonight.

GRISWOLD: You're referring to the blue line that goes directly east and west through there?

BARCA: Alt J.

GRISWOLD: Alt J. Like Gary said previously, the wetlands would have to be crossed and there's been no mitigation done in that area. And as he also said, there's homes that will be purchased through there.

It would save the swimming pool on the north, but to the -- as you go further to the west, you run next to the railroad right-of-way there, it's very tight right there now and we're constrained currently with the right-of-way that's adjacent to the railroad, so that means we would have to shift everything further to the south to avoid the railroad there. Those are all things that drive up the cost of Option J.

And also with it being so close to that railroad, that causes additional issues with that crossing with traffic coming out of there trying to make a left-hand turn right with that railroad crossing so close to it. With moving it further to the south there, that gets us away from the railroad crossing, makes it a safer entrance into 72nd.

WRIGHT: Thank you.

GRIMWADE: Matt, I'm looking at, must have been your cost estimate section of the report and Alternative J is reading as a total of 14,796 million; Alternative F 15,976; Alternative D and underpass 19,873, is there additional costs somewhere that is driving up Option J?

ALBRECHT: Well, so if you look at, you look at the study it breaks down everything in here, so...

GRIMWADE: So where do I find the total cost for each of the options?

ALBRECHT: Well, so if you keep scrolling back through these, so from this page from Appendix H, so you scroll, you flip the page, see each one of these are broken down by costs and line items.

GRIMWADE: So when I get to the individual options --

ALBRECHT: D, D, F, J.

GRIMWADE: -- so I'm on Alternative J, the individual option --

ALBRECHT: Yes.

GRIMWADE: -- and if I go through that detail cost, right at the bottom on this, behind the page

of it, it's still telling me 14,796.

ALBRECHT: Alternative J, 14,796, 14,796, total project, so I'm not seeing what --

GRIMWADE: Based upon that summary page J is the cheapest. Now that's not to say J is the best.

ALBRECHT: That's correct.

GRIMWADE: So the next question I would ask is, has a cost benefit study been done on each of the options weighing the quantitative and the qualitative benefits to be derived from each of the proposals?

ALBRECHT: So if you go back to the staff report and look at, so I've taken a summary from this, this report here from the consultant's summary, so on Page 3, so the table summarizes the comparisons of cost, so look at construction costs, right-of-way costs, residential impact, environmental impact, they've calculated these as least and most, so it breaks these down into categories, so whichever specific category.

So if you look at the table, so the first one, Alternative D with the railroad overpass, the construction cost, that is the most expensive. Going across, the right-of-way cost, it's a three-quarter, so you go all the way across, the average score is 3. So does that help get you to what you're looking for?

GRIMWADE: The question I have is, was or was there not a cost benefit study done for each of the options as part of the investigation? It would have to be a yes or a no.

GRISWOLD: Not that we know of there is not a BC done.

GRIMWADE: Okay. Thanks.

BARCA: Other questions for staff?

SWINDELL: You kind of answered it, but I think just to clarify, so the line on the map if you can put your cursor up there where the yellow intersects the red, intersects the red, right at that point, so going to the east, that is already an easement that is there.

ALBRECHT: Correct.

SWINDELL: Okay. Or your right-of-way, excuse me. The red is a line on a map that there's no easements already purchased, it's just a line on a map for us to say, hey, in the future, this is what we're thinking.

GRISWOLD: That is correct.

SWINDELL: And what has happened, I'm just making sure I'm understanding we're all clear, that the railroad came to us and said, hey, we'd like you to take another look at this thing because we don't want you crossing us --

ALBRECHT: No --

SWINDELL: -- is that accurate?

ALBRECHT: -- it wasn't the railroad. It started with a property owner that lived over here --

SWINDELL: Okay.

ALBRECHT: -- and she has sold her property and moved since then.

SWINDELL: Okay. So we started looking at that red line and we realized that we're going to have to go under the railroad or we're going to have to go over the railroad.

ALBRECHT: Correct.

SWINDELL: And the cost of that we said, whoa, wait a minute, this is way too costly to get across that direction.

ALBRECHT: Correct. Yes.

SWINDELL: Then we said let's look and see what alternatives we can come up with to help save the taxpayers some dollars because we already have this line on the map, we're already here, this is something we've thought out for 20 years already and what we're looking at is tonight saying, yes, we like your -- we want to accept the proposal on the yellow line just to make it simple, yes, we like the yellow line, let's change the yellow or if we say no, it remains the red line; is that correct?

ALBRECHT: Well, so --

SWINDELL: Is that correct?

ALBRECHT: Yes.

SWINDELL: I just want to clarify that so everybody knows what's on the table and what we're talking about. So the cost for that red line to continue on with what we were going to do, what is the cost again for the going under the railroad so the public knows so we can get it on the record here?

BARCA: Right here. 19,873,000.

SWINDELL: So just under 20 million to go under it.

ALBRECHT: Correct.

SWINDELL: To go over it?

ALBRECHT: Over is 21,386,000, so 21 and a half million.

SWINDELL: Okay. And the yellow line is 6- -- well, 15 and the blue line is about 16 or 17?

ALBRECHT: About that roughly.

SWINDELL: Rough numbers here. Okay. And the idea that the yellow line is the least amount of impact to anyone in the area, I mean obviously it's impacting people, like the person with the pool and there's some impact, I understand, but the idea is that this will be less for the taxpayers and it will be less of an impact as to any of the alternatives? I'm just trying to clarify that. Is that what we're going for, that's what we're attempting to do?

ALBRECHT: Least amount of impacts when we're looking at construction cost, right-of-way cost, residential impact, environmental cost, those four things.

SWINDELL: And I understand when it gets down to the individual, there's impacts, I want you to know that I recognize that, so... Okay. And then through the neighborhood it looks like there's on the yellow line after the bridge before the red there is one intersection that's going to get into the neighborhood, is that accurate, if you go to your west, go west?

ALBRECHT: Here?

SWINDELL: Keep going west. That's east. Whoop, go up on the yellow line, straight up, go to your right now, just a little bit, that intersection, that intersection is the intersection that's going to allow traffic in and out of that neighborhood; is that correct?

ALBRECHT: Correct. So if the railroad option is chosen, it would be an eight-percent grade starting right here to get up high enough to cross to get to 23 feet, so it would start here and go up, so that would be the walls going up all the way and the same it would be walls going all the way down for under as well.

SWINDELL: But if we follow the yellow line, is there access there into those two neighborhoods where I believe everybody lives? There's access there or is there no access?

ALBRECHT: Yes, there's still access here.

SWINDELL: Is access.

ALBRECHT: It would still remain.

SWINDELL: Okay. I just want to clarify.

BARCA: We need to be able to have this deliberation, so if you can just hold your comments, I think we have a clear understanding about your position on it right now. So what we need to do is help with the deliberation and that's happening right up here. Okay. I appreciate it.

SWINDELL: So I want to make sure that I'm understanding as well that depending upon development, the economy, this may or may not ever be built?

ALBRECHT: That is correct.

SWINDELL: It's on a 20-year plan that says if all the right things happen at the right time --

BARCA: Or the wrong things.

SWINDELL: -- or the wrong things I guess in some people's view, exactly, this could be built?

ALBRECHT: That is correct. A lot of assumptions go into that.

WRIGHT: It's not on the 20-year plan though, it's only on the arterial atlas.

ALBRECHT: It's on the arterial atlas, that's correct.

SWINDELL: So it's not even on the 20-year plan.

ALBRECHT: It's not on the 20-year capital facilities plan.

SWINDELL: It's not even on the capital facilities plan. Okay. And this has been the yellow line to the red line from 99th has been on the map since 1992; is that correct?

ALBRECHT: Yes.

SWINDELL: Okay. Thank you.

ALBRECHT: You're welcome.

BENDER: Who owns the roadbed?

ALBRECHT: Pardon me?

BENDER: Who owns the bed, the track?

BARCA: You're talking about the railroad track?

BENDER: Yeah. The railroad track, yeah.

GRISWOLD: That's Clark County.

BENDER: Is that part of Chelatchie?

GRISWOLD: Yeah.

BARCA: So is this the time you're going to clarify the viability of the railroad?

ORJIAKO: No, sir. That issue will come before you in the future, so I won't be commenting on it.

BARCA: I think it would be somewhat appropriate since everybody out there seems to have a conception of how viable the railroad is.

ORJIAKO: Again, I will not be commenting on that. I think, I'm not the railroad coordinator, so we have an issue that will be coming before you.

But to answer Planning Commissioner Richard Bender's question, the County owns the Chelatchie Prairie Railroad and it's leased to an operator. We will be appearing before you in the future on the viability and proposed use for the short line that the County owns and the operator will be able to answer the number of cars that goes through that and then you will be able to ask him questions.

BARCA: So I think it remains somewhat cryptic for the audience. I think what we should be able to say is there's a proposal for freight rail use that's happening out in the Brush Prairie area, and if you're not aware of it, then you should look on the County website concerning freight rail use and the ongoing planning and hearings that are coming up in that.

ORJIAKO: You are correct, but because the issue is not before you and not on your agenda, I didn't want to bring it up, but indeed there is on our website and we will be sending out mailing to property owners informing them of that proposal, but it's not before you.

GRIMWADE: Is there any timing constraints for a decision on this?

ALBRECHT: Well, it's a docket item, so the normal process would follow that there would be some sort of action taken this evening which would be brought forward to the County Council sometime in the fall, late, late fall, early winter, so that's the timeline.

GRIMWADE: Yeah, because I'm trying to sort of stitch together a number of variables that are

going on and it seems to me there's some sequencing that needs to be considered because depending on what happens with an issue which we're not allowed to talk about tonight maybe it's prudent to have that conversation before making a decision on this one.

ORJIAKO: I don't think that that issue will necessarily impact this because this area is in the Vancouver urban growth boundary and the proposal that we are making is that we not consider areas that are inside the Vancouver urban growth boundary or in the Battle Ground urban growth boundary as we look at the railroad because we don't have land use jurisdiction other than in an area that is already annexed by the City, and as such, we are excluding areas that are part of Battle Ground urban growth boundary and Vancouver urban growth boundary and look at areas in between.

Again, you're going to be seeing that proposal, but it's not before you. The proposal would only apply to areas designated as resource in the rural area and the railroad that the County owns is a 33-mile stretch of railroad, so decision on where the uses will be allowed will come before you, this alignment will not affect that.

BARCA: More questions for staff?

SWINDELL: I'm going to ask just one more. So regardless of what happens, there's going to be lines on a map, that doesn't mean that somewhere down the road that proposals can be made to have that changed; correct?

ALBRECHT: Correct.

WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a **MOTION** that this new alignment be adopted in the arterial atlas as presented by staff.

SWINDELL: I **second** it.

BARCA: Okay. It's been motioned and seconded that the staff proposal to accept Alternative F has been put forward to the Commission. So without any more discussion --

SWINDELL: I'd like to make a statement if I could.

BARCA: When we do roll call, you can do your statement.

ROLL CALL VOTE

SWINDELL: AYE
GRIMWADE: AYE
BENDER: NO
WRIGHT: AYE
BARCA: NO

BARCA: So the proposal for Alt F passes 3 to 2.

WISER: 3 to 2.

BARCA: And carry on.

SWINDELL: I just wanted to make a statement that decisions like this are not easy. I want everyone to understand that there's a lot of thought and consideration taken into these decisions. And even though the vote went quickly, there wasn't -- this was something that took a long time and long thought and we've talked about this for a while.

And I just wanted to make sure everybody knew that we all sitting up here understand that things like this, decisions like this impact people's lives and I just want to say that so you understand that these things aren't easy.

BARCA: So this isn't the end of it. Our vote here is strictly advisory for the County Council and there will be a hearing that comes before the County Council in which you'll be able to advocate for any of the alternatives or your opportunity to say remove all the lines and that is the organization that has the power to remove the lines.

PUBLIC: Will the County tell us when the meetings will be?

ORJIAKO: Yes.

BARCA: The hearing will be advertised, yes.

PUBLIC: When?

ORJIAKO: It's going to be in this room and all of the folks that signed in, we will make effort to make sure that they get notice of the Council hearing.

PUBLIC: Will they post again like they did for this one?

ORJIAKO: Yes, we will post the site again and if your name is already on our mailing list, don't worry, we will also mail you the notice of the Council hearing.

BARCA: Okay. All right. Let's go ahead and take a break and then we will get right into mobile homes. Ten minutes.

(Pause in proceedings.)

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS & PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION, continued

CPZ2018-00005 Manufactured Housing – A proposal to update the manufactured housing and mobile home development code language. The code will apply anywhere manufactured housing or mobile homes are allowed, which are located primarily in residential zones.

Staff Contact: Laurie.Lebowsky@clark.wa.gov or (564) 397-4544

BARCA: Okay. We've returned from the commercial break and we're ready to get started. We are going to do CPZ2018-00005, Manufactured Homes.

LEBOWSKY: Thank you. I'm Laurie Lebowsky making a presentation for this docket item. Give you some background.

Why are we making these changes to the code? First of all, this was part of a, was part of a Council initiated project last year to explore innovative housing techniques to expand housing choice. So we adopted a cottage housing and accessory dwelling unit code to expand the range for a variety of housing to hopefully address housing affordability. So the manufactured housing is Part 3 of that effort from last year, it's finishing it up.

Another reason we're making these changes now is that is in response to State legislation regarding manufactured homes, the County needs to update its definition of manufactured homes. Also, we have some regulations that treat manufactured homes differently than other types of homes which is not allowed under State law.

Also, so the State it says we can't treat manufactured homes differently than other homes; however, in a subdivision you can still have covenants that restrict the placement of manufactured homes.

So what's changing? Basically, as I said, we're creating separate definitions for mobile homes and manufactured homes. We're expanding the definition of a single-family detached dwelling to include manufactured and modular homes.

We are repealing the entire section of 40.260.130, manufactured homes on individual lots again because of the State law. We are going to allow recreational vehicles in manufactured home parks as long as they obtain a permit from Labor & Industries. We also will allow modular homes for temporary health hardships so long as that the way it's placed that it is temporary in nature. This is our public process.

You can see we went to DEAB. I went to DEAB a couple of times. At their July 12th meeting, the Development Engineering Advisory Board recommended approval of the code change as staff presented.

There was a question that came up at the Planning Commission work session that you all had a

couple weeks ago about concerning manufactured mobile home parks that the developer buys one, is there something, a program for relocation. And I e-mailed you the website from Commerce that talks about the legislation about if a manufactured home park is bought out and what options are available for people living in the manufactured home park or mobile home park.

Finally, to date we've not received comments regarding this docket item. I've received lots of questions, but really no comments about the code changes.

So staff is recommending approval of the code changes and the Planning Commissions recommendation, however you vote, if you vote tonight, that would go to the County Council for a hearing on September 18th.

And that concludes staff's presentation and I'll entertain any questions that you have.

BARCA: Any questions for staff?

SWINDELL: Very well done. Right to the point.

LEBOWSKY: Thank you.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

BARCA: Okay. Seeing no more questions for staff, we're going to move into the public participation part here. So we're asking that Shawna Kuhnke come forward for public testimony.

KUHNKE: I am Shawna Kuhnke, S-h-a-w-n-a, K-u-h-n-k-e. I manage a mobile home park in the Orchards area, Greenway Terrace and I'm here actually representing the park owner.

He is very all for the innovative housing, he wants to add more choices; however, our zoning is mixed use and it is not included in the code and we would like to know if that's still going to apply to us if we can have all of these same permissions that are going out or if that needs to include the mixed use.

BARCA: So we have a mobile home park that has mixed use zoning.

KUHNKE: Yes, we operate as a mobile home park.

LEBOWSKY: Right. So as far as the updates to the manufactured home parks, I just, as you can see, that I just added the language as far as manufactured homes. The zoning that's indicated, that's not changed. I don't know if possibly what happened is that you're the mobile home park predated the application of the mixed use zoning.

KUHNKE: That very well could be, yeah. So if we were to, if this all goes through and we were to go in and start getting permits to put accessory dwellings into the home or into the park in different places, would we be treated as if we fell under one of these zones then, these same rules, grandfathered in?

LEBOWSKY: I think it would depend. Number one, these changes apply to new development, new placement of manufactured homes. It would depend on the specific situation regarding your mobile home park, maybe it was a, if it's a nonconforming use, if it was permitted, then I would assume you would be allowed to have, you could place a manufactured home or you mentioned accessory dwelling units, that's a different section, that's a different section of code and those standards would apply, and so you may or may not be permitted to do that.

KUHNKE: And then the other thing I would ask to maybe be considered in our setbacks with street if we're able to add, like we have portions of the property that are larger and could possibly house the smaller homes, the park model RVs, but to put a 30-foot-wide road in to access these, like one of them might just be like a flag-type lot if we can have some kind of - what's the word? - oh, yeah, accessibility or allowance for smaller streets that maybe would just be one lot.

LEBOWSKY: Well, in terms of what I'm doing here with updating the code, it was just in what has to do with -- it doesn't have to -- it doesn't -- I wasn't looking at design standards or manufactured home parks, the changes that I'm proposing have to do with the updating the definition of mobile home and manufactured home.

I did change, staff is recommending that we spell out that a recreational vehicle or a park model could be allowed in a manufactured home park as long as you can get a permit from Labor & Industries, but the proposal right now and this docket item was about, as I mentioned, updating the definitions of manufactured home and mobile home to comply with State and Federal law, so the purpose was not to look at design standards of a manufactured home park.

KUHNKE: So it would probably still be on a permit basis case-by-case?

BARCA: I think, Shawna, what needs to happen is you need to bring these same questions forward and Laurie can connect you with the right people and then you can get into the dialogue about the kind of development ideas or questions that you have and then they can be answered appropriately because it sounds like there are actually several issues you'd like to cover --

KUHNKE: Yeah.

BARCA: -- and most of them are not applicable to us passing this ordinance tonight, but we'll get you hooked up with somebody.

KUHNKE: Okay.

BARCA: All right?

KUHNKE: Thank you.

BARCA: And, Will, are you interested in testifying?

HEBERT: No. She actually answered all my questions with a great presentation and I'm good.

BARCA: Okay. And seeing nobody else from the public coming forward for public testimony, we're going to close public testimony and bring it back to the Planning Commission. Are there additional questions for staff? All right. Then how about some deliberation or a motion.

RETURN TO PLANNING COMMISSION

GRIMWADE: I'll move a **MOTION** that the staff recommendation be forward for approval to the County Commissioners.

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

BARCA: Been motioned and seconded to accept staff recommendation. No discussion? Can I get roll call, please.

ROLL CALL VOTE

WRIGHT: AYE

SWINDELL: AYE

GRIMWADE: AYE

BENDER: AYE

BARCA: AYE

BARCA: And I believe, ladies and gentlemen, that concludes our agenda for the evening and meeting's adjourned.

OLD BUSINESS

None.

NEW BUSINESS

None.

COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION

None.

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 CDTV 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