



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, SEPTEMBER 6, 2018

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

6:30 p.m.

CALL TO ORDER & ROLL CALL

JOHNSON: So I'd like to call this meeting to order for September 8th, 2018. I am the acting Planning Commission Chair, Karl Johnson. Sonja, can we have roll call, please.

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

GENERAL & NEW BUSINESS

A. Approval of Agenda for September 6, 2018

JOHNSON: So the first items are general and new business. I'd like to get a motion for the approval of the agenda for September 6th, 2018.

SWINDELL: I make a motion that we approve the agenda.

BENDER: Second.

JOHNSON: Motion's been made and seconded. All those in favor aye.

EVERYBODY: AYE

B. Approval of Minutes for August 2 & August 16, 2018

JOHNSON: All those opposed? We also have to do an approval of minutes for August 2nd and 16 I see on here, so if we can do this again. I'll start with approval of minutes for August 2nd, can I have a motion for that.

BENDER: I make a motion we approve the minutes for August 2nd, 2018.

SWINDELL: I'll second it.

JOHNSON: Motion's been made and seconded. All those in favor.

EVERYBODY: AYE

JOHNSON: All those opposed? And finally, the third one, the minutes for August 16th, 2018. Motion, please.

BENDER: Make a motion we accept the minutes for August 16th, 2018.

SWINDELL: I'll second it.

JOHNSON: Again, the motion's been made and seconded. All those if favor.

EVERYBODY: AYE

C. Communications from the Public

JOHNSON: All those opposed? Okay. So right now what we'd like to do is, if there's any communication from the public other than what's on the agenda. So this is the confusing part, sometimes people come up and want to talk what's on the agenda, but if you have anything that you want to bring forward to the Planning Commission not regarding what's on our agenda tonight, please do so. It doesn't look like there's any fast movement to the front and so we'll move on.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS & PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION:

CPZ2018-0001 - Urban Holding Removal near the I-5/179th St Interchange
Consider removing the urban holding overlay on 40 acres designated in the comprehensive plan map and zoning map.
Staff Contact: Matt Hermen matt.hermen@clark.wa.gov or (564) 397-4343

JOHNSON: So tonight our public hearing is going to be on CPZ2018-00015. Before I do that, I would like to read just a quick little blurb here. Is there anybody on the Planning Commission that would like to disclose any conflicts of interest? Seeing none, really quickly.

COOK: Excuse me, Mr. Chair.

JOHNSON: Yes.

COOK: I'd like to note that Steve Morasch and Bill Wright have both recused themselves from participating in this hearing.

JOHNSON: Because of a conflict of interest I'm assuming?

COOK: A conflict or a potential conflict.

JOHNSON: All right. Okay. That's great. That's awesome. So quickly, if you haven't been to the Planning Commission, this is kind of a general procedure. It looks like we have a light audience, so we can be a bit flexible.

We'll begin the hearing with a staff report. The Planning Commission members will ask questions of the staff if they have any at this point. I will then open the hearing to public testimony. Members of the audience who wish to testify on the hearing item need to sign on the sign-in sheets at the back of the room.

Members of the public wishing to give oral testimony are to come to the front of the room at the table facing the Planning Commission. And again, the chair has the discretion to make the following statement, if reasonable and appropriate circumstance: I'm not going to limit testimony tonight because we have a small amount of people, but your testimony should be related to the applicable standards upon the hearing and the relevant standards are set out in the staff report copies of which are available in the back of the hearing room.

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

This is kind of important. When you testify, please testify in front of the microphone so our court reporter can hear your testimony, and also state your name and address for the record and spell your name for the court reporter. Be relevant and concise and don't repeat yourself. I will close the public testimony portion of the hearing. Any questions?

So moving forward, like I said, the urban holding on the removal of I-5/179th Street Interchange. Staff, Matt.

HERMEN: Great. Good evening, Planning Commissioners. My name is Matt Hermen, I'm a planner with Clark County Community Planning.

To start you off I want to orient you with your packets. On Tab 2 you have the staff report as well as Exhibit 1 containing the Draft Development Agreement. At the end of that tab is also a map showing the location of the proposal.

Tab 3 is our procedural requirements including our SEPA documents and public notices that have gone out. Tab 4 is the public comments that have been received.

So tonight you have a proposal before you to remove urban holding comprehensive plan and zoning overlays on approximately 40 acres of land. Specifically the urban holding overlay removal is for properties 18199000, 18119000 and 181206000.

Per the 2015-2035 Clark County Comprehensive Growth Management Plan, urban holding overlay designations may be removed upon a determination that the completion of the localized critical links and intersection improvements are reasonably funded as shown on the County's six-year transportation improvement program or through the approval of a Development Agreement.

The proposed action utilizes the Development Agreement vehicle for the removal of urban holding overlay tonight. The Development Agreement proposal has gone through extensive negotiation lasting approximately seven months with the developer as well as other County departments including Public Works.

The Draft Development Agreement that's attached as Exhibit 1 to the staff report is a Draft Agreement. Procedurally, the approval of the Development Agreement will run concurrent with the approval of the urban holding overlay removals.

The Draft Development Agreement is shown on Exhibit 1 of the staff report. I'll direct you to Pages 3 and 4 of the Draft Development Agreement and the specific conditions that are included in them.

Number 1: The cooperation with the developer and the County in a master plan for the overall

improvement of the I-5/179th Street interchange area.

2: The dedication of right-of-way on both sides of 179th Street between the I-5 ramps and 15th Avenue to accommodate the planned principal arterial. The planned principal arterial requires 100 feet right-of-way dedication.

Number 3: The dedication of right-of-way for a future two-lane minor arterial with bike lanes and a center-turn lane that would eventually connect 10th Avenue to 179th Street.

And, finally, Number 4: The construction and dedication of an eastbound to southbound right-turn lane at the intersection of 179th Street and 15th Avenue.

This proposed amendment to the comprehensive plan and zoning maps to remove the urban holding has abided by all State and local procedural requirements. Staff is recommending to the Planning Commission that they forward a recommendation of approval to remove the urban holding overlays on those three subject properties with the approval of the Development Agreement to the Clark County Councilors. And I will have this map in front of you so if we need to explain a little further we can. Thank you.

JOHNSON: So right now is there any questions for staff from the Planning Commission? None? Okay. So we will open it up to the public. Sonja, I don't have a sheet. Was there any sheets? Those wishing to speak on the item in front of us, we'll get you -- excuse me. Oliver?

ORJIAKO: The proponent.

JOHNSON: The proponents first. Okay. So we will take the proponents first it looks like, if that's okay. And if I call your name, again you don't have to say it twice. State your name and everything for the record, please.

KILLIAN: Good evening, Commissioners. My name is Lance Killian with Killian Pacific. Address 101 East 6th Street, Suite 350, Vancouver, Washington. I'm here on behalf of the proponent, Three Creeks, LLCs.

And I'd just like to, as part of the work session, which we also were in the audience in attendance, it was clear that it's probably helpful for you in your evaluation this evening to be informed as to some of the historical context around this request, but also some of the collaboration, public/private collaboration that's been happening now for several years that specifically relates to this, so I'm going to do that quickly here for you tonight.

The goal here for us, we're a local developer, we're based in Vancouver, Washington. Our purpose and what we try and do through our work is enhance community and we've been, the

property we first acquired here was in 2005, so we've been at this for I'm embarrassed to say well over 12 years and the major impediments frankly have been infrastructure in one form or another.

Sanitary sewer was a problem, transportation has been a problem, so patience is a virtue hopefully and I'll explain to you how this hopefully will allow us to finally get out of the gates and help from a public perspective in solving some of the remaining infrastructure challenges.

So this area, as you may know, has been in a moratorium, a transportation moratorium for over six years now, and that has precluded private development from occurring obviously over the course of that time and that will not change without significant transportation improvements being in place.

And so there have been for many years now collaborative efforts, public/private efforts going on to help try and resolve those bigger picture issues. I think the scope is well over \$100 million in transportation improvements that need to be invested to resolve the moratorium issue and open up the urban holdings and the areas within the urban growth boundary.

And just to be clear, I think this question came up in the workshop, the moratorium applies not only to the urban holdings areas but also to properties within the urban, that are already in the urban growth boundary that would impact or send trips, a certain number of, you know, minimum threshold of trips through this area.

So a relevant, I think, fact here is that this area is really the gateway to the Discovery, what's commonly known as the Discovery Corridor. It has -- it's on I-5 but it also is the largest sort of area, approximately 4,000 acres that are either undeveloped as vacant or underdeveloped that could be developed and that includes both in the urban area and in the urban holdings.

There was a, I'll hand copies to you here of a study that was conducted at the time that the lobbying was occurring for the funding of the 179th interchange conducted by a company called Johnson Economics. Let you get that in front of you here.

But I'm not going to go through this in any detail, but this refers to the 4,000 acres and there's a lot of detail in here that I was referring to, but if you flip to the last page, I think the punch line here from a community economic development perspective is that over a 20-year horizon if the moratorium was lifted and properties were allowed to develop over this time frame, the net present benefit to the county is estimated at just under \$700 million of revenue.

So, as you are likely aware, the interchange, the 179th Street interchange was funding was committed by the State legislature and that, but the challenge locally is that that funding is not dedicated until 2023 to 2025 biennium, so that's a good seven, eight years away.

And so the -- from a political public/private collaboration perspective with Clark County, the efforts have been focused on, and we've been a big part of this, trying to get as much on the ground from the County side of the equation in terms of the transportation infrastructure to be able to lobby further at the State level to try and move the funding for the State piece up and that is starting to bear some fruit with the State allocating the last capital budget expediting, granting another half-million dollar allocation to the design of the interchange at 179th and I-5.

So as referenced in your packet, we actually have a Development Agreement in place which affects the properties that are south of 179th Street and that was put in place in December of 2012 and that would require as part of the mitigation to develop on that property, we were required, we would be required to complete and construct mitigation along 179th in that, in the immediate area. I have another handout here to share with you that depicts that.

So what I'm going to walk you through here, just a couple of slides that show the progression of shortly after our Development Agreement was approved. This first page, this first slide is what the mitigation that we would have needed to construct to proceed with that in development on the property.

So if you flip to the next page. In 2014, or actually I believe it actually started in 2013, but Clark County engaged Kittelson & Associates, a traffic engineering firm, to look at and start studying not only the county transportation infrastructure, but WDOT was also part of this exercise to look at what the possible alternative configurations could be for not only the interchange but the County improvements off the interchange.

And so if you look through the next four sheets are different alternative scenarios, and as you can tell from pretty much all of these, they don't look anything like the first slide which is what the mitigation that we would have constructed had we proceeded at that time would look like.

And so the next slide, the one with blue on it here, is actually the at least in terms of what's been shared with us the closest current version that's being studied both with Washington DOT and Clark County. So the point of this is that the mitigation that we would have constructed would not -- would substantially be throwaway.

So we made, we voluntarily opted at that point in time to hold off on developing anything, work with the County and try and get to work collaboratively, try and get funding for the interchange, but also to try and determine what the improvements were actually going to look like at the end of the day, so that to the extent we were constructing mitigation, it would not be throwaway.

The last slide I'll just point out is there's reference in some of the staff presentation to sort of the next step or additional Development Agreements that would be coming in in this immediate area and this is just another representation to show what not only a phase, another

phase could look like or would look like as part of that, but to represent how different it is from what was originally going to be required as part of our original Development Agreement.

So the parties have, and I say that's public/private parties have been working collaboratively together because we know it's going to take all of our dollars and collaboration, political effort to try and achieve the infrastructure that needs to be in place for anything to proceed.

So what's before you tonight is really one step in the right direction in terms of that collaboration in lifting the urban holdings to allow for development to proceed on a portion of this property to allow us to invest in mitigation that ultimately is part and coordinated with the County's efforts here in the bigger picture.

So I think one thing that's important to understand that may not be entirely clear is we're not asking to vest any additional trips, we're basically asking to transfer trips from our existing Development Agreement on the south side of 179th to transfer approximately half, just over half of those trips to the phase, what is shown as Phase 1 on the map, the urban holdings portion, and the reason that we're asking to do that is that there is still not certainty as to what the interchange will look like.

There's an effort that's been going on now for quite some time to determine where if it's going to be roundabouts, where those roundabouts will be. And then in addition to that, 179th ties directly into the interchange so you can't really put a hard and fast snap a line on 179th and what it should look like until you know where the interchange is going to be that it's going to connect to.

And then third, there's discussion happening right now and studies underway at the County to determine whether 15th Avenue as shown on here gets extended and connected back to 10th Avenue or if that doesn't get built at all and instead a mid-block which would be 12th Avenue equivalent serves to function as the equivalent of what 15th Avenue would have provided.

So by taking this initial phase and pushing it as far north on the properties as possible, we're avoiding the unknowns of an undetermined transportation infrastructure alignments and design and allowing us to develop something now or sooner rather than later and not invest in mitigation that's potentially throwaway from a public/private perspective.

So we're happy to answer any questions you might have tonight relative to historical context or the specific property itself.

JOHNSON: Questions from --

BENDER: Yeah. The blue side, is that the WDOT concept?

KILLIAN: So this is a slide that I believe Kittelson, yes, Kittelson had prepared and this is, it looks like from what we can tell that the direction that the practical design process that WDOT is going through in collaboration with Clark County right now will end up resulting in a roundabout configuration that is similar.

So you'll see that this does show an extension of 15th and a roundabout at 15th that -- I don't -- I don't know if that's -- the County hasn't -- part of the sort of chicken and egg here is the State needs to, everybody needs to be on board with what the interchange looks like so you can determine what the off interchange County improvements look like and alignments and so this was at the time, and this is the best representation or guess of what that, where that process would lead to.

BENDER: And that funding is, what, eight years out you said?

KILLIAN: The funding for the interchange itself is 2023 to 2025.

BENDER: Okay. And, Matt, has the County talked with WSDOT about the concept?

HERMEN: Yeah, we collaborate quite closely with WSDOT during their, yeah, the scoping of the ultimate interchange and the ultimate design of that.

BENDER: And the buy-in is there on WSDOT's --

HERMEN: The design, as Mr. Killian has said, is not complete yet. So we're currently going through the process with WSDOT, leading the process of the ultimate design of that interchange.

BENDER: Thank you.

COOK: You should know that the funding for the interchange itself is not necessarily the funding for the surface roads that are in the area and that themselves will be quite expensive.

BENDER: So that's the on the Clark County dime or is that on the developer dime?

COOK: Some of each. As, you know, there are transportation impact fees that would be involved, there's also TIF credits that we would be involved for dedication of right-of-way and all of this whole area, as Mr. Killian has indicated, is going to be a public/private collaboration as the planning for it has been.

BENDER: Let me make sure I understand then. Total funding is not there yet?

COOK: Total funding for?

BENDER: For the surface roads that we're talking about with the TIF and the Developer Agreement are theoretically going to pay for?

COOK: Well, the Development Agreement doesn't pay for them, that is something that's going to have to be determined by the Council how they want to put that into the County budget and there are in the DA, the Draft DA here, and this is a draft, there are some aspects that the developer would volunteer to dedicate to the County, but again, those result in TIF credits, they're not just gifts. So there are a variety of funding needs and funding mechanisms and, no, I would say that it has not yet been determined exactly what all the funding will be.

BENDER: Thank you.

GRIMWADE: Do we have any idea on what the total cost is for say the I-5 which is involving WSDOT versus the surface road network, what sort of cost structures are we looking at?

KILLIAN: I don't know if you want me to -- I mean, I can share with you what I've heard but we're not the ones driving that process, that what the legislature's allocated from for this project from the State interchange side is \$50 million, the projections, and these are rough, that the County has provided for the off interchange improvements and they're on both sides of I-5 is somewhere in the neighborhood of 50 plus million dollars, so...

HERMEN: So a total of 100 million as Mr. Killian previously stated.

KILLIAN: And just one clarification as it relates to this Development Agreement, we're mitigating the transportation impacts through the transportation impact improvements that we would be doing as part of it.

The bigger picture here obviously is going to require more mitigation to open up more capacity for the overall area, and it's going to ultimately end up being a phased process, I mean there's no, it's not all going to happen at once. It's just so it's the next sort of wave I believe that you will see of Development Agreements is to bite another big chunk off and we're going to be participating in that also.

So it's sort of the continuation as Chris referenced of this public/private collaboration and how we leverage what we're bringing to the table. In our case we're bringing dollars and improvements, but also right-of-way. We control all of the right-of-way east of I-5 for 179th, anything related to the interchange that crosses into our property and then 15th or 12th Avenue, and so as part of this DA, that includes some of those elements too.

HERMEN: And please keep in mind that the Development Agreement, the Draft Development Agreement as Exhibit 1, only applies to the urban holding that's shown here and the impacts

that result from the development of those three parcels.

COOK: The part that's identified as Phase 1. There are, as Mr. Killian said, we anticipate that there will be a group of other property owners, some whose property is in urban holding who will be coming with Development Agreements and requests for lifting of urban holding.

JOHNSON: Mr. Killian, can you, I'm sorry, I didn't understand or didn't hear, the interim improvement concept, how does that play into this right now again? I'm sorry, you probably already said it and I wasn't listening.

KILLIAN: Oh, okay. So that last slide is really what will likely be coming before you as part of the -- what Chris has referenced to additional Development Agreements. So what current discussions with the County and County staff, there's a group of property owners that are collaborating with the County in sort of what's referred to as a Pipeline group to come in and agree to jointly help fund a portion of the improvement as shown there on the last slide, and so I was just including that as to make the point that the first slide is much different than where this is likely turning out and that -- so if that helps.

JOHNSON: Matt, is this something that would happen before potentially -- I'm not -- before the interchange or is this something, I mean is this kind of like a stopgap? Obviously it says --

HERMEN: It's not a stopgap. The ultimate idea is to build the interchange, build the local streets so that they support the ultimate interchange design.

JOHNSON: Right.

HERMEN: Whether the local streets happen before the interchange --

JOHNSON: We don't know that.

HERMEN: -- we don't know that.

JOHNSON: So this isn't something that we're going to see necessarily before --

HERMEN: Correct.

JOHNSON: -- the State were to fund, fully fund, yeah, we don't know that. Okay.

HERMEN: Correct.

KILLIAN: I have one. So I know the development group that's working on that piece, their intent, the whole reason they're doing this is to be able to invest, commit to invest now, to be

able to develop in the near future as opposed to waiting eight years from now, so...

JOHNSON: The timeline.

GRIMWADE: I'm not sure who to ask on this one, but you mentioned there's other developers that are going to be involved in funding this Pipeline, how confident are we that they are going to come to the table? There are going to be Development Agreements struck or are you left holding the bag if they don't come to the table?

KILLIAN: Well, as it relates to Phase 1, that is the way it's sort of happening, that is separate. So the last, the slide you're referring to there is really will be further -- this proposal would not be attached to that, this would be apart and separate. So we wouldn't be -- there's nothing other people would have to participate in for us to be able to proceed with this.

But that next Pipeline group, yes, if we're a part of that and if one or two of the parties or if somebody doesn't perform, there's sort of a -- and this has happened before in Clark County, we've actually participated in two different Pipeline efforts like this, so it certainly has happened in the county before.

GRIMWADE: So just taking this further. So the Pipeline Agreement would come into effect with the area below Phase 1 on the map?

HENIGES: That's actually what I came up to speak for just a couple of minutes on to help --

JOHNSON: Can you identify yourself for the record, please.

HENIGES: Carolyn Heniges, Transportation Division Manager of Public Works, Clark County.

JOHNSON: Thank you.

HENIGES: H-e-n-i-g-e-s. I think one of the key points that you'll want to understand about the difference between what's before you tonight and this discussion about the bigger Pipeline.

The Killians have trips already allotted to them in those parcels south of 179th. So they're in a little bit of a unique position because they already have trips that are approved and some attached mitigation. They're allowed to move the trips up if it's approved by Commission and Council, to move the trips up to what you see as Phase 1, and what that does is it puts on hold the improvements that are south of 179th and that's what creates the capacity for them to be able to do this.

So when we speak of Pipeline, we're talking about opening up new trips into the corridor and that's why it requires so much more of the improvements and the much bigger project, but

because these are already using allotted trips, it's in a little bit of a unique position and they're offering to mitigate the impacts of just the Phase 1 with the approval with the DA. Does that help?

GRIMWADE: Yeah, that helps.

COOK: We have been in discussion with representatives of other landowners in the area, so we have, I mean we know who they are, we have a clue of what they want and they have been working both in concert with Mr. Killian and with Kittelson so, and with Public Works and Planning, so there is actual movement happening here. It's not like, well, we won't have any idea where to turn to start work next, it's already started.

GRIMWADE: Okay. So what I'm hearing is we have sustained movement in the right direction?

COOK: Absolutely.

GRIMWADE: Okay.

JOHNSON: Is there any more questions? Okay. Thank you very much, Lance. I have two people on here, I'm not sure if you want to speak or not. Bridget Schwarz, are you in here? Would you like to come up? Is anybody else speaking here? Yeah, they're done. Yeah.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

SCHWARZ: Hello. My name is Bridget Schwarz and I'm here to speak on behalf of the Fairgrounds Neighborhood Association. S-c-h-w-a-r-z.

Our neighborhood is in a unique position of being at the conflicts of two freeways, I-5 and I-205, and that's going to make you a natural area for a very heavy development and, boy, have we got it. We had a few years off when the economy wasn't good, but now it's come running, roaring back and we're busy. We are also the southern end of the Discovery Corridor.

So we're big on taking surveys and I'm going to tell you about one. But first I want to find out, you guys have the Development Agreement, do you have any of the addendums that came with it? Do they?

COOK: I don't believe that those are completed.

SCHWARZ: Okay. So I want to tell you about our experience with the first Development Agreement. After they signed it, we became aware of it and we did a public records request and we said we want it and what we got was all the there as and wherefores and herewith and

references to addendums and there was nothing there, they were all blank pages.

So I clarified it. I put in another public records request and I said we need the addendums, we need to look at that. And they sent it back, the same thing, blank pages. So I tried a third time and said, okay, we need the content on the addendum pages, and their response was you've got what we've got, that's it.

Over the years I've tried to get that information and I keep getting the same answer, you've already got it, everything that we have. And so a friend of mine Chuck Green says, well, you just don't know how to do it, so he put in a public records request and had to admit I got the same thing you did. Finally, in July, after the latest Councilor's work session, we got it.

So what you don't know is the trip generations, the reserve trips, the TIF calculations, the proposed improvements, you don't have any of that and I think you're going to have to have that information in order to make a recommendation to move on.

So we did a survey and I'm going to explain it to you and I've got copies for you. It was mailed by the County to all of the parcel owners. So some places went where there aren't even any people living there. We had 10 questions.

The first question is, do you live in the Discovery Corridor? And the answer was 89 percent yes, and they had been living there for an average of 18 years. And if you think about the development we've had for that average to be 18, think about how many people have been here for like 50 years as opposed to people that just moved in.

We are asking people, do you work in the Discovery Corridor? And only 26 percent were working in the Discovery Corridor, but they've been working there for 12 years.

The third question was that, these are the land use zonings that we have, business park, commercial, light industry, mixed use, parks/open space, public facility and residential. The first one was probably no surprise, we rank parks and open space Number 1, good luck with that. Number 2 was business parks, we like the family wage jobs. Number 3 was mixed use, we like the family wage jobs. And 4 was commercial, and it was really quite far past the first three because they're service-related jobs. 5 was residential. 6 was public facility, and 7 was light industry. I don't know why we don't like light industry, but that came in last.

Then we asked people that about the transportation infrastructure and that an awful lot of people seemed to think that that's the number one priority and we asked the question and 74 percent said yes. Why? Congestion is already a problem. We need to improve the infrastructure before development occurs and we need to increase mass transit options.

The fifth question, the Discovery Corridor will require a tremendous public and private

investment. Should stakeholders and service providers work together to create a strategic plan to guide development priorities? 95 percent said yes. The most popular comment is failure to plan is planning to fail. And as a result of the answer to that question, we put together a summit of Discovery Corridor stakeholders that pretty much everybody signed and they got their chance to say this is top of mine for me when I think about the Discovery Corridor stakeholder or project. Okay.

Question Number 6, today there are only four road projects in the Discovery Corridor that are funded.

The first is to increase I-5 capacity; upgrade the interchange; upgrade 179th at the interchange; completing the connector that goes from 179th down to 149th on the west side of the freeway. The other roads we had people suggest.

Number 1 was upgrade 179th Street at the I-5 interchange. Number 2 was complete the connector from 179th Street south to 149th Street which is our I-5 alternative. Number 3, upgrade the I-5 interchange at 179th Street. Number 4, increase I-5 capacity. Number 5 was safety. Number 6 was maintenance and preservation. Number 7 was complete the other corridors to create grids. Number 8 was provide alternative modes of travel. And Number 9 was demand and transportation management like staggered work shifts and carpools and things like that.

Question Number 7, traffic improvements on the I-5 interchange at 179th and on 179th at the I-5 interchange will take years to construct. How do you see these projects going forward? Check all that are important.

Number 1, maintain the interchange and 179th function at all times. Number 2, do not begin either project until the alternative route to the south is complete. Now, that's become a problem. It isn't fully funded, so what's going to happen is the work that they're doing right now is going to open up probably late this fall, it's going to be open for about a year and then it's going to shut down so they can build five more blocks of it. We need that alternative before we totally choke that interchange which is pretty congested already. So there's a logical delay that's going to have to be accounted for in starting the I-5/179th Street interchange.

Question Number 8, urban services, roads, water, sewer, et cetera, are not currently available through much of the Discovery Corridor. Elsewhere, Developer Agreements have been used to provide these urban services sooner rather than later. Should a Discovery Corridor strategic plan be used as a criterion for the Development Agreement approval? And so it was 82 percent said yes. We're trying to get the message, let's do a strategic plan first.

Number 9, sizable areas of our neighborhood are zoned urban growth, urban holding and urban reserve. Development Agreements and development approvals are being negotiated today

that may mandate future annexation to the City of Vancouver. The current timeline is probably 10 to 20 years. Should that decision be reserved for the future business and homeowners instead? 66 percent said yes. A huge number of the 34 percent remain said we don't want to be in any city.

So to kind of connect the dots here as far as what we're saying, we're saying don't start this interchange project until we've got a back way around there and that's going to be a couple of years. Number 2, don't shut that down, there are people that are unwilling or unable to get where they need to go through another route, so you've got to maintain it. Number 3, there's got to be a better plan than just people coming in with deep pockets and buying up trips. It's a strategic plan will help you.

At the work session a couple of weeks ago with you guys, we got a \$40 million surprise, 40 million. Oh, it's not just the 50 million from the State, we're also going to have to come up with something and there's no plan for that. If you look at the west side of the I-5 and the Discovery Corridor area and the urban holding, that's all for business parks and good paying jobs.

Right now if you try to run down 184th, 189th or 194th, if you got a car coming the other way, both of you are going to have your left-hand tires out in the ditch, and if it's a UPS truck, forget it, find a way to get off the road so the guy can get by. So we've got a lot of work to do.

We are very aware of the impacts and what's going on. I mean, we've survived the Amphitheater and rebuilding the exhibition hall and the hospital. We had massive testimony that convinced Costco to move on down the road because of the transportations. Walmart's putting their site, has put their site up because of that kind of stuff too. So we got some pretty good expertise in our group and we have been totally shut out of this process.

The one thing that I got to say, thank you to Community Planning is when we were trying to get work from these people, find out what's going on, Public Works kept saying there's nothing, there's nothing, there's nothing, but Oliver sent him to one of our meetings to say this is how it works, this is how Development Agreements go together. Now we want to get a seat at the table.

JOHNSON: Okay. Thank you very much. So, Steve, are you talking, did you sign this? Okay. All right. Great. Is there anybody else from the audience that would like to speak on the issue at hand? Seeing no one approach, I will bring it back to the Planning Commission for any comments. Gentlemen.

BENDER: I have a question. On the final slide, the Pipeline Interim, where does it correlate within the master plan of WDOT on the blue slide?

HERMEN: So what you're looking at at the last, Figure 4 I believe, at the last slide that Mr. Killian handed out, you're seeing a connection at -- you're seeing the 179th Street between the I-5 ramp and 15th Avenue with the extension of 12th Avenue connecting to 10th Avenue.

So where this fits in into the Development Agreement process is this is not going to be constructed or conditioned as part of the Development Agreement. The dedication of right-of-way for 179th is a condition in the Draft Development Agreement.

The other thing that's a condition in the Draft Development Agreement is an eastbound to southbound right-turn lane at the intersection of 179th Street and 15th Avenue. When the other Development Agreements come in, this is a potential of what the ultimate corridor will look like.

BENDER: So there is compatibility then planned into the process.

JOHNSON: Robin.

GRIMWADE: Yeah. Just a couple of questions. Is there an overall strategy by Clark County for how it removes parts of the urban holding overlay or is it incremental?

HERMEN: So right now the largest constraint is the capacity at the I-5/179th interchange. As mentioned before, the State has allocated WSDOT Southwest Region with the 50 million for State funds. Those State funds do not come in until 2023-2025, that's going to start the process of designing the interchange, the ultimate improvements for the interchange. That right there sets kind of the bellwether for what the current constraints along the corridor is.

GRIMWADE: Yeah. Chris.

COOK: If you look at the first page of the staff report, it shows the overall criterion for removal of urban holding in this area, and that's by the heading West Fairgrounds and East Fairgrounds. So the Council needs to make, this is from the comprehensive plan, so the Council has to make a determination that the completion of localized critical links and intersection improvements are reasonably funded as shown on the County six-year TIP or through a DA.

So that is the mechanism that is in the comprehensive plan to ensure that there is infrastructure to support urbanization of this area.

GRIMWADE: Yeah. I suppose what I'm getting at is why this block, why not 10 or 20 further down the road, what's --

COOK: Because Mr. Killian owns this block and --

GRIMWADE: Okay. But I'm talking about --

COOK: -- you're working with the transportation.

GRIMWADE: I'm asking about is there an overall strategy for the way in which urban holding overlays is removed, we either have a strategy or we don't have a strategy.

COOK: Who comes first.

GRIMWADE: There must be a pattern of development that we want to ultimately see.

COOK: Well, that's kind of put forth in the zoning.

GRIMWADE: So is there a strategy or not?

COOK: You know, I don't know what you mean by a strategy, Commissioner.

GRIMWADE: It outlines the direction by which one will achieve the goals of the organization. Do we have something or not? Perhaps Oliver can enlighten us.

ORJIAKO: Good evening, Planning Commission members. Oliver Orjiako, Community Planning Director. I won't call it strategy, I will call it what are the conditions for lifting urban holding when it is applied.

The application of the urban holding is in a sense an admission that there is infrastructure gaps and that infrastructure gap may be in the form of transportation as this area shows, the other is sewer, but those are paid through system development charges. The zoning or the urban zoning is already in place.

So in terms of planning how the area will develop has already been determined and approved. So the strategy to remove it or the conditions by which the urban holding will be removed is going through this process we are now, and our legal counsel is correct that it is first come, first serve.

GRIMWADE: Okay. Thanks. The other thing is, has there been any consultation with the school district as a result of what the development of this would ultimately mean to their infrastructure and ability to meet the needs of the community?

HERMEN: So throughout our comprehensive plan update we conduct a capital facilities plan, that capital facilities plan identifies the forecasted growth to the school districts and we have conversations with the school districts as far as the capacity at their schools and their ability to serve those future students.

GRIMWADE: Great.

COOK: This property is all within the urban growth boundary, there is no question that it will be developed.

GRIMWADE: I'm not doubting that. All I just want to make sure that sometimes decisions are made without the districts being involved and then it's suddenly like, oh, we weren't aware of this, we're not prepared, we've got six, seven years where we can't accommodate that issue. So the fact that discussion is going, that's positive in my mind. The only other question I've got is the Development Agreement. I've done many of these in my career and --

COOK: Lucky you.

GRIMWADE: -- I am a little concerned that the financial side hasn't been addressed, and while it's probably not the jurisdiction of the planning committee, Commission to worry about that, it's the County. I'm just wondering, has the County thought about what that means to all the other competing demands and priorities and how is it going to make sure that what is needed for this development is put forward?

COOK: Well, that's a good question for the County Council.

GRIMWADE: Yeah. Otherwise I'd say look --

COOK: We are not.

GRIMWADE: No. It's a great Development Agreement, but the one thing that concerns me is the financial aspects not being addressed and it sort of gives me a little unease more so than the lack of exhibits. Okay.

JOHNSON: Yes.

BENDER: And, Ms. Cook, are there any amendments or addendums we aren't aware of that should be in the report?

COOK: As I believe I said to Ms. Schwarz or someone, they're not completed yet. There are drafts. I didn't create the staff report and Mr. Hermen who I think did opted not to put incomplete things on the attachment.

I can absolutely certify that no one is trying to hide anything from anyone but rather that they are in the process of being negotiated.

BENDER: I don't think it's a matter of hiding something from the members up here, I think it's a matter of having a complete document so we're voting in total knowledge, that's my concern.

COOK: Well, you are voting on a draft in any case. If there is a question, you know, the DA does talk about various attachments, for example, one is supposed to have legal descriptions on it and, you know, we have the legal descriptions, and the other has trip generation estimates. Do you gentlemen wish to see trip generation estimates? I mean --

JOHNSON: Getting in the weeds.

ORJIAKO: If I may, I think your observation is a good one. This is not typically how we would have presented this to you. We will be working with the applicant to make sure that the exhibit, where we ask for the legal description, that that's provided and what does that mean, you know what the legal description means.

We are looking at three properties, we have to legally define what they are so that when they're recorded, they're recorded properly. The second is the trip generation, for example. I believe that their traffic engineer will provide that to us and we will attach that, it will be public. The other exhibit --

COOK: And it will be approved by our Public Works --

ORJIAKO: Yes.

COOK: -- who has been working very closely with the traffic engineer for the developer. So this is not something that's just going to fall upon us. We already have a lot of the material, we've asked for some specific additions and changes, so we don't have those yet, consequently they're not complete.

ORJIAKO: And the last thing I will add is that one of the reference to the exhibit talks about the prior DA that covers all this property that are to the south. If you want that, we can provide that to you. I'm sure that the applicant has a copy of that and we too probably have a copy of that because it has been recorded. Just putting that in perspective. I apologize.

COOK: One of the interesting aspects of the DA as it is currently written, I think, is that it will also incorporate some of the prop- -- some of one of the other properties that's to the north there. If you look at the map, you'll see that there are three properties and three parcels in pink that are north of 179th. The one where the cursor was a second ago, not that one, that one, some of that property will be included in the DA and will be able to use the trips that are transferred from the south, but there's no urban holding on that property, so your decision tonight doesn't have to do much with that property.

JOHNSON: Any other questions?

SWINDELL: I guess I'll just ask a couple of clarifying questions, that the proposed development is going to provide 200 single-family homes, 326 apartments, is that what's planned in that area, it's going to generate about 400 trips?

HERMEN: I believe that's the proposal, yes.

SWINDELL: And they're taking the trips that they already have available to them on the pieces south of 179th Street, so theoretically they could develop that southern piece using those trips.

HERMEN: Correct.

SWINDELL: If they want to build the infrastructure, it's just going to get ripped out in a couple of years. And what I believe is, what's happening is the developer is saying, hey, let's do something that makes sense, let's save all those dollars and let's move the development away from this area if I'm understanding, please don't let me speak for you, but I believe that's what I'm hearing. We want to work with the County and we want to work with the State and we want to put the dollars where it makes sense, and by doing this, it's actually going to help fund, by building this development it's going to actually help fund the future development of all of those other street improvements that need to happen after the overpass is built. Did I get that?

HERMEN: Yes.

SWINDELL: Okay. Just wanted to make sure I understood that.

JOHNSON: Any other questions or comments? I would entertain a **motion**.

GRIMWADE: I'd make a **motion** that the staff recommendation be recommended for approval to the County Commission.

SWINDELL: I would **second** it.

JOHNSON: We have a motion, we have a second. Can we have a roll call.

ROLL CALL VOTE

SWINDELL: AYE

GRIMWADE: AYE

BENDER: AYE

JOHNSON: AYE

JOHNSON: Hearing that we have all the ayes the motion is passed. And I think that's all we have on there.

OLD BUSINESS

None.

NEW BUSINESS

None.

COMMUNICATIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION

SWINDELL: I guess I'd just say I'm upset that Jollie's is no longer there, but I guess we'll have to live with the new development.

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 CTV on the following web page link:

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

Minutes Transcribed by:

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

Sonja Wisner, Program Assistant, Clark County Community Planning