

**CLARK COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF PUBLIC HEARING
THURSDAY, MAY 19, 2011**

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

6:30 p.m.

CALL TO ORDER & ROLL CALL

DELEISSEGUES: I call the Clark County Planning Commission to order for May 19th, 2011. May we have roll call, please.

DELEISSEGUES:	HERE
MORASCH:	ABSENT
BARCA:	HERE
ALLEN:	PRESENT
WRISTON:	ABSENT
USKOSKI:	HERE
VARTANIAN:	HERE

Other: Oliver Orjiako, Community Planning Director; Chris Cooke, Prosecuting Attorney; Sonja Wisner, Administrative Assistant; Jim Vandling, County Forester; Gary Albrecht, Planner; Michael Mabrey, Planner; and Laurie Lebowsky, Planner.

GENERAL & NEW BUSINESS

A. Approval of Agenda for May 19, 2011

DELEISSEGUES: Is there any changes to the agenda for tonight? Go ahead.

VARTANIAN: I move we accept the agenda as presented.

ALLEN: Second.

DELEISSEGUES: All in favor.

EVERYBODY: AYE

B. Communications from the Public

DELEISSEGUES: Are there any communications from the public on any item that you might want to bring forward that is not on tonight's agenda, communication with the Planning Commission? Sure, come on up, state your name and address for the record.

YOCHIM: Which one works?

WISER: They all work.

YOCHIM: Good evening. Steve Yochim, 20716 NE 10th Avenue. I'm here on the other issue of what's on the agenda, but I want to take the opportunity to bring up our issues with the zoning that we talked about last Fall of within our area that is designated as urban hold right now and office campus park zoning.

And we've been in front of all the people and the Commissioners that keep us in the urban hold and we would kind of like to know as a group how we move forward to meet into people's agendas to work on working on getting the zoning changed. At our last meeting it was kind of left open like, well, we can't do anything until October and when you reviewed the issues again in October with the land use zoning.

So I would like to find out at this point who we need to talk to either as a support person because basically we know a little bit about the zoning and what we can do in that area.

DELEISSEGUES: Oliver, would you like to shed some light on the issue?

ORJIAKO: Good evening, Planning Commission members. What I can do is take Mr. Yochim's information and then be able to direct him on what process.

DELEISSEGUES: Is that okay? Is that good?

YOCHIM: Sure. Yeah. I just want to --

DELEISSEGUES: Sure.

YOCHIM: -- make that public. I'll get in contact with you and we'll go from there. Good. Very good. Thank you.

DELEISSEGUES: Well, thank you. Thanks, Oliver. Anyone else in the audience wish to bring anything forward that's not on tonight's agenda? Okay, seeing none, we'll move ahead, then, with the public hearing items. And the first one would be open space and timberland applications from Jim Vandling. Jim, staff report.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS & PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION

A. OPEN SPACE & TIMBERLAND APPLICATIONS

The Planning Commission will consider staff recommendations for approval or denial of Timberland or Open Space Applications for Current Use Assessment pursuant to Chapter 84.34 of the RCW. The criteria for Open Space or Timberland

was established by Resolution No. 1977-10-32, adopted November 7, 1977 and Ordinance No. 1982-02-65 adopted March 17, 1982, and Ordinance No. 1996-02-30, adopted February 27, 1996.

Staff Contact: Jim Vandling, (360) 397-2375, Ext. 4714 or e-mail: james.vandling@clark.wa.gov

VANDLING: Good evening, Mr. Chairman and fellow Commissioners. I'm here for what is the County's 25th year of reviewing current use applications for open space and timberland and we're holding this hearing as part of our required duties to comply with RCW 84.34 as a growth management county.

County code which covers the subject tonight is found in Chapter 3.08 and we have this year 21 total requests. Of those 21 total requests 16 of those were for new timberland applications, 5 requests were for open space classification either streams or soil conservation classifications, and this evening I can tell you that our recommendation to you here on the Planning Commission is to approve all of them as they meet all of the applicable criteria in the State RCWs and the County code.

DELEISSEGUES: Thank you, Jim. Any questions of Jim?

BARCA: No.

DELEISSEGUES: Would it be appropriate to put all of these in one motion or do you --

VANDLING: And that is historically what we do with reference to Exhibit A which is the summary sheet for the entire staff report.

DELEISSEGUES: Okay.

ALLEN: I **MOVE** that we recommend approval to the Board of Commissioners as listed in this report and in Appendix A.

BARCA: **Second** it.

DELEISSEGUES: Moved and seconded that we approve the recommendation by staff for the applications for timberland designations, transfers from designated forest to land or farming timberland, transfers from designated forestland to timberland or farming open space. Any other discussion on the motion? If not, roll call. '

ROLL CALL VOTE

BARCA: AYE
ALLEN: AYE
VARTANIAN: AYE
USKOSKI: AYE

DELEISSEGUES: AYE

DELEISSEGUES: Thank you, Jim.

VANDLING: Thank you.

BARCA: That's got to be a record.

DELEISSEGUES: Yeah, Jim's done that. The next item on the agenda would be B, annual reviews and docket items. And the first one of those is CPZ2011-00015, electric vehicle infrastructure. May we have a staff report on that.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS & PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION, continued

B. ELECTRIC VEHICLE INFRASTRUCTURE

This proposal meets the Revised Code of Washington (RCW) 36.70A.695 that requires Clark County must allow electric vehicle infrastructure as a use in all areas except those zoned for residential or resource use or critical areas. The proposal adds a new section, 40.260.075 Electric Vehicle Infrastructure (EVI), adds EVI as a definition to CCC 40.100.070, and adds battery charging and exchange station installation to CCC 40.570.090 Categorical Exemptions.

Staff Contact: Gary Albrecht (360) 397-2280, Ext. 4318 or e-mail: gary.albrecht@clark.wa.gov

ALBRECHT: For the record Gary Albrecht, Clark County Community Planning. I'm here to discuss CPZ2011-0015, electric vehicle infrastructure, so I just want to go over a quick background of why we're doing this right now.

In 2009 the Washington State Legislature recognized development of electric vehicle infrastructure as both an economic and environmental priority and with the support of the governor enacted House Bill 1481 which is designed to encourage electric vehicles. And to create a consistent regulatory framework that would help this industry grow across Washington State the Legislature required the Puget Sound Regional Council and Department of Commerce to develop guidance for local governments.

The legislation also requires that Clark County allow electric vehicle infrastructure as an allowed use by July 1st, 2011. In early Spring 2011 staff worked with technical experts from Parametrix, Clark Public Utilities, Washington Department of Transportation, Legacy Salmon Creek Medical Center, Clark County Chief Building Official and Vancouver's planning review manager using the prescribed guidance to make a recommendation for development regulations on electric vehicle infrastructure.

The committee agreed that in the beginning stages of the electric vehicle infrastructure in

Clark County that less regulation is better because the supply and the demand of charging stations is unknown. They decided now is not a good time to create performance, design or sign standards.

The proposed action right now is to allow electric vehicle infrastructure in all zones and what we did was create a special use code in the Special Use Standards section and we've added electric vehicle infrastructure as a definition in our Definition sections of the code and added battery charging and exchange station installation as categorical exemptions in our categorical exemption code. So as far as the zones go we've added them as an allowed use to Table 40.210 and 40.220 and 40.230 which basically is going to allow electric vehicle infrastructure in all zones.

The SEPA comments, the public period comment, closes today and we received one comment from the acting fire marshal from Vancouver Fire District and they say no significant impact on the fire service. And as far as public comment goes we've had a review from Three Creeks Advisory Council. They have seen this code and they support the code as it is.

And I do want to mention as far as the Department of Commerce goes, they made a suggestion to consider providing some design guidance on location of charging devices and signage for these devices and that technical advisory committee is aware of Commerce's design guidance. However, since the actual demand is unknown they felt that at the beginning stages of introducing electric vehicle infrastructure in Clark County the prescribed design guidance is not necessary.

So that moves us on to our recommendations and conclusions. So based upon the information and supporting documents staff recommends that the Planning Commission forward to the Board of Clark County Commissioners a recommendation of approval of CPZ2011-0015.

DELEISSEGUES: Thank you, Gary. Any questions of staff?

VARTANIAN: I have a question. Just for clarification purposes could you explain "categorical exemptions," please.

ALBRECHT: By statute there are certain categories, certain uses, that do not have to go through the SEPA process so the battery exchange stations will not have to go through a SEPA process.

VARTANIAN: Thank you.

DELEISSEGUES: Any other questions? Okay. Thanks, Gary.

ALBRECHT: You're welcome.

DELEISSEGUES: I don't have anybody on the sign-up sheet for this item, but if anybody

in the audience wishes to testify, you can come forward. Okay, seeing none, we'll return it to the Planning Commission for deliberation, motion.

VARTANIAN: **MOVE** we accept staff's recommendation to move this on to the Commissioners.

USKOSKI: **Second.**

ALLEN: Second.

DELEISSEGUES: Moved and seconded we move this on with a recommendation of approval for electric vehicle infrastructure. May we have roll call, please.

ROLL CALL VOTE

BARCA: AYE

ALLEN: AYE

VARTANIAN: AYE

USKOSKI: AYE

DELEISSEGUES: AYE

DELEISSEGUES: The next one is CPZ2011-000110 or 00010, excuse me, commercial code update and Gary's back again for another staff report.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS & PLANNING COMMISSION, continued

C. ANNUAL REVIEWS & DOCKET ITEMS:

1. CPZ2011-00010 Commercial Code Update

This proposal would amend the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning designation from Community Commercial to General Commercial on the following 88 parcels:

106941-000, 107325-000, 109490-000, 106923-000, 109580-000, 109204-000,
109040-000, 107330-000, 109440-000, 109555-000, 109010-000, 109380-000,
157510-000, 107335-000, 109495-000, 109540-000, 109110-000, 109390-000,
109054-000, 107340-000, 109431-000, 106910-000, 109550-000, 109210-000,
157511-000, 107350-000, 109510-000, 106924-000, 106922-000, 109207-000,
108860-000, 157508-008, 109420-000, 109530-000, 109170-000, 109140-000,
109057-000, 157508-012, 106920-000, 106921-000, 109560-000, 109145-000,
108900-000, 157508-014, 157508-006, 109480-000, 109175-000, 108960-000,
109060-000, 157508-016, 157508-002, 109500-000, 109167-000, 109415-000,
109030-000, 157508-000, 157508-010, 109470-000, 107020-000, 108970-000,
108870-000, 108871-000, 107320-000, 109450-000, 109565-000, 106970-000,

109090-000, 109020-000, 109190-000, 109445-000, 106995-000, 109581-000,
108910-000, 108920-000, 108880-000, 109220-000, 109570-000, 106950-000,
108930-000, 109160-000, 109392-000, 109200-000, 107020-002, 108940-000,
109150-000, 109400-000, 108950-000, 109021-000

The total acreage subject to this action is approximately 20 acres. It includes the community commercial area roughly between N.E. 105th Avenue and 114th Avenue and N.E. 4th Plain Boulevard and N.E. Rosewood Avenue.

Staff Contact: Gary Albrecht (360) 397-2280, Ext. 4318

or e-mail: gary.albrecht@clark.wa.gov

ALBRECHT: Yes, thank you very much. For the record Gary Albrecht, Clark County Community Planning. I'm here to talk about CPZ2011-00010, commercial code update in the Orchards area. This topic has been brought to you before last year, November 2010, and the commercial code update was part of that discussion.

In December of 2010 this topic went in front of the Board of Clark County Commissioners and it was to rezone the whole limited commercial to something other than limited commercial because we basically got rid of the zone and there was a proposal that came in during the hearing process to change a specific area to general commercial and the area was in Orchards. And I have it on the map.

If you look up on the map this is the general area that came in for the request to change it to general commercial and these are the parcels here. It's about 20 acres and there are 88 parcels there. The request was to change it to general commercial at that time and due to public notifications we couldn't make that happen and so the Board directed staff to have it moved into the docket process for this year.

And they wanted staff to go out and talk with the neighborhoods and the City of Vancouver to get feedback on this proposal because they wanted to hear from everybody in that area. So staff went to Maple Tree Neighborhood Association for a meeting and there were 18 people that attended. And staff also went to Sunnyside Neighborhood Association meeting and there were 39 people that attended and generally the attendees there, the residents, support changing the zone to general commercial.

And as far as the findings go, staff has found that this proposal meets the comprehensive plan policies and it's consistent with the plan designations and the purpose statements. And as far as SEPA comments, they also actually officially ended today as well and we've added comments to your binder from that.

We received one comment, again from the acting fire marshal from the Vancouver Fire Department and no significant impacts on this proposal. And we've received one comment from Washington Department of Transportation late this afternoon and their comment was no comment, but if development occurs later on, they might comment.

And as far as conclusions go, based on the finding that the approval criteria have been

met staff recommends that the Planning Commission amend the comprehensive plan and zoning designations on 88 parcels in the Orchards area to general commercial. And that takes care of it.

DELEISSEGUES: Thank you, Gary. Any questions of Gary?

BARCA: I have a couple of questions. This map that's on the screen before us it appears to have different designations than the other map which would be the yellow and gray and green hatched map, this one.

ALBRECHT: Yes.

BARCA: Can you clarify for me the symbology in what we're really looking at?

ALBRECHT: Well, this is the zoning map that you see up on the screen right now and then what you have in front of you is comprehensive plan designations so that the urban medium if you'll look at your map that's in the binder, that's the R-18 zone.

BARCA: The R-18 zone?

ALBRECHT: Yes. The R-18 on the map that you see on the screen --

BARCA: The one that's on the screen?

ALBRECHT: Yes. -- that's R-18 and then if you look at the one that you just lifted up, the yellow zone --

BARCA: Yes.

ALBRECHT: -- to the left that's urban medium so that's the R-18.

BARCA: All right.

ALBRECHT: So the urban medium is the comprehensive plan designation.

BARCA: Okay. And then here it says C-3 and in the colored map it says CC --

ALBRECHT: Yes.

BARCA: -- which I think is community commercial?

ALBRECHT: Correct. That's the comp plan designation.

BARCA: All right. And then down where it says CG on the map on the screen, then it just has --

ALBRECHT: It's commercial so that's --

BARCA: It's just commercial --

ALBRECHT: So that's --

BARCA: -- but not community commercial.

ALBRECHT: It's general commercial --

BARCA: General commercial.

ALBRECHT: -- that's how the City has it set up.

BARCA: So what we're dealing with is the City designation versus the County designation. Is the functionality going to be different?

ALBRECHT: I don't believe so. It's already set up for commercial so across the street from Fourth Plain is general commercial so it would just match with what would be proposed on the other side. Is that what you're asking?

BARCA: Well, I'm trying to get to that point. So the jagged dotted line that we have is the separation between the County and the City?

ALBRECHT: Yes. Correct. Yes.

BARCA: All right. So on the County side where it says C-3 that is what we are proposing to change to bring it in alignment with the City functions that are on the adjacent borders?

ALBRECHT: Correct.

BARCA: Okay. Because what I read here didn't really say that to me so I'm just trying to get it into terms that I can understand.

ALBRECHT: Okay.

BARCA: All right.

DELEISSEGUES: Any other questions of Gary? Oliver, do you have --

ORJIAKO: No, I was just going to further clarify your question. The County also has a general commercial designation so this will also be applicable to other areas in terms of uses allowed that we have a designation and a zoning of general commercial.

BARCA: So we're going to go from community commercial to general commercial --

ORJIAKO: Yes.

BARCA: -- to make it compatible?

ORJIAKO: Yes.

ALLEN: Is it exactly the same area as was being considered back in 2010 or has there been some annexations already conducted?

ORJIAKO: It is just the same as it was.

ALLEN: Exactly the same?

ORJIAKO: Yes.

ALLEN: Thank you.

DELEISSEGUES: Any other questions of staff? Okay. I've got one name on the sign-up sheet. John Anderson, did you want to testify?

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

ANDERSON: Thank you. My name is John Anderson. We've owned property at --

DELEISSEGUES: Would you state your address for the record, please.

ANDERSON: Sure. 5805 NE 107th Avenue. We own one of the 88 parcels in the area and we're strongly in favor of the zone change to general commercial. We think that it will definitely best serve the needs of that neighborhood and also the surrounding neighborhoods of Maple Tree and Sunnyside.

It's the issue of functionality for us that the general commercial designation allows businesses that are serving the traveling public and for instance like the Orchards Feed Mill is actually kind of a destination business, people are driving from other places to go there, and the general commercial designation just takes that into account.

We think it may be the difference that makes a difference this zone change and that will kind of uplift the entire neighborhood, so we completely support the staff recommendation. Thank you.

DELEISSEGUES: Okay, thank you. Any questions of Mr. Anderson? Okay, thank you very much for your testimony.

ANDERSON: Thank you.

Return to Planning Commission

DELEISSEGUES: Anyone else in the audience wish to testify on this item? Okay, seeing none, we'll return it to the Planning Commission. Deliberation? Motion?

BARCA: I'll make a motion to **APPROVE** the recommendation from the staff concerning the zone change.

ALLEN: **Second.**

VARTANIAN: Second.

DELEISSEGUES: It's been moved and seconded that we recommend approval to the Board of County Commissioners for the commercial code updates. May we have roll call, please.

ROLL CALL VOTE

BARCA: AYE
ALLEN: AYE
VARTANIAN: AYE
USKOSKI: AYE
DELEISSEGUES: AYE

BARCA: George, you can only vote once.

VARTANIAN: I know, you got me all excited though.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS & PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION, continued

2. CPZ2011-00011 NE 65th St / Kerr Rd

This proposal would amend the County Arterial Plan Map to add a future extension of 65th Street to Kerr Road between NE 121st Avenue and NE 131st Avenue and would designate this roadway as a Collector street (C-2b) from NE 117th Avenue (SR-503) to NE 137th Avenue.

Staff contact: Mike Mabrey 360-397-2280 ext 4343 or e-mail michael.mabrey@clark.wa.gov

DELEISSEGUES: He tried. The next item on the agenda tonight is CPZ2011-00011, NE 65th Street slash Kerr Road. Mike Mabrey, staff report.

MABREY: Good evening, Commissioners. You're probably experiencing a bit of deja vu because this item has been before you in the past. There have been some developments that cause us to bring it back to you.

The request was made by WSDOT in one of our coordination meetings between our Public Works and Transportation staff and WSDOT that we look at the designation of 65th Street, and I'm going to fool around with maps in a second here to show you where we are because, there we go, do this one first. I have to shrink this down a little bit I guess.

The intersection of 65th Street at SR-503 it's fairly congested, there's certainly a lot of traffic on 503 moving north and south. The west side is Rosewood Avenue which is classified as a collector, a C-2b, the east side is 65th Street which isn't classified as anything.

65th Street is built like a collector, it's 36-feet wide in a 60-foot right-of-way, and part of the rationale for bringing this back to you is that the current lane configuration at that intersection is such that the signals have to be timed to give the side streets a whole lot of green time which is holding up traffic on the main streets because there are not lanes that are properly aligned on each side on the Rosewood side and on the 65th Street side, there's not enough left-turn lane capacity, there's not enough right-turn lane capacity.

So adding more lanes to a nonclassified street gets to be kind of problematic in terms of funding as well as just kind of meeting a rationale for doing so. The suggestion was if this were classified as a collector that would help us to move it ahead in terms of looking at the intersection and the potential to add some lanes to make that operate more effectively.

You'll see a letter from WSDOT staff supporting the proposal in your staff report packet. There's also a letter from the City of Vancouver dated April 12 in support of this proposal. I kind of jumped right in, I didn't even say who I am, so let me go back to the beginning.

DELEISSEGUES: I said who you were.

MABREY: Oh, okay, great. Thank you.

The City of Vancouver's letter is also in support of this and they point out and summarize some of the history and some other rationale for the proposal. Back when Fourth Plain was a State Highway, WSDOT looked at improving circulation in this area as far back as 2000.

The year 2000 they had started a public process in cooperation with the County to address some safety issues and as a result of that looking at the fact that there were 75 accidents over 4 years on that corridor resulting in 42 injuries, they started to look at restricting left turns at some of these intersections and in the end they put a median across 124th Avenue.

That was kind of the first phase of the solution.

The second phase of the solution was to get some cross-circulation on the north side so that the people who live north of here and use 124th Avenue would have the ability to go over to 121st for instance and come out at the signal on Fourth Plain. In June of 2005 WSDOT transferred \$400,000 to the County to use in securing this street connection and

we used those funds to buy the right-of-way to extend 65th Street between 121st and 124th.

There's probably a better map that would show that and I will go to this one. Okay. So that would be this little segment right here. That didn't exist when you heard this proposal back in 2008 I believe it was. So one of the main considerations, one of the things that we saw at least in the record, was concern about the impact of extending a street through these smaller parcels and what would they have left to develop. I recall that distinctly. I'm sure there are other concerns about property impacts, but this was a major one and there was a lot of testimony on it.

So essentially the property owners were willing sellers. We bought the right-of-way and the segment from 121st to 124th at least has right-of-way and could be built either as development occurs adjacent to it or as a capital facilities project. It's not on our current list of short-term projects.

The City of Vancouver's letter also notes, and I think our staff would support, that Fourth Plain is a principal arterial and its primary function is to carry a lot of traffic across the county. Unfortunately you have a lot of parcels that have commercial zoning on the north side and on the south side that have no alternative access to another street.

They haven't developed yet, but when they do they're going to want full access driveways onto Fourth Plain which is going to degrade the function and increase the accidents on Fourth Plain Boulevard so a frontage or parallel street seems to be a critical way of preserving not only the capacity of that major arterial because it allows some of that traffic to be directed out to other signalized intersections that are existing out there, but it also supports the future development of this as an urban center.

Urban centers have to have circulation and if you look over in the Sifton area there's a whole lot more pattern of streets there than you see in this area particularly between 121st and clear out to 137th. So what's changed is this connection is available and when you look at it at least half of the route exists in terms of either road or right-of-way.

Some of what drives the necessity of doing this in the short-term rather than waiting for annexation is we have the land use authority and at any day a development application could come in that would preclude this connection from ever happening. We did have a development application on the east side in this area here and they proposed to extend the street through their property.

So they found a way to make that work with a mixed use and commercial development that, see if I can bring it up, I can show you that site plan, no, I guess I can't. I thought I had saved it as a proper Word file, but it didn't turn out that way. At any rate there is an approved site plan for a diagonal street as part of that commercial development.

So that's why this is before you again. The City and WSDOT have written letters of support, the proposal would support future land use development out here and staff finds

that it meets the criteria for approval.

BARCA: Okay then.

DELEISSEGUES: Have you given up on the map?

MABREY: Yeah, I am giving up on the map.

DELEISSEGUES: I see you trying to work on it there.

MABREY: I'm just trying to get the junk out of the way at this point.

ALLEN: Could you just show with the mouse one more time as to where that connection was proposed to go.

MABREY: The approved development up there?

ALLEN: Correct.

MABREY: Yeah, this kind of obscures what's there. It's east of 131st so it's in this area right here if that makes sense.

BARCA: Along the Kerr Road?

MABREY: Along the extension of where Kerr Road would extend west.

ALLEN: Thank you.

DELEISSEGUES: Mike, is that it?

MABREY: That's it.

DELEISSEGUES: Recommendation for approval obviously, I hope.

BARCA: From him?

DELEISSEGUES: From him.

BARCA: Yeah, that's what the staff report says.

DELEISSEGUES: Any questions of Mike? I've got some. Number one, could you go ahead and purchase the right-of-way on that without changing the classification to a collector if it were just a local road?

MABREY: The right-of-way that we did purchase?

DELEISSEGUES: No, the right-of-way that you need.

MABREY: The additional right-of-way through there?

BARCA: The remainder.

MABREY: I don't know that the classification makes a whole lot of difference other than we don't typically allocate or budget dollars to purchase local street right-of-way. In fact we don't really improve anything below an arterial in most cases (inaudible).

DELEISSEGUES: No, I just wonder why it's so critical to change the classification?

MABREY: It's critical to change the classification because it would be unusual for us to show a local street alignment on the arterial atlas, so anything less than a collector is typically not shown on the atlas.

ALLEN: So is this part of the strategic planning for future expansion out there?

MABREY: Well, it's part of planning to address the impacts of the existing zoning before it develops so that you can assure that you get the transportation connections that are necessary to serve it.

Because each one of these properties coming in on its own, you know, if the middle one comes in first they're going to say we don't want to dedicate some little short segment. I don't see any plan approved here that requires us to dedicate right-of-way for some diagonal road that may never get built. Well, unless we make the commitment that some day that road is going to get built in advance, then we won't get it.

ALLEN: Was there any contingency with that 400k from WSDOT and what other partnerships would you foresee in the future if this goes according to plan?

MABREY: The \$400,000 was to improve circulation in that area so it wasn't earmarked specifically for purchasing right-of-way at that location, but that's what we used it for.

ALLEN: Thank you.

DELEISSEGUES: Any other questions of Mike? If not, we'll go to the sign-up sheet. Charity Blount, would you like to testify?

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

BLOUNT: No, my husband will.

DELEISSEGUES: Or Matt as the case may be.

BLOUNT: Hi, I'm Charity's husband. Actually I have a couple of questions, I guess, right

away from what you mentioned and that was --

BARCA: Name and address.

BLOUNT: Sorry. Matt Blount, 13310 NE Kerr Road, Vancouver, Washington. Thank you.

My question was since the median that you talked about from the original funding for the two part was installed, what's the accident and injury rate been?

MABREY: I don't know the answer to that off the top of my head. I'm sure it's gone down significantly. I know people do go around it because I drive that route myself quite often, but I don't have a number. I mean it's probably not relevant to our decision because the median is there.

BLOUNT: And the reason I mention it is because it does seem relevant because you mentioned it as a safety issue initially and that's why the letter from the City was there.

MABREY: Well, I was going through the history of how we came to where we are right now and that was a WSDOT decision that was done somewhat in conjunction with the County. Fourth Plain is now in City jurisdiction so any decisions to install medians would be made by the City which makes this another interesting kind of dilemma in that you have County land use authority on the north side, City land use authority on the south side.

The County could approve a development proposal on the north side, the City could say, well, we want a median, we don't want any access at all to Fourth Plain, the County could say, well, sorry, we can't enforce that. It's fairly complicated because of the multiple jurisdictions, but it kind of brings to the fore the need for interjurisdictional cooperation in order to get the future that you think is appropriate.

I know I'm not addressing the specific question that you had. I don't know the answer to how many accidents there have been at that specific location.

BLOUNT: I guess what I'm trying to indicate is that I don't believe that there is significant enough evidence to say that adding this arterial will alleviate safety issues at this point or prevent anything like that.

MABREY: Okay. Well, the point is not to change the accident history on Fourth Plain under today's scenario, but as you know --

BLOUNT: It's to alleviate traffic; right?

MABREY: Well, with future development on the north side you can see there are many acres of commercial land on the north side that remain to be developed and when that development occurs they're not going to have any choice but to have a full access driveway onto Fourth Plain and they're probably going to want a signal.

So unless you want two or three more signals between 121st and 131st, it's probably a good idea to channel some of that traffic through the backdoor out to those signals and that's what this proposal would accomplish in the long term.

BLOUNT: And so potentially I can understand that and I would say then a good example would be maybe directly across the street The Palms and what they did was they did create that side street off of the light that already exists, but they didn't run an actual arterial all the way back the other way --

MABREY: Right.

BLOUNT: -- to create more side traffic.

MABREY: Because they had a corner to work from.

BLOUNT: Right.

MABREY: Right.

BLOUNT: So some of these properties would have a corner to work from or that road could come off of that side maybe, but, anyway, that's to talk about the commercial part of it. Clearly I have personal reasons because of where I live right there on Kerr Street and the neighborhood itself has kind of culturally turned into almost a cul-de-sac style neighborhood.

It's really kind of three neighborhood blocks and any given day I could be outside my house right now and there would probably be several toddler age kids in the street walking around playing and that sort of thing.

And I know sidewalks would be installed, but once the culture is established of that sort of thing in a neighborhood the risk can go way up for little kids like that getting hit.

MABREY: Okay.

BLOUNT: So I question convenience versus safety and whether or not we're making a decision of convenience without thinking about the precautions.

DELEISSEGUES: Okay.

ALLEN: Matt, could you point out where you live on that Kerr Road.

MABREY: Oh, we need to come over to the other map, let's see if I can find it.

BLOUNT: Yeah. It's 13310 so there's a T in the road there. That wouldn't be it either. You need a little closer look.

MABREY: See if there's another choice here. I got -- well, okay.

ALLEN: That's when you were talking about that cul-de-sac.

MABREY: It's a little hard to see, but this is Kerr Road right here.

ALLEN: But there has to be --

DELEISSEGUES: That is a little hard to see.

ALLEN: Yes, it is.

BLOUNT: There's not an actual cul-de-sac there.

ALLEN: Oh, okay.

BLOUNT: But I'm saying that the culture of the neighborhood has become such that people are out in the streets all the time. There's a basketball hoop out there and kids are playing ball, you know, there's kids --

ALLEN: So it's a cohesive neighborhood --

BLOUNT: Yeah.

ALLEN: -- section?

BLOUNT: Yeah. I know it's a very small section right there and maybe it's hard to have significance in that case, but I would ask that you guys consider that seriously.

ALLEN: So it's along that existing road up there or close to that existing road?

BLOUNT: Yeah. Right where his arrow's going to be.

ALLEN: Okay. And there was something that was near that that was being proposed in conjunction with the new development so isn't that connecting right to that road?

BLOUNT: The new development would be to connect from this side all the way across up to 117th and widen the road and to use it as a primary traffic funnel off of Fourth Plain. Or off of 500 actually.

ALLEN: But that's not one of the considered routes, is it, for the strategic plan?

MABREY: Well, Kerr Road is part of the route that we're proposing.

ALLEN: Right.

MABREY: So, yeah, this is the Kerr Road section here. I would just say that I recognize

that the north side of that street is residential and the south side is kind of industrial and there's some commercial on the end. The primary thing we're trying to do is get a connection from here to here so that this future commercial traffic can get out at a signal, not to try to channel it through your neighborhood. But it --

ALLEN: Right.

MABREY: -- it doesn't make a whole lot of sense to end it right here. But I mean it probably doesn't make a whole lot of difference one way or another if that was the wishes of the Planning Commission to just terminate the designation at 131st instead of going to 137th because you additionally have that problem what do you do on this end and --

ALLEN: Right.

MABREY: -- you bisect this piece and tie it into 137th at a funny angle or not so...

VARTANIAN: So you would consider having a signalized intersection at 131st and Fourth Plain? If we stopped it --

MABREY: There's one there now.

ALLEN: There's one now.

MABREY: There's one here now, right.

VARTANIAN: So if I understood you correctly you're not proposing it but you would consider a possibility of ending the designation of the street at 131st --

MABREY: At a hundred and, yeah.

VARTANIAN: -- instead of going all the way through Kerr Road?

MABREY: At 131st, yeah.

VARTANIAN: Yeah.

MABREY: Yeah. I mean you don't have to include Kerr Road, functionally it probably would accomplish the same thing.

ALLEN: And that would not disrupt the existing as he said cohesive neighborhood either.

MABREY: Yeah.

ALLEN: So that would be an option that would be acceptable to WSDOT and the City of Vancouver?

MABREY: I don't think WSDOT would care one way or another. And the City I think they'd probably prefer the current proposal but they'd live with it until they had the ability to change it.

ALLEN: But it would still provide a viable alternative to Fourth Plain.

BLOUNT: That's comforting.

MABREY: I mean the point is not to move traffic long distances but to get it out of these commercial areas and out to signalized intersections so that you don't have the demand for full access driveways on Fourth Plain.

ALLEN: And also avoid that funny connection at the end on --

MABREY: Right.

ALLEN: -- on the east side.

DELEISSEGUES: Okay.

ALLEN: Thank you very much.

BLOUNT: Thanks.

BARCA: Next.

DELEISSEGUES: Charity, did you have anything to add?

BLOUNT: Sure.

DELEISSEGUES: If you do, here's your chance.

BLOUNT: Thanks. Hi. My name's Charity Blount, the same address, 13310 NE Kerr Road. Along with the neighborhood one thing we were thinking, too, if it's insisted that they have to do this through the residential area that it would be a 25 mile an hour zone with speed bumps so that people would know that they have to slow down.

It's really sweet there, there are so many children out there, I am actually doing a cupcake party this Saturday with all these little neighborhood girls that are just all around the streets all the time playing and they're just so much fun. And, again, with the community there it's getting to be a lot more fun than it used to be.

We've lived there for six years in June and we've seen a lot of transformations there than when we first moved in there. Apparently before we moved in there it was kind of a more of a drug area, we've seen four new homes come in there, two new duplexes next to us that have four large families in them and we just would like to preserve that. And in

addition we chose this area because it wasn't on a busy street and it would reduce all the home values through there as well.

DELEISSEGUES: Thank you. Any questions of Charity?

BLOUNT: Thank you.

VARTANIAN: Oh, I have a question. What time is the cupcake party?

BLOUNT: It's at 2:30. You can come if you'd like. Thank you.

DELEISSEGUES: Any other questions?

VARTANIAN: Thank you.

DELEISSEGUES: Thank you, Charity. Next on the sign-up sheet is Lonnie Johnson.

JOHNSON: Good evening. My name is Lonnie Johnson, 6917 NE 132nd Court, I live right off of Kerr Road. I got a question for you, how many properties are going to be removed when you build that extension through there?

MABREY: Well, there's no buildings along the proposed alignment at all if that's your question. I mean from here to here is vacant other than that used car lot building that's further south and this would be the only question about what happens here if this were to be built out and this is a vacant lot right now, there would have to be some kind of realignment of the street, but I don't foresee any buildings being torn down.

This is a line on a map at this point and it doesn't fix the alignment and nobody's going to come in and start building anything in the foreseeable future. The point is really to identify a location for a road as properties redevelop.

JOHNSON: Is there a timeline for this project to take place?

MABREY: No, because it's not a project, it's a road designation that goes on the arterial atlas so that when properties that are immediately affected by it have to come in for development, they have to respond to the fact that there is a line on the map that affects their property.

They have the ability to say, well, we don't like it right here, let's jog it around this way and make suggestions about alignment, but one way or the other typically they would have to build a road that meets the standard. In this case it would be a two-lane collector with bike lanes.

JOHNSON: Well, I'm not sure but how wide would the road be?

MABREY: What?

JOHNSON: The extension?

MABREY: Why would it --

JOHNSON: How wide?

BARCA: How wide?

MABREY: Oh, how wide. It's a total of 34 feet and a 60-foot right-of-way so that gives you two 12-foot travel lanes one in each direction and a 5-foot bike lane in each direction. And one of the advantages I didn't mention is that right now there's no place to ride on Fourth Plain going east and west for bikes. It's very difficult in this area.

You basically have to go up to 78th I think to traverse through Sifton and anywhere on bikes so this would classify the road and allow us to go back in on the existing piece of 65th and stripe it for bike lanes. Right now nobody uses it for parking, there's on-street parking would be legal, but you never see any vehicles out there so what you have is just a big piece of pavement that isn't very well-defined.

JOHNSON: That's all I have. Thank you.

DELEISSEGUES: Any questions? Thank you very much for your testimony. Dean Gano.

GANO: He covered it.

DELEISSEGUES: Okay, thank you. Jay or Diana Harrison.

HARRISON: I'm sorry, I just thought I was signing in.

DELEISSEGUES: Okay, thank you. Rick Richart.

RICHART: My name is Rick Richart. My office address is 14600 NE 20th Avenue, Vancouver, 98686. We own a property at the end of I guess it's Kerr Road right at 137th, the last little box at the intersection.

MABREY: This one right here?

RICHART: Right there, yes. I think Kaiser Permanente is directly east across the street and I think the Biffle property is behind us.

And so my questions are, number one, time frame, and of course it's all about me, but that designated area, what's the time frame for designation and does the designation that you're seeking encompass all of that from 117th to that 137th Avenue location?

MABREY: Well, the proposal that's before the Planning Commission tonight is to classify this existing piece of road, this piece of right-of-way, and a future extension of a road between here and Kerr Road, and then Kerr Road and some little curvy alignment that brings it into 137th as a collector street.

RICHART: I see.

MABREY: It wouldn't be built typically until the adjoining properties or the affected properties develop.

RICHART: I see. So it's not like the improvements that we saw on 137th Avenue where the frontage was purchased by was it the State at that time and then widened the road, this is something that happens as a part of the development process?

MABREY: Right. 137th north of Fourth Plain was a County road project.

RICHART: Was a County road project?

MABREY: Right.

RICHART: And so this small one-acre parcel that I own is affected at the time of development, is that correct, if this proposal were accepted and to go through?

MABREY: Typically that would be the case unless the County put it on their six-year program to build which is pretty unlikely because this area is scheduled for annexation within the next five to ten years anyway, so we're unlikely to invest a whole lot into road improvements.

RICHART: So it will be a City issue by the time it --

MABREY: Right.

RICHART: -- comes to fruition?

MABREY: What we're trying to do is to preserve the alignment primarily between 124th and 131st.

RICHART: Not clear to 137th; is that right?

MABREY: Well, we're showing it as collector clear to 137th. The Board's heard some testimony and concern about the Kerr Road section from here to here and they can certainly decide to stop the designation here and just have this section be called a collector and leave it at that if that's their recommendation.

RICHART: I see. And I just noticed the map is the only thing that I received at my office, but when I look at the possibility of this being a 60-foot wide right-of-way --

MABREY: Right.

RICHART: -- with two lanes each way plus a bike path?

MABREY: Right.

VARTANIAN: One lane each way.

MABREY: Well, one lane each way, I'm sorry, yeah.

RICHART: One lane each way, okay, thank you. And so I guess it's just too early to make any determination of how that affects my property?

MABREY: Yeah, I think it is. Certainly if an engineer were to come in and try to design this thing as a collector, they wouldn't come in at a diagonal, they'd want to have a straight section along your property and then find a way of curving it around in here and then probably terminating this street by twisting it down this way.

It would normally be built if somebody were going to go out there with it and design it, but I don't know what exactly this is, I don't remember what this right-of-way width is in front of you, so whether you would be affected at all it's hard to say.

RICHART: I see. So at this point I submitted for a development review, gosh, a site plan review some years ago to build apartments on that property and we let the approved application lapse, but if we were to go back in for it I guess my question is do I pull that trigger now and begin the reapplication process or do I wait for this to take place. So that's my purpose in being here and right now it looks like what you're telling me is we're not going that far yet or your recommendation is not to do --

MABREY: Well, no, the recommendation does go clear to 137th and we'll see what comes out of the Planning Commissions' recommendation, may be different than that.

RICHART: I see. So if I put in a development application the possibilities are?

MABREY: You would be vested prior to the adoption of this which doesn't become effective until the 1st of January anyway.

RICHART: I see. And if I stall until after then?

MABREY: If you sell it?

RICHART: If I stall my application and I wait?

MABREY: Oh, if you wait until after there's a possibility that if this were adopted you would need to dedicate additional right-of-way on your north property line if the current

right-of-way is not 60 feet.

RICHART: Is that something that we give up or is that something that is purchased?

MABREY: It's something that you'd give up if you're developing.

RICHART: If you're developing, I see.

MABREY: Right.

RICHART: All right, thank you.

MABREY: You're welcome.

DELEISSEGUES: Any questions of Rick? Thanks, Rick.

RICHART: Thank you.

DELEISSEGUES: David or Jennifer Langley.

LANGLEY: I'm Jennifer Langley.

DELEISSEGUES: Could we get your address.

LANGLEY: 13417 NE 71st Street.

DELEISSEGUES: Thank you.

LANGLEY: We are right next to that parcel you were just talking about. My question is based on your background staff report. Here it says "no public improvements are planned in the six-year transportation improvement plan," well, when does that six-year transportation plan expire and when does the new one begin?

MABREY: Well, they change every year, but typically we don't find a pot of gold from one year to the next and so the list of projects that are funded doesn't change very rapidly. I guess if your concern is that suddenly we would want to go out there and build a street through your property, I can be pretty confident that that's not going to happen any time in the near future.

And if that proposal did come forward, you'd certainly be made aware of that. Basically we can barely afford to fund the large arterial street projects that we have committed to over the years. Does that answer your question? Is this the property you're talking about, the square?

LANGLEY: Move to the left, that little box, that box is me.

MABREY: Okay.

LANGLEY: And that's our commercial property.

MABREY: Okay.

LANGLEY: And 60-foot right-of-way will take off the whole back side of my -- basically drop down your cursor a little bit and that would feed right into me. Yeah, that would take off a good chunk of my property, my income, so that worries me a bit. And that little goat path right there called 135th is literally a dirt goat path.

MABREY: Oh, it's worse than that. You could lose a Volkswagen in there easily.

LANGLEY: Yeah. And you can wade in it when it's raining.

So I heard you say with the last gentleman that would be an area that would probably be vacated, that little 135th?

MABREY: No. I wasn't trying to say that that would be vacated. Well, it might be. If you were going to try to design a through route that went from here to here and tied into here, there would be some kind of a curve that transitioned it through there and so, yeah, part of it would end up being vacated over the long term if this were being built. Does that --

LANGLEY: And if you did take a chunk of my property, we would be compensated? Did I hear you just say if they were developing it, they'd just have to let go of it?

MABREY: Right. If you're developing, you dedicate it. If you're not developing and we have a capital project like 137th Avenue, we commit to doing a major project, then we go out and buy the right-of-way and do the improvements. That's pretty rare for us to do that on anything other than major arterial streets though.

LANGLEY: Thank you.

VARTANIAN: Don't go away.

DELEISSEGUES: We got a question here, Jennifer.

LANGLEY: Sorry.

VARTANIAN: No, that's okay. Right now that's an empty lot?

LANGLEY: No, that's how my husband and I make our living.

VARTANIAN: You have something on there then?

LANGLEY: Yeah, we have a tow truck company.

MABREY: Right. It's the one just to the east, right, this one here, is empty?

LANGLEY: Yeah, that one's empty.

VARTANIAN: But yours has got something on it?

LANGLEY: Yes, we are actively running a business there.

VARTANIAN: Thank you.

DELEISSEGUES: Any other questions of Jennifer? Thank you very much. David, do you have anything to add or -- okay, thank you very much.

That concludes my sign-up sheet. Does anybody else in the audience wish to testify on this item? Okay, seeing none, then we'll return it to the Planning Commission for deliberation and a motion.

VARTANIAN: I have a question or two or 75.

DELEISSEGUES: Sure.

BARCA: Yeah, let's get the questions out of the way.

VARTANIAN: Thank you.

DELEISSEGUES: Part of the deliberation, my man.

VARTANIAN: That section along Kerr Road there's a number of what appears to be smallish parcels along it on the north side. That's where the residences are right now?

MABREY: Yeah. I can pull up an aerial map.

VARTANIAN: No, I got that too. It was just --

MABREY: Yeah, zoom in a little bit.

VARTANIAN: What's on the south side there?

MABREY: It's kind of a mix of mostly business uses.

VARTANIAN: So there's things on it?

MABREY: Yeah, almost all of these are. And I think this corner one is a house and then as you get up here there's a business at the end here. This one's vacant. She said she has a business here. So, yeah, there's kind of a mix of uses along there.

VARTANIAN: And the portion of the road that's missing between --

MABREY: From here to here?

VARTANIAN: Yes, thank you.

MABREY: Is essentially vacant. And this parcel has an RV sales lot on it. It used to be an auto sales and wrecking yard.

VARTANIAN: My inclination, if I can give an inclination, is that we do just cut it off at 131st. Quite frankly, I mean, why run into a neighborhood that's already got something going for it. And if the City takes it over eventually and they decide to do that, then it becomes a problem between the residences and the City. But I don't see why we should have the designation go all the way out if there's already an established neighborhood and other businesses along that line and that's how I feel about it right now.

ALLEN: How long is this segment? If we cut it off at 131st, how long would it be?

MABREY: I don't have a measuring tool on this, I'm not used to having that ability, but 117th to 131st has got to be --

ALLEN: Because I too have --

VARTANIAN: 37 blocks.

ALLEN: -- reservations.

MABREY: -- better part of a mile anyway.

ALLEN: So it's a good chunk of alternate route from Fourth Plain. But I too have problems and that's why I asked that question about the cohesive neighborhood out there. I have a problem cutting through that neighborhood so it makes sense to cut it off at 131st and not go into the residential, especially when it's already a cohesive community as well as then not having to deal with the jagged connector at the end of that east route.

So I understand that WSDOT is very much interested in having some improvements, but I think that since there were no criteria or contingencies put upon that 400k and since that 400k doesn't really go that far, I would say that we would not violate anything from the WSDOT by cutting it off at 131st, but I think we would avoid some negative impacts on an existing cohesive community if we do cut it off at 131st.

MABREY: Right. We fulfilled our agreement with WSDOT by buying this piece of right-of-way from 121st to 124th. That money is spent --

ALLEN: Right.

MABREY: -- and so that's all good.

ALLEN: And of course especially with a complex issue with the City/County ownership of a road that is failing, I think that this would be a good alternative, and it would provide a good alternative, but I think it would be much better if we did cut it off at 131st.

BARCA: So, Mike, didn't you show a picture before that showed a proposed development that came off of 131st?

MABREY: I did. And see if I can find it again. There it is. So this is The Village at Old Trolley Square. It's an approved site plan and on the right-hand side is 131st where it meets Kerr Road and so this is an extension of that diagonal roadway that's being proposed to go west from 131st following essentially the same diagonal as Kerr Road. And I don't know why my arrow's not showing up very well, but that's what we're looking at.

BARCA: I can see it, yeah. So this is approved?

MABREY: It's approved, yeah. I don't know if it will ever be built, but they found a way to make it work with the zoning.

BARCA: I guess I look at this right now is the way that the land is developing on its own, and the Blounts example of The Palms, and it seems to me that this commercial land is kind of developing organically all on its own. I don't really see an advantage to the public to create this collector unless you're going to try and channel traffic between 117th all the way out to 137th as the proposal was originally stated to get traffic off of Fourth Plain.

We've already seen all of the problems by trying to do that and the intersection of the proposed road to 137th is so close to Fourth Plain if you're going to have another signal intersection out there that's a bigger nightmare than we've designed on 65th which is a horrible, horrible intersection that nobody should have had to have happen but it did.

Everything that we didn't learn on 65th we're going to repeat here on 137th and I consider this as a planning nightmare. We're doing it for one proposal but we're willing to break it up into pieces and it isn't going to account for any improvement, but we're going to give a corporate subsidy to people to help them channel traffic to their commercial site when we don't need to.

These people figured out how to do it, the next group of people will figure out how to do it. The Palms figured out how to do it, frontage roads work. I think what the audience needs to understand about this is once the line is on the map, then there can't be development without doing the road.

So once this line is on the map if we vote to go forward tonight with it and then the Commissioners approve it, then whenever the land develops this will continue to march towards you because there's no way to prevent it, the line is on the map.

My consideration is there's other opportunities for us here and trying to run a parallel road this close through does not benefit the public, not in the way we state that it's going to benefit it. I think it's another one of those situations where we have stated intentions but they're not going to come true any more than putting that intersection at 65th was going to help.

Who did it help, Taco Bell. So I think the whole proposal just like in 2000 should be shelved and a new consideration needs to happen.

DELEISSEGUES: Valerie, do you want to weigh in on it?

USKOSKI: Well, I guess my thoughts are is when you look at the west end there if we've already acquired the right-of-way and then the property line to the next two parcels to the east kind of lines up with that right-of-way, when they develop they're naturally going to want to extend that roadway through there.

And if we've already got an approved development that's made that alignment work, we've essentially already got a connection inherently built in there for as those develop that I don't know that it's necessary to put that classification on there, especially through the residential area of Kerr Road on the east end.

VARTANIAN: On the last map, not this one, the one just before it, can you sort of put where that development is? The proposed, sorry.

MABREY: Yeah, it's this C-3 area right here.

VARTANIAN: Which is currently vacant?

MABREY: Not the whole thing but --

VARTANIAN: No, but there's nothing there currently?

MABREY: Right. So the counter to that is, yes, some developer found a way of doing that. The next developer could come in and say I want to put a big box at the back here, I don't want to build anybody any streets, and I want a driveway here and I want a driveway here and that's what --

BARCA: You don't have to give them the driveway.

MABREY: Oh, yeah, you do. I mean you won't be able to force them to build a diagonal street through there unless you have an arterial atlas that shows that you have to do that.

ALLEN: Right.

MABREY: There's no way that you're going to make a proportionality argument or a nexus

argument that was going to require somebody to build a street there.

ALLEN: Because even though they're vested, it doesn't mean that they're going to be doing it.

MABREY: Yeah.

ALLEN: Because even though we can't really count on that being a natural connector to begin with because they don't really have to do it.

BARCA: Well, I think the threat of signalization all up and down Fourth Plain is it's just that, it's to make people think that this is a more palatable solution but it isn't necessarily the only solution. You can restrict the method and flow of traffic in there. Yeah, he gets the driveway but he doesn't have to have a signalized intersection. That's a choice that's made.

Medians went in for a reason, there are already signalized corners to get to and I think that the design is not the fluidity that we think we're getting out of this deal. We're going to get a real big headache at 137th and in between that time this is going to become a City matter. But once the line goes down it's the line is down and I don't think the County public gets a benefit out of it.

VARTANIAN: A couple of --

DELEISSEGUES: Milada, do you have anything? And then we'll come to George.

ALLEN: No. Basically I'm done, but I'm still very much concerned that if it does go as proposed that we may be bifurcating a cohesive neighborhood and that has to be avoided. And of course even though we do understand that we have to have an alternate to the Fourth Plain transportation problems.

And we do have the right-of-way now, we still need to somehow capture an opportunity for strategic planning for providing alternate to the Fourth Plain and have it on the map so there's full disclosure to people who are wishing to either purchase and/or develop in that area and if an opportunity comes up that we can capture that opportunity if we have a strategic plan in place.

DELEISSEGUES: George.

VARTANIAN: Did you tell me that there's an issue with 76th?

HOLLEY: With the what?

VARTANIAN: 76th Street, that there's issue. I'm sorry, what's that road classified as? Do you know offhand?

MABREY: I have the arterial atlas map here if I can find my lousy arrow. There it is. It's purple. That's it, it's a purple street.

VARTANIAN: Oh, thank you. Does it for me.

MABREY: That's the sad part is this doesn't come with a -- it's a --

ALLEN: A neighborhood collector.

DELEISSEGUES: A major collector.

MABREY: Well, it's an arterial.

VARTANIAN: Okay, that's good enough. I guess kind of on the one hand I'm pretty much agreeing with Commissioner Barca. I mean what are we talking about, a block running parallel roughly and I don't see the benefit quite frankly of all of that.

But since we do have the right-of-way purchased, if we have to do something there, I would stop it at 131st. I don't see why we can't go up 503 to 76th and out that way quite frankly because that's already an arterial road, there's got to be a traffic light there someplace. I mean you don't have to have -- well, isn't there a traffic light at what is that, 503 and 76th?

MABREY: Yes.

VARTANIAN: I mean why can't they come and go from there?

MABREY: To this --

VARTANIAN: To that area.

MABREY: -- commercial when you get a WinCo in there or something, whatever happens to be there.

VARTANIAN: Yeah. Well, let me make sure, I just want to make sure I understand something. We already have a road that's here Fourth Plain?

MABREY: Right.

VARTANIAN: And there's something that says thou shalt not have any driveway access to that?

MABREY: Unless there's no alternative which we are creating the situation where there will be no alternative.

VARTANIAN: Well, I guess that's my question.

MABREY: We're perpetuating it anyway.

VARTANIAN: So they have to have something to come and go.

MABREY: Right.

VARTANIAN: It's not a matter of I'm sorry about the lot, you lose, you can't say that?

MABREY: Well, if this or these two properties came in first for development, they would say I want full access driveway and the signal right here and they'd probably get it because --

VARTANIAN: Well, by law we have to give that to them?

MABREY: No. Well, we have to give them access, yes.

ALLEN: Access.

VARTANIAN: Why?

MABREY: It would be --

DELEISSEGUES: Right in, right out.

MABREY: Yeah.

VARTANIAN: Yeah. But I mean why do we have to give them access? Because the road is there somebody comes in and buys the lot --

MABREY: Right.

VARTANIAN: -- and wants to develop it --

MABREY: Right.

VARTANIAN: -- I'm sorry but you don't have an access so you can't develop anything, why can't we say that?

MABREY: No, we can give them a right in, right out I suppose.

BARCA: You have to give access.

VARTANIAN: You have to give, okay. Though you can give them like they said right in, right out.

MABREY: Right.

HOLLEY: One at a time, please.

VARTANIAN: Yeah, sorry.

BARCA: My apologies.

VARTANIAN: No. No.

BARCA: I was apologizing to her.

VARTANIAN: Well, then why are you looking at me.

I would tend to agree. You know, back into the work session I didn't see the benefit of having it that close to Fourth Plain and you could have an entrance into a commercial area that's not major other than handling the truck traffic coming and going through the commercial area and the public and go up 76th, out 76th perhaps, but if there is no alternative better engineered or not, I'm still going with stopping at 131st.

DELEISSEGUES: Well, my view of it and looking at this and having taken some transportation planning courses in the past, I really favor this proposal that you've got and my concern would be if you stop it at 131st that people may continue on on a much less improved road through the neighborhood just to get over to 137th and it could become a bigger problem if you don't extend it than if you do.

I mean it's something to think about. At least you would have sidewalks, curb and gutter, a full access roadway if you allow this proposal to go all the way over to 137th. The worst thing that could happen is people split off and they don't want to go down 131st because there's a backup on Fourth Plain so they run through the neighborhood and there's nothing worse than a bunch of commuters running through neighborhoods on substandard roads.

You've already got the right-of-way purchased on part of it, you've got developers that are using what they see as an opportunity for a frontage road and a frontage road could take the place of this dotted line on either side. I mean all you're doing here is showing that there needs to be a connection.

It doesn't show where that connection has to be and that will be dependent upon the development. When the development's proposed the people in the neighborhoods can come in and give their view of what they think about the proposal at that time and that would have a lot to do, I think, with shaping where the road actually ended up if they didn't do that study ahead of time and get the public input before they even did their development which they'd be smart to do, a frontage road or connecting roads.

And I say that strategic planning is a good word for it. If you don't do it now you're going to lose the opportunity to get this done. You're going to have a bunch of roads that end,

dead-end, start, stop, you're going to have a bunch of roads that are as they exist today which are inadequate and then there will be a development somewhere along the line where they improve it to the standards that we would like to have the whole road to. And the only way you would get that done later on would be to come back and use taxpayer County money to improve the whole roadway because you'd lose the opportunity to get that done in the development phase.

So personally I support your proposal a hundred percent and I'd go all the way to 137th because if I lived on Kerr Road, I wouldn't want these people coming through my neighborhood to avoid the traffic backup on 131st. At least they ought to consider it, think about it, which would be better.

And I've lived in some areas where the commuters find shortcuts and one of them was Washington D.C. through Fairfax and you wouldn't want to live anywhere around those guys because they're going through there 90 miles an hour. And George Washington Parkway's backed up, I-6 is, 66 was backed up and they'll just take off through the residential areas.

And if you got half of that road built, it looks like a real good opportunity to keep on going and come down at the signal there on Fourth Plain. And if you connected that all the way across over to Ward Road some way or another, they'd go through there too. It could go up to 76th and across like you say, but that's pretty busy too in the mornings.

Mike and I have been victims of having to drive that road often, I know what it's like on Fourth Plain, but ever since the State took over the Ward Road and Fourth Plain intersection they've screwed that signal up totally. You can sit there waiting for a left-turn arrow for a long, long time and there's nobody coming at all on the westbound.

VARTANIAN: What's west of Kerr Road? At the end of Kerr Road what's west of that? Is there any road there? Is there anything there?

MABREY: Well, Kerr Road ends here and then there's this --

VARTANIAN: No, west.

MABREY: -- that nonexistent thing. Oh, I'm sorry, west of Kerr Road? Where? Here?

BARCA: That's that proposal.

VARTANIAN: Yeah. There's nothing there right now; right?

MABREY: A vacant field, right.

VARTANIAN: Well, since there's nothing there why do we have to have a through road, can't we just block it, put a Jersey barrier at the end of Kerr Road so people won't come through?

DELEISSEGUES: You mean block it off at 131st?

VARTANIAN: Yeah.

DELEISSEGUES: I guess you could. Might not --

VARTANIAN: Well, people are coming on it today from 137th.

DELEISSEGUES: The people that live on the west side of Kerr Road might not like it if they can't get out of their neighborhood.

VARTANIAN: Well, they can get out. First of all there's nothing there, and, secondly, they can get out of their neighborhood by going to 131st.

DELEISSEGUES: Maybe. 137th.

VARTANIAN: No, 131st if you block off there.

DELEISSEGUES: I thought you were going to block it off at 131st?

VARTANIAN: I am. Oh, you're talking about coming out the other way, I'm sorry.

BARCA: Proposal.

DELEISSEGUES: Well, does anybody have any closing argument?

BARCA: I think you know where I stand so let's get the vote on.

DELEISSEGUES: Are we ready for a motion? Somebody want to charge for it?

VARTANIAN: Well, I guess a strong suggestion before the motion is that you look at the alternative going up to 76th Street which may not be an alternative but just consider it.

In any event, if we do decide to go through here I would make a motion that we stop the designation where Kerr Road starts and if it can legally be done that we put a road end at Kerr Road and so just stopping traffic from coming in from that extension.

MABREY: Okay. Well, I would just suggest that your **motion** be limited to something that has to do with the arterial atlas because operationally we're not going to be putting barriers or anything like that.

VARTANIAN: Okay. Then I **MOVE** that we cut off the arterial designation at 131st. Is that correct?

ALLEN: Since he was able to add some clarification may I just kind of make a statement

that frontage roads sometimes cost a lot of money because you have to acquire already developed properties, but then also it would go all the way to 137th we're also facing the problem with the Sifton School being right there and so that would be a problem to consider if we go all the way to 137th.

And then also there might be where that loop comes in at an awkward S, almost like an S curve at the end of the east portion of the segment, there might be some problems with the properties that are adjacent to it. And then also with the frontage road you're also facing problems with the displacement of some people.

And I don't know if the environmental justice would have anything to do with this particular segment or not, but I just wanted to put those out there for those of you who wanted to go all the way to 137th.

BARCA: Milada, a point of order, was that a second?

DELEISSEGUES: We've got a motion so is that --

VARTANIAN: Do we have a second?

ALLEN: We don't have a proposal yet.

DELEISSEGUES: Yeah, George said --

VARTANIAN: I just made a motion.

ALLEN: You just made a motion, I'm sorry.

VARTANIAN: No, that's all right.

ALLEN: I thought you had launched into more explanations.

VARTANIAN: No, no, no.

ALLEN: Could you repeat the motion, please.

VARTANIAN: The motion is that we start the designation of the --

MABREY: C-2b.

VARTANIAN: Thank you. -- C-2b at what is it 503 and bring it up to 131st and stop it there.

ALLEN: **Second.**

DELEISSEGUES: **Moved and seconded.** Any questions on the motion? Roll call, please.

ROLL CALL VOTE

BARCA: NO

ALLEN: AYE

USKOSKI: NO

VARTANIAN: AYE

DELEISSEGUES: Well, I'd vote **NO** because I think it ought to go all the way to 137th, but I'd like to ask Ron and Valerie to go ahead and say why they voted no so the County Commissioners can get the advantage of their thoughts.

BARCA: Go ahead.

USKOSKI: I guess my thoughts are is that I think if you're going to do this, you really probably should do it all the way to 137th for the reasons that Dick has said, but on the same token I don't know that it's necessarily warranted.

And I don't really like how close to Fourth Plain it is. It seems that it serves just those commercial properties right in that area and you're going to have a bit of a channel there like a block away.

BARCA: And I think the intersection at 137th is a designed disaster. I think coming up short to 131st does not meet the purposes that were stated for making it a designation on the arterial atlas and I believe that we're pushing this because we spent \$400,000 of WSDOT money for our right-of-way that isn't working out and I believe we just need to reel this thing in and say it's not in the best interest to put this in, developers will figure out a way to get traffic into their development, we don't need to do this for their benefit.

DELEISSEGUES: Just a point of order here, I'll change my vote to YES. I'll go to 131st rather than not have the project at all so we get it on, we can move it forward with a 3 to 2 vote. Any other comments?

BARCA: Can you do that? Is that legitimate?

WISER: Can you do that?

VARTANIAN: He just did it.

DELEISSEGUES: I just did it.

VARTANIAN: He's the Chair.

ALLEN: And there's no objection from the counsel.

DELEISSEGUES: Before we go on we're going to take a ten-minute break and we'll come back at about 10 minutes after 8:00.

(Pause in proceedings.)

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS & PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION

3. CPZ2011-00012 NE 10th Ave

This proposal would amend the County Arterial Plan Map to designate NE 10th Avenue between NE 179th and 219th Streets as a Minor Arterial street (M-2cb)
Staff contact: Mike Mabrey 360-397-2280 ext 4343 or e-mail michael.mabrey@clark.wa.gov

DELEISSEGUES: We'll resume deliberation and discussion on the next item on the agenda which is CPZ2011-00012, NE 10th Avenue. So, Mike, you're back for another --

MABREY: Thanks.

DELEISSEGUES: -- staff report. Thank you.

MABREY: Who's spot here?

DELEISSEGUES: It's electrifying.

MABREY: Let's try this again. Is this me?

DELEISSEGUES: I think the whole thing went off here.

MABREY: Okay. For the record Mike Mabrey, Community Planning staff. This proposal comes about for one reason and that is that currently this section of NE 10th Avenue is shown on the arterial atlas as a State Highway, it's no longer a State Highway. Jurisdiction was transferred to the County following the opening of the I-5/219th interchange.

So the County needs to classify this road system on the arterial atlas as something. It is a major roadway, it's identified as part of the regional transportation system in the metropolitan transportation plan, it's something a lot more than a local street, it's part of the old Pacific Highway actually, and part of a continuous route, well, from downtown Vancouver to at least La Center.

This section of roadway currently passes through land use that is effectively rural but is now in the urban growth boundary at least between 179th and 209th. The area from 209th to 219th is classified as an industrial urban reserve overlay. So from our perspective it makes sense to give the whole section from 179th to 219th an urban road classification.

We're proposing a minor arterial classification M-2cb, that includes one travel lane in each direction, a center turn lane or median, bike lanes and sidewalks. The cross-section standard is 46 feet of pavement and an 80-foot right-of-way. That's the same cross-connection and classification as has been adopted and built on NE 15th south of 179th Street.

Traffic volumes in this section decreased somewhat after the interchange opened, but have gradually built up again. They're in the neighborhood of 11,000 daily trips and will increase as the area develops. The design volume for a minor arterial is up to 16,000 average daily trips.

We looked at whether one travel lane in each direction was going to be adequate. The projected volumes in the year 2030 the travel demand model during the p.m. peak hour are somewhat less than 600 in each direction which indicates that one travel lane in each direction should be adequate to serve traffic with future build-out of the area. The rule of thumb for one travel lane is about 800 vehicles in the peak hour.

Center turn lanes will be needed to safely accommodate left turns at street intersections and major driveways as the area develops. Bike lanes are appropriate for a minor arterial street, would likely be required in any event in order to receive State or Federal funding for any future improvement project.

The process by which roads get built to urban standards is either half street improvements as adjacent properties develop along their frontage or a County financed capital improvement project. County projects are programmed based on a priority ranking system and the available funds. Typically County projects are only done on arterial streets, although there are some exceptions such as 88th Street. There's no plans to widen this section of 10th Avenue in either the six-year program or the 20-year capital facility program, but then there wouldn't be because it hadn't been our facility until last year.

The effects on current property owners, future road and right-of-way width will affect to some extent what a developer might be willing to pay for the property. No right-of-way dedication would be required unless the property is developed or the County comes in and buys it at fair market value.

The current right-of-way width varies significantly in there, and I think I have a graphic that shows that if I can find my arrow, there we go, and you can see that it goes in and out quite a bit, but in the narrowest sections it's at least 60 feet, then some of these wider sections are already at 80 feet, there are some pieces that are at 70 and then at major intersections there's areas where there's even more right-of-way than beyond the 80 feet. So that's kind of the current status.

We found that the applicable criteria are met and the minor arterial designation seems appropriate given that we typically locate arterials about every mile and you'll see that this is the area we're talking about right now. 29th is an arterial, 50th is an arterial, NW 11th is an arterial, so it's about a one-mile grid typically in each direction. So that concludes the

staff report.

DELEISSEGUES: Any questions of Mike?

BARCA: Mike, will you clarify again what is the size of the road that we're designating here, please.

MABREY: The ultimate built width would be 46 feet of pavement.

BARCA: And 80 feet of right-of-way?

MABREY: 80 feet of right-of-way is typical. And what you see in the cross-section is that the outside 10 feet or so really doesn't get used for physical improvements. I think the reason that we require it -- I mean the cross-section for a collector is essentially the same but the right-of-way requirement is less.

What happens on a minor arterial is that you have higher speed traffic and typically telephone poles and other obstructions are put within the right-of-way. This allows them to be outside the traveled way a little bit further and creates a larger clear zone from those kinds of hazards.

BARCA: Can you clarify for me the current paved width of the State route?

MABREY: The existing route out there on the south end there's a merge lane, but for the majority of it it's about 35 feet roughly. There's a bit of a shoulder on each side.

BARCA: So we're roughly talking about an additional 5 feet of width on each side of the road for getting us to the 46 foot paved?

MABREY: Right, from curb-to-curb and then --

BARCA: From curb-to-curb.

MABREY: -- there would be sidewalks in addition.

BARCA: Sidewalks beyond that. Thank you.

DELEISSEGUES: I was just thinking that there probably wouldn't be any sidewalks or frontage improvements until it developed.

MABREY: Right, unless we built it as a major capital facility project.

DELEISSEGUES: And that wouldn't happen any time soon.

MABREY: No.

DELEISSEGUES: Any other questions of Mike?

ALLEN: Yes.

DELEISSEGUES: Go ahead.

ALLEN: The right-of-way, I think one of those schematics that showed the zigzag pattern on the east side of the road is that because of right-of-way or is that because of something else?

MABREY: The zigzag is the current right-of-way as was typically I guess purchased or acquired by the State over the years.

ALLEN: And are there opportunities to acquire some more right-of-way to straighten it out or --

MABREY: There may not be the necessity to for the cross-section that we have in mind, but I'm not sure that I understand the question. Certainly we could go out and buy it.

ALLEN: Because I'm looking at all of that in and out.

MABREY: All of that in and out, right.

ALLEN: Yes, all of that in and out along the road and of course we also have I believe there's a stormwater drainage along that side or --

MABREY: Yeah, there are. There are ditches along the majority of the built route I'm sure.

ALLEN: Yeah, lots of them there. So if you do go through and put this on the arterial atlas and then we would be able to secure some funding to maybe potentially improve the zigzag pattern and straighten it out a little bit or improve some of the drainage patterns or --

MABREY: Well, we would be able to build it out to the cross-section of that designation, right, and that would require additional right-of-way in some locations certainly.

DELEISSEGUES: Any other questions of Mike? Okay, thank you, Mike. We'll go to the sign-up sheet. I have Steve Yochim.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

YOCHIM: Again I'm Steve Yochim, 20716 NE 10th Avenue. I was at the neighborhood association meeting last week and my property is south of 209th. If you look there's one little block of land. Whoa.

MABREY: Yeah, this isn't the best way to do this. Let's go back to another map.

YOCHIM: Okay. Take the arrow off to the corner of 209th and 10th, over to the left on the west, on the east, west side, west side.

MABREY: On the west side, yeah.

YOCHIM: Down and just right there that little block.

MABREY: This one here?

YOCHIM: That's mine. And then plus the next piece is mine. And the question comes up about supposedly that right-of-way through there is what they call a military right-of-way. It was back in the First World War or Second World War when they put in that highway it was designated as a military highway and there are certain right-of-ways through there that were designated and my house sits approximately probably 45 feet from the existing right-of-way. Maybe not that far, I haven't measured it.

And my question is, I think you started answering it, the total width of this right-of-way is going to be 80 feet if it's put out to its potential, in other words with curbs and sidewalks and bike lanes, you forgot the bike lanes, there's two bike lanes there on the proposal.

MABREY: Yeah. No, I mentioned bike lanes.

YOCHIM: So with that geography that you're planning for that right-of-way is that planned within the existing right-of-way right now in front of my house?

MABREY: Well, I don't know the specifics in terms of your house so it's hard to say. There certainly appears to be even more than 80 feet of right-of-way through here, but where the center line would be established for a continuous street and you'd have to almost get to the design level to know for sure.

So this is 60 in here but as you can see there's a lot more on the east side than there is on the west side so whether another five feet or so would have to come off your side it's difficult to tell until somebody goes out there and surveys and builds (inaudible).

YOCHIM: So what are the legal setbacks that you can build from the right-of-way to somebody's front porch basically? Is that documented anywhere?

MABREY: Well, if you came in to build on an urban lot and I guess it would depend on the zoning and what you were building obviously. Each zone has its own setback requirements. I mean if we're buying right-of-way is your question can we buy right up to your front porch, no, I think we have to make sure that your house is still habitable.

YOCHIM: Okay. So that brings up the next issue about the zoning. We're right now trying to negotiate having our area rezoned.

MABREY: Right.

YOCHIM: And I really feel at this time if this is committed again like Ron was talking about earlier where the County's in habits of drawing lines and once the line is drawn, then it's harder than heck to go back and try to get the line undrawn again.

And a perfect example is the urban growth boundary. When we were taken in the urban growth boundary that line was drawn at one time at 199th and somebody decided they were going to draw the line up and take us in and it shouldn't have been done basically at that time.

Anyway, the point of it is is that once that is committed to this project, I feel that that jeopardizes the worth of my property because once that line's drawn and somebody comes and wants to buy my house, they're going to say, well, what am I buying with that shown on the map. So I have that in question.

And right there where that little jog is that goes towards 219th is just strictly a dropoff. It's a dropoff from the road there, it goes down.

MABREY: Right there?

YOCHIM: Pardon me?

MABREY: Right there?

YOCHIM: Now you lost me again here. Yeah, right there. See that little point right there is just a dropoff and that's where there's a creek that runs under there too. So I mean that's really not an issue but so I'm really concerned about that. I would be happier with some other kind of -- if there was another alternative we could do at this point from 199th north for instance beings how this is still in contention about the zoning.

I don't know if you can do that, if there's any other alternatives that you can do with the road atlas. And we never heard about that. We heard the maximum you can do, but what's the minimum you can do as a road atlas, as an arterial?

MABREY: Well, there's a variety of classifications. I guess the next thing lower than a minor arterial two-lane is a collector which has the same cross-section and five foot less, ten foot less right-of-way. But we're really concerned about the bigger picture, what is the function of this road in the big picture. And I understand your concern about how does this impact my specific property which we can't really address very effectively at this point in time.

YOCHIM: Well, that's what I mean.

MABREY: Yeah. But there's clearly 80 feet plus right-of-way there, whether all of the road

that eventually gets built will fit within that, most likely it will, I don't think we're going to want to build sidewalks in that drainage ditch. Or I mean in that dropoff that you mentioned.

DELEISSEGUES: Not likely.

MABREY: But we can't make design-level decisions and tell you here's what we guarantee is going to happen to your property 20 years from now if we ever find funding to build the road.

YOCHIM: But my question, then, is what's the reasoning to making this decision and you haven't really investigated that part of it? I mean just to go through and say we're going to do this and --

MABREY: Well, I think I've tried to block off what the options are. It's not a State Highway anymore, it's not a local street obviously, it could be designated as a five-lane highway and that would probably serve everyone well forever, but it would have pretty dramatic impacts on the adjoining properties and I don't think that the long-term traffic usage, it's marginally okay at three lanes which is what we're proposing.

YOCHIM: If it continues on with the zoning that you're talking about, what it's designated now as?

MABREY: Well, regardless of the zoning of the adjacent property this is a road that gets you to Battle Ground, this is a road that gets people from the north part of the county down into the hospital area. I mean it's not a minor road. It's formerly a State Highway, now it has a different purpose.

The question is what is the purpose and future of it and what we're suggesting here is that it is in an urban growth boundary area for most of its length and we're proposing pretty much the smallest cross-section for an arterial that could be proposed.

YOCHIM: Mike, your traffic study that you did shows an increase, where was that done at, at 179th or was it below 199th?

MABREY: No, I looked at the central portion. The travel demand model shows the demand for travel from link to link so I looked at some of the intersections. And I believe I looked at 199th to 209th, but I got outside of 179th area certainly because I wanted to see what's the demand over the entire length from 179th to 219th.

YOCHIM: Because I live there and I question that the traffic has -- it decreased substantially when the interchange went in, but now what's happened is people turn at 199th, they come up, come up I-5 and go to 199th. I experienced that tonight trying to turn left off of 29th on 199th and there must have been 20 cars going east on 199th.

So they come up 10th Avenue, 199th, they go to Battle Ground and they go down 199th

now so the traffic between 219th and 199th is a lot different than what below 199th is. So anyway --

MABREY: Yeah.

YOCHIM: -- that's all the questions I had. I think that we draw a lot of lines out there and then we decide what we're going to do with it later at this expense of the people that live along these lines. And so thank you.

DELEISSEGUES: Any questions of Steve before he goes?

BARCA: No.

DELEISSEGUES: Okay, thank you very much.

BARCA: I do have a question for Mike though. Mike, it sounds like it might be an opportunity for us to kind of explain what we believe the future vision for the area is and when you were looking at the modeling what we anticipated the development pattern between 209th and 179th being.

I think as you state the fact that there's a future vision for it and we believe that we need this size of a road for to facilitate that vision, it might be helpful to explain what you anticipate that being.

MABREY: Well, I think that that was sort of the point of contention that Mr. Yochim started out with is he disagrees with the current zoning. He doesn't want it to be business park or office campus or industrial.

BARCA: Granted that's in contention.

MABREY: Right. That's certainly what's in the model for 2030 because that's the current zoning.

BARCA: Right. And so that being said, if we accept the current zoning what does that bring to the road because I think that helps explain the standard that you have chosen.

MABREY: I don't think I would recommend a different standard whether the adjacent property was low density residential.

BARCA: So if it stayed rural residential you would --

MABREY: Well, rural residential we wouldn't be talking about a minor arterial most likely because it would be a rural road so we would be talking about a rural classification but it's not. Does that answer your question?

BARCA: No. No, it didn't. But basically as I'm hearing you say it, because it's in the

urban growth boundary regardless of the choices this is the choice that you would say is most appropriate?

MABREY: Yeah. It's not driven by the traffic generated by the adjoining land uses, it's driven by the fact that its connection from a minor arterial basically and between two principal arterials essentially from 179th to 219th and those are major east/west routes.

BARCA: So this is all pass-through traffic, this isn't employment traffic, this isn't traffic that you're anticipating utilizing the land between 209th and 179th, you're really talking about the impact of people passing through?

MABREY: Well, I think it's certainly a mix of both of those, but the function of the roadway is if you look at the bigger picture as it's an arterial, it's not a collector street, it's not collecting road traffic from adjoining land uses and bringing it out to an arterial, it's part of a route that goes a long way north and south through the county. Does that make more sense?

DELEISSEGUES: It does to me.

ALLEN: And as a State route it was basically established as such, major north/south collection route, but also you have the urban growth area boundaries out here to consider but industrial reserve overlay kind of at the north portion of this. Is this something that is driving this particular proposal now versus waiting for another couple of years until we know what's going on in this area?

MABREY: No. What drives this is the fact that it's currently shown as a State route which is inaccurate and if this got out of urban holding and people wanted to develop, we wouldn't know what to tell them to build to.

ALLEN: Right.

MABREY: And frankly we'll never get it on our capital facilities plan and our six-year program.

ALLEN: And of course --

MABREY: And if we don't even recognize that we own it and have a classification for it.

ALLEN: Right. And of course you would not be eligible for any funding that would come in for improvement of that road either.

MABREY: Right. So it's just to harmonize it with the existing situation.

DELEISSEGUES: I'd like to get back to the sign-up sheet and we can deliberate when we've heard all the testimony if that's okay with everyone.

ALLEN: Just had some questions.

DELEISSEGUES: Karen Levens.

LEVENS: I'm not speaking tonight. Thank you.

DELEISSEGUES: Thank you. Jim Bullin --

BULLINGER: Bullinger.

DELEISSEGUES: Okay.

BULLINGER: I pretty much got my questions answered earlier.

DELEISSEGUES: Thank you. I notice it says please print clearly and I maybe it's my eyes but, Ina Jeffers, Jefferies.

BARCA: Close enough.

JEFFERIES: I can't read either.

DELEISSEGUES: If I mispronounce your name, I'm sorry. I've been a victim of that all my life.

JEFFERIES: That's all right. Ina, Ina, whatever.

DELEISSEGUES: Okay, thank you.

JEFFERIES: My name is Ina Jefferies, I reside at 21403 NE 15th Avenue, I also own property at 21400 NE 15th Avenue. Five days a week irregardless I go from my home to 209th and down 10th Avenue to the freeway. Number one reason is it's a mile and a half shorter than if I go out on the new freeway.

DELEISSEGUES: That makes sense.

JEFFERIES: Gas prices. My questions and my concerns if they take 10th Avenue from 179th Street up to 219th Street and do it like they did on 15th Avenue from 179th Street south, it's going to be a real nightmare. There is a lot of homes, there are small businesses in that area, they're going to put an island down there and how are they going to get them over -- you're going north, oh, hey, I got to go over here to Shorty's Nursery or I got to go over here to this horseshoe place but he's on the other side so that means you got to go clear up and around. It's ridiculous, number one.

And number two is who's going to pay for this? Me as a taxpayer I got to pay for putting some pretty little island in the middle of a road that already has one lane going north, one lane going south, there's enough room on either side of those lanes for bicycles because

there was four of them when I was coming in here tonight going southbound on 10th Avenue with no problems. I've seen them going both ways, I've seen them at 11:30 at night when I'm on my way home from work riding up 10th Avenue. They had lights on their bicycles, okay, no problem.

But it's just if you do widen it the County or whomever is going to have to purchase the land or take it, whichever the case happens to be, and who's going to pay for that, you and I as taxpayers are going to have to pay for that when the road is perfectly all right. I can see no reason to it.

If they're going to develop for commercial, like there's several places down where you come off the freeway at 179th, there's two or three properties there that have big "for sale" signs on them zoned commercial somewhere, okay, fine. If they're going to have to have a commercial property there, then whomever buys that and has to improve that to get onto that property should be the one to do the road widening, the sidewalks, whatever's necessary, just like they did up at Ridgefield Junction. That new road going back through there is beautiful, but who paid for it, the companies that moved in there. You follow what I'm saying?

DELEISSEGUES: That's exactly what we want to have happen.

JEFFERIES: Yeah. But will it, I mean?

DELEISSEGUES: Sure. It won't happen if we don't classify the road to some standard that will require them to build it to.

JEFFERIES: Well, my next question, how do they classify a road as substandard?

DELEISSEGUES: It's not. The classification is based on function. The function of the road as Mike was pointing out was to get people from point A to point B and it doesn't have to be four lanes, two lanes, one lane or anything else to be an arterial. I mean usually the function of being an arterial means it will carry more traffic so eventually it will probably need more lanes.

JEFFERIES: Well, eventually but how many?

DELEISSEGUES: Certainly not in the immediate future.

JEFFERIES: That was my next question, how far ahead are we talking, 20 years, 10 years, 30 years? If it's 30 years I probably won't even be here but --

DELEISSEGUES: Me either.

JEFFERIES: -- you'll have to come visit me at Northwood Park. But this is the thing that concerns me is that if let's say we okay this, then five years down the road all of a sudden all this construction's going on on this road, that's going to really make a mess.

Are we going to be able to cause less problems that way, are we going to receive notification of the fact that, oh, from 179th to 199th it's going to be widened, okay, how much widened would that be if they did widen it?

MABREY: It would be about ten feet wider. You'd have a curb line on the sides of it. First of all, all of our dollars are committed for the next six years and this project isn't even on the list.

JEFFERIES: Oh, good.

MABREY: Don't worry about short term. I can't imagine how that would change. The additional paved width is we're at about 35 now, it's 46 is the ultimate and then you have sidewalks outside of that.

JEFFERIES: Sidewalks and, yeah.

MABREY: Yeah, there's a long process of design and right-of-way acquisition that would happen before any construction would happen so the adjoining property owners would be aware of this several years in advance.

JEFFERIES: As long as it's several years.

MABREY: And when it got to construction certainly there would be a lot of contact.

JEFFERIES: Okay. And I know I don't really ride on 10th Avenue but I use it. We've been out there since '65 so I've seen a lot of changes over the years out there and so far most of them have been for the good. Granted not all of them but most of them have been for the good.

And one other question I have, where do I go to get a list other than online because I do not have a computer of what these zone, you know, R-3, R-4, whatever, these that we get mean? Can you tell me that?

DELEISSEGUES: I'll let Mike tell you that.

JEFFERIES: If there are a list because I've had people ask me, I said I don't know.

MABREY: Sure. What is a C-3 or an R-5 and all of that?

JEFFERIES: Yeah.

MABREY: Well, all of that's available. There are handouts down at the permit center on the 1st floor when they're open or you can get my boss Oliver's card on the way out and he will be glad to contact you and find a way of sending you what you need to know.

JEFFERIES: Well, that was my questions and you've answered them very satisfactory. Thank you.

DELEISSEGUES: Probably could even mail a copy of it to you.

MABREY: Sure.

BARCA: Whoa, whoa, mail.

VARTANIAN: Just as a point of clarification, the road as it exists today will not change physically until development starts happening, the designation for it, however, needs to be put in place. Otherwise whenever development does start nobody's going to know how wide, where's the road supposed to be, how are we supposed to develop, what land do we have to dedicate to the roads.

My question is is there any way to tell right now or again an approximation in going from what we have today on the ground to the M-2cb classification that's built how much of that would get paid for by the developers going up that street? Half?

MABREY: It's very hard to tell. But again I think we're tending to move away from the half-street improvement model particularly on arterials because it's so hard to get the vertical and horizontal alignments to match up to what you end up building in the long run so you'd end up having to tear stuff out.

That's going to be one of those policy decisions that will come out of the road standards update that we're currently going through, but it's certainly been the subject of a lot of discussion recently.

So given the fact that a lot of these are fairly small parcels, I would say on the east side of just north of 179th you might see commercial development build half-street improvements, but on a parcel-by-parcel basis north of that it's hard to imagine a discontinuous half-street widening all through here.

VARTANIAN: Right. But I guess not too long ago there was going to be a Home Depot on the northeast corner of 179th and 10th and mixed use farther north along the road, most of that upgrade would have been paid for by the developer; is that correct?

MABREY: Right. For those larger projects certainly.

VARTANIAN: Well, the larger projects. So it's not all going to be borne by the taxpayers.

JEFFERIES: That was my question.

VARTANIAN: Yeah, but some will obviously, but it's not going to be for the whole thing to go in. Excusing what you may feel is appropriate for a road and what the long-term plan is for the road, but that's part of the Discovery Corridor if we're still using that term and

industrial areas and commercial areas that are supposed to go up there for jobs purposes. And I appreciate that there are people living there and using it today, I'm right there by that myself.

JEFFERIES: Well, yeah. And I know when they come off the freeway at 179th, there's the two left-turn lanes and then the center lane is straight through and then the right lane can go straight through and then --

VARTANIAN: Yeah. And by the way they're also going at 179th coming off of that as a speed --

JEFFERIES: Yeah. It's dangerous. I've seen close to some bad accidents there --

VARTANIAN: Oh, yes.

JEFFERIES: -- because they need to just change the arrows, make the right lane arrow right only, but not that they will do that. That was my question and I thank you for your time.

DELEISSEGUES: Thank you. Any questions before you leave? Okay, thank you. Go on. Robert Watkins.

WATKINS: Robert Watkins, 19003 NE 10th Avenue. And on the development of this road you're saying that it's going to be also driven by development. So they've already been talking about developing the first few parcels there north of 179th so if they do that does that mean you're only going to build that road in front of those few parcels or is that road going to continue on?

MABREY: Well, the road widening would be done by the developer as part of their project along their frontage.

WATKINS: So if you develop a few pieces and then you skip a piece and you develop another one, you're going to have a road that ends and then another shitty section and then another good section of road?

MABREY: It's possible that you'd have that for a while, but as I was saying we're tending to go away from that model because it doesn't work. Particularly when you have a lot of ups and downs, it's hard to tell somebody what they're supposed to build and have it match up to the road that you -- if you ever go through and finish it, it's hard to get it all to match up right.

The code would currently require a developer to do half-street improvements typically along their frontage as development occurred. Right now most of the area north of 179th is in urban holding so they can't develop anyway, but that corner is not. So I don't know if I'm walking all around your question or not.

WATKINS: Well, yeah, you are.

MABREY: But, yes, you can see right now 179th for instance there are areas that are widened and areas that aren't in front of some of the neighborhoods and so it's possible that you would see that along 10th Avenue. What I was saying was that we're beginning to find that that may not be the best way and we may have to find another way of doing projects that are more continuous.

So I would say in the short term if a big commercial development came in on the corner, they would build their road widening piece and put in sidewalks and in the future we'll see whether that policy changes.

WATKINS: And as far as access out of the properties onto the road if it is developed all the way out are you going to limit access off of everybody's property onto that road?

MABREY: I'm not but the code might actually. This is a major arterial and as properties redevelop it's possible that you'll see a median go down there. But it's also possible that you won't. If you go up 72nd Avenue we just built a five-lane road out there from Andresen north, right north of the railroad tracks, should have had a median down the middle based on the standard cross-section, but the Board decided not to do that because they felt that there was a need for a continuous center turn lane.

So it's possible to do it both ways. It all depends on the safety concerns and number of driveways and the amount of access that you want to allow your adjacent properties.

WATKINS: Well, because there is a lot of driveways coming onto 10th Avenue from all those properties and --

MABREY: Sure.

WATKINS: -- if you widen that road out and they develop one side and you widen that whole road out is everybody going to have access or what are you going to do for access, it's off of your property onto it then.

AUDIENCE: There's no other road to go either.

MABREY: Right. Well, you're imagining the scenario where the County goes out and throws \$40 million into widening this road with no development change on either side of it and that's just not going to happen.

WATKINS: Yeah, you could still have development change but you still have a residential area.

MABREY: Well, as that property redevelops it's not going to be large acreage with a house on it, it's going to be something else, some other more dense urban use whether it be business park or something else if the land use changes so you'll have local streets

which you don't have right now. You won't be a mile in between streets anymore.

WATKINS: Yeah, because you've got your other little colored lines on there for other roads.

MABREY: Right.

WATKINS: So then you're going to end up using those roads as access onto 10th and close everything else off.

MABREY: Well, you're going to have some kind of grid pattern of urban streets as this area redevelops. Whether you have full access onto 10th Avenue in the long distant future I couldn't guarantee you one way or another today.

WATKINS: Okay.

MABREY: And frankly the State wouldn't either. When it was a State Highway you can see what happened at 503. As the adjacent land uses develop and you get more traffic and you get more demand for access, they start putting medians down the middle because that's what keeps people from getting killed making left turns.

ALLEN: So you're saying, Mike, that if it remained as a State route and with all the development, the State would have to come in and do exactly what we were talking about improvement of the road, but because they have given us the responsibility or decided that they no longer need this particular road, it is up to us to make it safe but also we need to put it on the arterial atlas in order for us to classify it accordingly to what its function that we had basically inherited from the State?

MABREY: Right, we have to give it a functional classification. Both the State and the County have policies about limiting access to arterial streets and sometimes that includes doing access management and sometimes it includes installing medians, but certainly not always and not very often, frankly, if you look at our current arterials.

ALLEN: So whether it's incorrectly classified as a State route or whether it's classified as an arterial route they're still responsible for the safety, but the problem is that if it is classified as a State route, then we cannot get the grants and/or we cannot really do our due diligence here?

MABREY: Well, it's not a State route so we're left up in the air as to what it is at.

ALLEN: And comply with what it should actually be.

MABREY: Right.

VARTANIAN: Can we give it back?

MABREY: No. I hand carried the box of keys and right-of-way things and gave it to our right-of-way folks and so it's ours.

DELEISSEGUES: Well, let's let Robert continue with his testimony and we can get on the list here.

WATKINS: I think that's all I got.

DELEISSEGUES: Okay. Well, thank you. Julie, do you wish to testify?

WATKINS: No, he'll hear it all the way home.

DELEISSEGUES: Okay, thanks. David, and I can't pronounce the last name, can't read it.

GOHL: It's Gohl. No comment.

DELEISSEGUES: Okay, thank you. Ronald Fournier.

AUDIENCE: He had to leave.

DELEISSEGUES: George --

ESPINOSA: Espinosa.

VARTANIAN: That's me.

BARCA: Espinosa.

DELEISSEGUES: And then Brian Mahoney.

BARCA: Well, let George come up.

DELEISSEGUES: We will. I thought George said he didn't need to testify, but come on up, George. Sorry about that.

ESPINOSA: George Espinosa at 20801 NE 10th Avenue and I just got a quick question that I'm sure you must have considered it and there's probably a simple answer to it, but there's a grade problem out there.

If I leave my driveway to go southbound on 10th Avenue, I have about maybe two-tenths of a second at 40 miles an hour to clear that northbound traffic lane. If I go north on 10th Avenue, I've got maybe four-tenths of a second to get up to speed and out of the path of northbound traffic.

The same problem exists at the intersection of 209th. And you can go out there on any

given day when it's not raining and you'll see the skid marks on the pavement. I would just like to know how they intend to address that problem if you're going to widen the road, increase the speed and bring up the volume of traffic?

MABREY: Well, widening the road is part of the long-term discussion, increasing the speed isn't, and increasing volume of traffic isn't, but I understand your concern about sight distance. It's something that would be addressed if we were to do this as a capital project from beginning to end.

If the County took this on we would end up taking out some of those vertical humps and improving the sight distance along that. If it's done as a piecemeal development driven thing, then it's very difficult to get those things taken care of.

ESPINOSA: Well, it just appears to me because I try to visualize what it would take to do that and you're going to have to do a lot of fill or a lot of cut and you're going to make some of that property inaccessible one way or another and just to me it seems like a bad plan I guess is what I'm trying to say.

You heard a multiplicity of issues that concern us as residents and beyond just the disrupting our life-style there's real practical problems to this whole plan. And you've heard all the other concerns that are mine also, but this is because it really affects our property.

If you widen that road the speed is going to increase whether you allow it or not. Just taking traffic off the road has increased the speed.

MABREY: Right. Well, if you want a response I would say that our engineers deal with these kinds of cut and fill issues and removing sight distance problems every time they do a project and there are a lot more challenging locations than this --

ESPINOSA: I understand that.

MABREY: -- where they have to deal with it.

I understand your concern about direct impacts and the unknowns of the future and it's hard to imagine that road getting widened. What we're talking about at this point in time is what kind of road is it and what kind of road is it going to be in the future.

And so just saying we don't like this is not going to get us to a solution because we have to have something on the map. We have to call this road something because it's not a State Highway anymore.

ESPINOSA: You can't possibly arrive at a solution until you know what the problem is and you have no idea how you're going to develop that property out there, you don't have the foggiest idea. We haven't even agreed on what the ultimate zoning is going to be or the disposition is in or out of the urban holding.

And so to go forward with this, I don't know, it's like we've got something in mind and we're going to drive it regardless of what anybody says. I'm done. Thank you.

DELEISSEGUES: Any questions of George? Thank you, George. Brian Mahoney. Is there a Brian Mahoney in the audience? Anybody else wish to testify on this? Didn't you testify already?

YOCHIM: I got one other question.

DELEISSEGUES: Okay, come up. Make it brief.

YOCHIM: It's a legal question.

DELEISSEGUES: There you go, Chris.

BARCA: We're all out of it.

YOCHIM: No. So --

BARCA: Name, name, name.

YOCHIM: Oh, Steve Yochim, 20716 NE 10th Avenue.

DELEISSEGUES: Thank you.

YOCHIM: So at previous meetings with our designated zoning we were assured that we could add on to our homes without having any hassles because of the particular zoning that we have now, and the question I have is when this goes through and I go to decide that I add on to my house is that classified as "development" so would I have to pay for those road improvements?

BARCA: Okay.

MABREY: What's the trigger for development definition --

BARCA: Just bring her up.

MABREY: Yeah, maybe you can recall. It's a certain percentage of the value of your house I believe.

COOK: Good evening, Chris Cook, Deputy Prosecuting Attorney. Well, I don't know what that percentage is. I was thinking more that in order to justify frontage improvements that there would have to be more than an add-on to a house.

MABREY: Right.

COOK: There would generally be some form of development that I think would be adding trips or --

MABREY: Yeah. You'd be expanding, then, at nonconforming use which is --

COOK: Right. Which is --

MABREY: -- you'd have to go through a review process but it doesn't trigger site plan review.

COOK: No, it doesn't. And it doesn't trigger or probably would not trigger frontage improvements. But I think that once again you're asking for us to talk about design issues right now which is difficult because we don't know.

This stuff is a designation for the future and it's not something that we can look at some polygon up on the map and say, well, that means X in terms of how the road will affect your property. We just don't know at this point.

YOCHIM: So in other words would the County be willing to sign off on an agreement like that? I mean if I come into the County and --

COOK: No.

YOCHIM: -- and apply for a building permit next week or let's say I need a charity case and I need to move my mother-in-law onto my property and put a, you know --

VARTANIAN: Accessory dwelling unit.

YOCHIM: -- one of those little mobile homes on there so that's increasing the trips because if she still drives that's increasing the trips. I'm just saying if I do decide to add on --

COOK: If you decide that you wish to submit an application, I suggest that you talk to the folks in the Development Department and they will be able to give you a better notion of what the implications would be based on the particular development that you propose.

YOCHIM: I guess that kind of answered it. Thank you.

DELEISSEGUES: Anyone else wish to testify? Come forward, please. I'll have to add their name to the list.

SLAYDON: Hi. My name is Cheryl Slaydon and I live at 1719 NE 209th Street but my parents own 20419 NE 10th and I wanted to know, you were saying that from 179th to 219th is a thoroughfare or something to go through, but I thought that's why we put the interchange at 219th and I-5 to get the traffic off of 10th Avenue for those people going to

Battle Ground. Wasn't that the reason?

MABREY: Well, that was part of the reason. I would say that the reason the 219th interchange was built had a lot to do with getting trips to Battle Ground, but as Steve mentioned there's still a lot of traffic that goes up 10th Avenue and turns at 199th and heads over in that direction. I do it myself quite often because --

SLAYDON: Yes, there's a lot of --

MABREY: -- I don't want to go to Battle Ground.

SLAYDON: Yeah, there's a lot of traffic that goes up 179th and/or 10th Avenue and they turn and go east --

MABREY: At Shorty's.

SLAYDON: -- at 199th. There's a lot. There's a few that go up further. And I notice that during the winter there was more traffic going southbound on 10th Avenue and I was wondering if the reason the people were not taking the 219th interchange is because it gets icy and they didn't want to go around the loop with water and ice, but now that the weather is better I notice that there's not as much traffic going southbound on 10th.

Now I can't say that I have a problem with widening the road, I mean it's going to happen sooner or later, that's an issue hopefully in 20 years and not in 6 years, but that's going to happen and it may make 10th Avenue safer because there are some problems with 10th Avenue.

One is by 199th there's a property there and it always floods the property and the water when it really rains really hard that there's a few times, mostly like in the bad rains in 1995, that the road the water came up to 10th Avenue so that would probably be something you guys would work out, but it would probably make 10th safer.

But my biggest thing that I request is please do not put medians on it because I have a 35-foot horse trailer and I pull it by a 15-foot semi so that gives me 50 feet and if you put one way each way and then you put one of those medians, I'm not going to be able to turn up to my mom and dad's off 10th to get up there to get my horses, so that all I ask is please do not put a median.

MABREY: Right. And at the time if this thing goes to construction or design, you'd need to get involved in the discussion at that point in time because I know it was people with horse trailers that kind of drove the decision not to put a median in 72nd Avenue when they did that widening project.

SLAYDON: And that's all I have.

DELEISSEGUES: Well, thank you. Anybody else wish to testify? Okay.

STRONG: My name is Todd Strong. I live at 801 194th Street and I represent the Pleasant View Church of the Nazarene. And this goes back to the question of what defines "development" or "improvement" because right now we have engineering drawings with the PUD to bring a waterline under 10th Avenue.

We're a church there, we have to have a water suppression system. We've got tanks out there right now with 60,000 gallons of water that are rusting through and we are currently looking at bringing a waterline which is east of 10th Avenue under 10th Avenue and up to the church on 194th.

What kind of red tape are we going to run into if this recommendation is approved then? Will we then at this point which we're looking at trying to complete this project this summer will we then be asked to put sidewalks in?

MABREY: No. What you're doing isn't really development, it's adding utilities or improving utilities so it shouldn't make any difference.

STRONG: Very good. That answered my question. Thank you.

DELEISSEGUES: Okay, thank you.

BARCA: Yeah, but we do need bike lanes from you.

STRONG: Off street or off road?

DELEISSEGUES: Okay. Anybody else wish to testify? If not, we'll return it to the Planning Commission for deliberation. Go. Yeah, I don't know what these slides are, they're very interesting.

RETURN TO PLANNING COMMISSION

VARTANIAN: Is that part of the road construction up there?

MABREY: Oh, you don't want to look at puppy dogs, come on.

VARTANIAN: You're trying to get to my good side.

DELEISSEGUES: I thought maybe they lived on 10th Avenue or something.

MABREY: Just trying to lighten the mood here, come on.

DELEISSEGUES: Oh, good.

VARTANIAN: Yeah, please.

MABREY: It might look a little funny on CVTV, come on help me out.

DELEISSEGUES: Does somebody want to start the discussion on what they think we should recommend to the County Board of Commissioners?

VARTANIAN: I guess one of my questions, and I'm just going to address it for now, if we go ahead and recommend something and given that the residents are looking to get a zone change or to get pushed back out of urban holding or urban growth boundary, which I seriously doubt is going to happen, would that have any impact on the road by changing the designation of the road to going through a rural area as opposed to an urbanized area?

MABREY: Well, if the urban growth boundary were to get scaled back to where it was in 2007, then it might be difficult to say that this should have an M-2cb, although it really wouldn't make any difference. I mean we designated urban designations on the north tier here all the way out to 219th everywhere else to the east of here, 29th Street, 50th Avenue, 29th Avenue, 50th Avenue, 72nd so, no --

VARTANIAN: Well, I guess all I'm saying is --

MABREY: -- not really.

VARTANIAN: -- even if they do get out of the urban growth area the road is still going to meet what we're trying to say here?

MABREY: Yeah. We're looking at a long term what ultimate cross-section should this be when it gets built --

VARTANIAN: Right.

MABREY: -- and it's not as if we're able to go out and build these roads out in advance of the development.

DELEISSEGUES: The function of the road would be the same, it would just probably delay development of that road for a long time. I mean if it were out of the urban growth boundary, there would probably be less development and less likelihood that there would be any improvement on the road.

MABREY: Sure. That's true.

VARTANIAN: Up that way, yeah.

MABREY: That's true.

VARTANIAN: And the other thing, I guess, what the residents need to keep in mind,

especially the young lady who spoke last, the 219th interchange was there to take heat off the 179th Street interchange and to facilitate traffic in and out of Battle Ground.

But don't forget between 179th and 219th is a whole urbanized area that's scheduled for industrial or commercial or jobs or whatever you want to call it uses and if we want that to happen, and I know some don't, it needs to have roads to service that and whether you're in favor of that kind of development or not, that's why we have urban growth boundaries and that's why we have comp plan updates and whatever else and that's the time to get involved.

But so far right now that area is designated for lack of a better term "employment lands" and if we make that assumption and that's what we're going on, the road has to be there to accommodate it. And again whether we like it or not, unless we all stop having children these people have to go and work some place.

BARCA: Wow. Wow.

VARTANIAN: See, I don't have any children so I can say that.

BARCA: Wow. Are you done?

VARTANIAN: I'm probably fired actually.

BARCA: Okay. So I look at this we have the road, we need to change the designation, I mean that is ultimately why we've been put here. If we look at the functionality of the road and what we want it to be, to me it seems like to facilitate future consideration we really need to look at the way that the land use zoning is at this moment. It's business park, it's light industrial and it moves down into commercial.

It seems to me this particular arterial talking about moving people through it isn't really what we want to take place with it the way that we're zoning it. It seems like we really want it to be more of a collector function. Unless we're going to be completely re-engineering the road I think Mr. Espinosa's statements are very accurate about the safety of the road and it's a legitimate observation to say that the traffic now that it's lighter is faster.

And I travel in that zone occasionally and I do see at the intersection down at 199th that people are making very last minute decisions with their speed about the choices that they are to make there and the line of sight is poor all up and down the elevations of the road.

So to me it seems like knowing that we haven't fixed our problem of how to actually engineer and build from 179th all the way to 219th because of the funding that it takes to do that, it will probably develop piecemeal and in that regard it seems to be it's still in our best interest to try and create a safer environment and a slower environment.

I would recommend that we even slow it down more and that helps facilitate from the idea of the way that the zoning has been on the map and that would be my recommendation is

that rather than go to an arterial, we go to a collector.

AUDIENCE: Yes.

DELEISSEGUES: But, again, the classification of the road's got nothing to do --

BARCA: That's why we're here.

DELEISSEGUES: -- with the speed or anything else, it's just the function of the road.

BARCA: That's what I said.

DELEISSEGUES: Well, you're mixing them up though.

VARTANIAN: Mike, I know you said it before but now I've forgotten, what's the difference between an arterial and a collector? Because Ron's right. I mean if that roadway is going to be there to service the industrial and all the other stuff that we're looking to zone, I'm not sure, maybe an arterial isn't the most appropriate unless it's exactly the same as a collector. I know it's not.

MABREY: Well, the build cross-section is exactly the same as a collector, you won't see any difference in it. What's different is the driveway spacing, the access requirements, the horizontal and vertical curves so the amount of sight distance that you would allow less sight distance in a collector than on an arterial if you were going to go in and rebuild this road. It's less --

VARTANIAN: Would you allow less sight distance?

MABREY: Yeah, because collectors are somewhat lower traffic and somewhat lower speed. Collectors are usually posted at 35, arterials can be posted at 35 or 40, sometimes higher as they get into the rural areas.

VARTANIAN: But there would still be traffic safety requirements. In other words it may be 35 but if there's enough hills and whatever else have you, you may have to lower the speed limit so that it will accommodate the line of sight?

MABREY: It wouldn't make any difference, people will travel according to what they feel they can get away with frankly.

ALLEN: So why did you decide to look at the arterial versus the collector for this particular proposal?

MABREY: The volumes are high, it's part of a long continuous route, it doesn't just bring traffic out to arterials, it's part of what I would consider an arterial route. Because if you go south there's going to be that 15th Avenue connection and then that ties into 20th and that goes into Highway 99 and that goes to Main Street and that goes to downtown Vancouver,

and if you go north it keeps on going.

So it's not a short discontinuous piece that brings your traffic out to a longer more continuous road system, it's part of a long route.

ALLEN: It's a State route.

MABREY: Well, yeah, a former State route. And the volumes are up there in the 11, 12,000 range and probably going to be closer to 16, 15, 16 in the future.

VARTANIAN: I guess that's one of my concerns, why are we looking at that as one continuous route when it's right next to I-5?

MABREY: It's still a continuous route and people --

VARTANIAN: Well, I know that. But I mean if there was no I-5 there, I could see a better rationalization for calling it an arterial and changing the design requirements, but since I-5 is right next to it, it just seems we've got two main thoroughfares there going parallel.

MABREY: Yeah, but they have very different purposes. You shouldn't be going on I-5 to go from Kozy Kamp to Battle Ground, you would take the backstreet most likely. But if you're going from Sacramento to Seattle, you're likely to be on I-5 and you're not going to take a detour over on 10th Avenue unless you're a truck that's trying to avoid the scales.

VARTANIAN: Well, yeah, and that happens.

MABREY: Yes, it is.

VARTANIAN: But I guess the question that I have is since it's supposed to be servicing businesses along 10th, people are going to be getting on and off I-5 to get to those businesses. They're not going to come down from Seattle along whatever roads are available to come down onto 10th, they're going to come down I-5.

MABREY: What's different about this is even with no businesses out there, you've got 11,000 trips on it today.

VARTANIAN: Yes.

MABREY: And they're not going to local destinations adjacent to the roadway so obviously it's a popular route to somewhere from somewhere --

DELEISSEGUES: Obviously.

MABREY: -- and it's going to become --

VARTANIAN: More popular.

MABREY: -- even more heavily traveled when you have adjacent land uses that generate traffic.

VARTANIAN: Yeah, but I'm thinking with trucks coming up and down 10th to go into the light industrial areas and people probably not want to go that way anyway. I don't know that, I'm just --

ALLEN: You're speculating.

VARTANIAN: -- thinking out loud.

MABREY: Right. I guess the other consideration is it's on the one mile grid where we typically classify things as arterial and it will be capable of handling a fairly large amount of traffic, so that's the thought that went into it from my end.

DELEISSEGUES: Valerie.

USKOSKI: Well, from what I've seen I think the arterial classification's correct.

VARTANIAN: Thank you for that astute observation. Yeah. Yeah.

DELEISSEGUES: Anything else?

USKOSKI: Nope.

DELEISSEGUES: Ron, anything else?

BARCA: No, I've already said my piece.

DELEISSEGUES: Milada, do you have anything else?

ALLEN: I've already mentioned most of my observations on this. And although I had some doubts at the beginning, I think that even with the testimony added to my decision that the arterial probably would be the best way to go.

DELEISSEGUES: George, closing argument? Well, I'd just reiterate, I guess, that function of roads is that locals feed into collectors and collectors feed into arterials and this is definitely an arterial from a functional standpoint.

Now whether you want to change the standards, now it's a different story. The road is serving as an arterial. If you want to change the width of the road or the capacity of the road or the speed of the road or sight distance or vertical elevations, dips, drainage, any of those things, that's different.

But usually if it functions as an arterial, then it should be built to the higher standard for

that very reason and it's going to take all the traffic from the locals that go into the collectors and all the traffic from the collectors that will eventually feed into the arterial, so that's usually why they build it to the standard that you're talking about.

Now I think it's very appropriate what you've done and I support it for those reasons. I should say what you're recommending and I support your recommendation. So does somebody want to --

ALLEN: A motion.

DELEISSEGUES: -- proceed with a motion?

ALLEN: I make a **MOTION** that we recommend approval of 10th Avenue between 179th and 219th Streets to change the designation from a State route to a minor arterial M-2cb to the Board of Commissioners.

DELEISSEGUES: Is there a second?

VARTANIAN: **Second.**

DELEISSEGUES: Moved and seconded. Any discussion on the motion? Roll call, please.

ROLL CALL VOTE

VARTANIAN: AYE

ALLEN: AYE

BARCA: I believe this is a disservice to the zoning vision we put forward and I'm going to vote NO.

USKOSKI: AYE

DELEISSEGUES: AYE

DELEISSEGUES: Thank you, Mike, you weathered the storm in good shape. I appreciate your staff recommendations and the answers you've given us.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS & PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION, continued

4. CPZ2011-00013 Bike and Ped Plan Implementation

This proposal would amend the County Comprehensive Plan to Add implementing language to the transportation element of the County Comprehensive Plan. The language would refer to the newly adopted County Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan and establish it as the guiding document with regards to bicycle and pedestrian issues.

Staff contact: Laurie Lebowsky 360-397-2280 ext 4544 or e-mail

Laurie.Lebowsky@clark.wa.gov

DELEISSEGUES: And Laurie's up, and the last on the agenda for tonight is CPZ2011-00013, bike and pedestrian plan implementation. And thank you all for being here, appreciate your input.

LEBOWSKY: Good evening, Commissioners. For the record Laurie Lebowsky, Community Planning. As Commissioner Deleissegues mentioned this is CPZ2011-00013, bicycle and pedestrian plan implementation.

The proposal before you is to amend the transportation element in Chapter 5 of the comprehensive plan to reflect the bicycle and pedestrian plan that was adopted by the Board of County Commissioners in November of 2010. The language that we are proposing is in Attachment A of your staff report. Also the staff report reflects that this proposal meets all the applicable criteria.

Finally I wanted to add that we did receive one SEPA comment regarding this proposal and you have copies of it. It's the e-mail from Heidi Scarpelli. She's the acting fire marshal for the Vancouver Fire District. In her e-mail she -- what's that?

DELEISSEGUES: Go ahead.

LEBOWSKY: Oh. Basically she's saying implementation of the bicycle and pedestrian plan will improve safety for bicyclists and pedestrians resulting in fewer calls for fire department services. And that's the only comment I received. And that concludes my staff report. Are there any questions?

DELEISSEGUES: Questions?

BARCA: No.

DELEISSEGUES: You had a group working on this, didn't you?

LEBOWSKY: Correct.

DELEISSEGUES: I don't know, an advisory committee or whatever?

LEBOWSKY: Correct. Yes. There was an ad hoc advisory committee part of the plan and they are disbanded; however, with the implementation of this plan the Commissioners wanted the existing bicycle advisory committee changed to a bicycle and pedestrian advisory committee and that has occurred.

DELEISSEGUES: If there are no questions, there's nobody in the audience left and I don't have anybody on the sign-up sheet.

VARTANIAN: I make a **MOTION** that we accept staff recommendation for the bicycle pedestrian plan.

ALLEN: **Second.**

DELEISSEGUES: Moved and seconded. Any discussion on the motion?

BARCA: Do you know what their recommendation was?

VARTANIAN: I do. To have one. Yes, I do.

BARCA: Amendment to the comp plan?

VARTANIAN: Yeah.

BARCA: Good.

DELEISSEGUES: Roll call, please. It's getting late.

ROLL CALL VOTE

ALLEN: AYE

BARCA: AYE

USKOSKI: AYE

VARTANIAN: AYE

DELEISSEGUES: AYE

DELEISSEGUES: So that concludes the agenda for tonight and we'll move to old business if anybody has any old business?

OLD BUSINESS

None.

NEW BUSINESS

A. Election of Chair & Vice Chair

DELEISSEGUES: New business, we'll have the election and we'll turn it over to Sonja to conduct it. You get to conduct the election.

BARCA: Really.

DELEISSEGUES: She usually has little pieces of paper.

WISER: We don't have Steve and Jeff present.

BARCA: It's not on the agenda.

WISER: Do you want to wait until they come to a meeting or would you prefer that I polled Steve over the telephone?

VARTANIAN: Do they have to be --

BARCA: Can we elect them both?

ALLEN: In absentia.

VARTANIAN: Well, we have a quorum, can we have the election without them?

WISER: We have a quorum of five, it's up to you.

ORJIAKO: Yeah, it's up to you.

DELEISSEGUES: What's your pleasure?

VARTANIAN: My pleasure is that we just continue with the current officers.

DELEISSEGUES: No. Do you want to elect them now or do you want to wait for --

BARCA: We're going to postpone the election or have the election.

VARTANIAN: Well, I'd just as soon have the election.

DELEISSEGUES: We could call Steve Morasch.

ALLEN: But then we have to disclose some other things on the phone that you wouldn't have to disclose here.

VARTANIAN: If you want to wait, then we can wait.

WISER: Do you want to wait or does somebody want to make a nomination?

DELEISSEGUES: Do you want to go ahead now or wait, that is the question.

BARCA: I would prefer to have Steve present since he's been involved in the last two elections. That would be my preference, but what does the rest of the group say?

VARTANIAN: Okay, that's fine.

ALLEN: I agree with Commissioner Barca.

VARTANIAN: Yeah, we can wait.

WISER: We'll wait until the next hearing. The next hearing is in June.

DELEISSEGUES: Hopefully Steve will be here.

VARTANIAN: And it would be nice if we saw Jeff too.

COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION

BARCA: So for clarification our meeting with the City on Tuesday they start at 4:30 but we don't have to be there until?

WISER: 5:30 I believe.

BARCA: 5:30. And they're having their meal at quarter after 5:00 or something?

WISER: 4:30.

VARTANIAN: No, it will be about when we get there I think.

DELEISSEGUES: I think they're going to have their meal at 5:00 but I'm not sure about that.

BARCA: You can just e-mail me just to clarify.

WISER: I believe dinner's at 4:30 and then the work session begins at 5:30 and you can get there between 4:30 and 5:00.

BARCA: Yeah. Well, I saw on their agenda I believe they have some City business that I don't care to attend.

WISER: We'll e-mail you.

BARCA: Thank you.

DELEISSEGUES: Oliver, did you have something to tell us?

ORJIAKO: No, Commissioners.

VARTANIAN: Do you want to talk about the baseball field or anything?

DELEISSEGUES: Is there any other new business? Well, seeing none, we're adjourned.

ADJOURMENT

The hearing adjourned at 10:00 p.m.

All proceedings of tonite's hearing can be viewed on the Clark County Web Page at:

[http:// www.clark.wa.gov/longrangeplan/commission/06-meetings.html](http://www.clark.wa.gov/longrangeplan/commission/06-meetings.html)

Proceedings can be also be viewed on CVTV on the following web page link:

<http://www.cityofvancouver.us/cvtv/>

Chair

Date

Minutes Transcribed by:

Cindy Holley, Court Reporter

Sonja Wisner, Administrative Assistant