

**CLARK COUNTY
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
Thursday, July 17, 2014**

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

6:30 p.m.

I. CALL TO ORDER 6:30 P.M.

USKOSKI: Okay. This is the Planning Commission for Thursday, July 17th. We'll call to order and have roll call.

II. ROLL CALL & INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MORASCH: ABSENT

USKOSKI: HERE

BARCA: HERE

QUIRING: HERE

BLOM: ABSENT

JOHNSON: HERE

III. GENERAL & NEW BUSINESS

A. APPROVAL OF AGENDA FOR JULY 17, 2014

USKOSKI: Okay. Moving on to new and general business. We have first the approval of the agenda for tonight.

JOHNSON: I move we approve the agenda for July 17, 2014.

BARCA: Second.

USKOSKI: All in favor.

EVERYBODY: AYE

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR JUNE 19, 2014

USKOSKI: Next up the approval for the minutes of July (sic) 19th, 2014.

QUIRING: I move the approval of the minutes of July 19th, 2014. Whoops. June 19.

BARCA: Second.

USKOSKI: All in favor.

EVERYBODY: AYE

C. COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

USKOSKI: Do we have any communications from the public? All right. So moving on to the agenda items tonight.

IV. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS & PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION

A. SHORELINE MASTER PROGRAM LIMITED AMENDMENT

We have up first - I believe the shorelines won't be here tonight, so - CPZ2014-00009 for the concurrency code and capital facility plan update. So if we have staff presentation.

LEBOWSKY: Yes. Laurie Lebowsky with Community Planning, and with me tonight is Steve Schulte from Public Works.

MCCALL: Excuse me. We need a motion to hold that over to August 7th.

USKOSKI: Oh.

LEBOWSKY: The shorelines.

MOTION TO HOLD OVER SHORELINE MASTER PROGRAM TO AUGUST 7

JOHNSON: I motion we hold the Shoreline Master Program Limited Amendment over to --

MCCALL: August 7th.

JOHNSON: -- August 17th --

MCCALL: 7th.

JOHNSON: -- 7th, excuse me, check that, 7th.

COOK: At 6:30.

JOHNSON: At 6:30.

QUIRING: Second it.

USKOSKI: Do we need to do a roll call on that, Marilee? Okay.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

USKOSKI: AYE

QUIRING: AYE

BARCA: AYE

JOHNSON: AYE

MCCALL: Thank you.

B. CPZ2014-00009: CONCURRENCY CODE & CAPITAL FACILITIES PLAN UPDATES

USKOSKI: Okay. Now moving on to concurrency.

LEBOWSKY: Okay. Commissioners, Steve and I are here to present the proposed changes to the concurrency ordinance and the capital facilities plan. If you recall, we had a work session with you all on June 5th. The presentation I'm doing tonight is pretty similar to that at that work session, so I'll be going through that. I want to keep it fairly brief, the staff presentation, since it's similar to what you've seen before. Feel free to stop if you have any questions -- to stop me if you have any questions.

The guiding principles for our concurrency update, as previously mentioned, the Board had put this on the work program for both Community Planning and Public Works, and that the concurrency ordinance and capital facilities plan update be based on the principles seen here.

And here are -- whoops. These are the key elements of the concurrency program update, including the assumptions for the growth rate which as you know are the OFM medium projection which is what the Board of County Commissioners adopted. The previous capital facilities plan and comp plan, the growth rate was double the assumed growth rate for our comp plan update. And we also with this concurrency update are going to retain some measures to ensure that intersections and roadways are protected.

This is our example that we used for showing the difference in terms of how we're changing the system. The new system is based on roadway capacity. And this example is illustrating how that would work with the development occurring and with roadway capacities, and the example here we're using is Highway 99 at 78th Street.

As you saw in the guiding principles, the Commissioners wanted a new standard that was simpler and more predictable for both developer -- for the developers, applicants and for staff.

And here are other elements of the concurrency program update. We are allowing flexibility in the future for a possibility of measuring a two-hour peak traffic measurement. We are working with a new status system to look at to monitor our roadways. If they get close to capacity, that we know ahead of time and that there's a flag and that we need to, if there's an issue, that we monitor it. Once a roadway or an intersection are fully built out, then the concurrency test no longer applies. And we are moving more towards automation of traffic counting and monitoring intersections.

I just want to add that in your hearing binder, we made some minor changes to the Title 40 code

language. I want to point them out real quick. If you look -- I'm looking at, this is for Page 2, highlighted in yellow, Lines 12, 13, 15 and 22, this was per your recommendation from the work session June 5th. And then additionally on Page 6, Page 6, Lines 12, 16, 23 and 24, and they are highlighted in yellow, and again that was per your recommendation, we made those minor changes.

USKOSKI: So can you remind me why we changed from peak hour to peak period. I don't recall.

LEBOWSKY: We were talking about how now when we measure for capacity it's an hour, peak hour, and we wanted to have the flexibility to in the future go to a two-hour measurement, and we went to peak period because then that could accommodate in the future should we want to change to a two-hour measurement for capacity.

USKOSKI: So at that point it would become a policy change on how the period is defined?

LEBOWSKY: If you look in the -- let's see. What page is that? They talk about -- Page 6 we talk about the Administrative Manual, that's the manual that we use for measuring for concurrency. In the previous version of this code language it wasn't really spelled out, but it's in that Administrative Manual where we would change if we wanted to go to a two-hour peak period instead of just the peak hour.

In terms of right now for measuring for capacity, we really are a peak, peaky one hour, our roadways, how they function. In the future when there's more traffic, we wanted to have that flexibility built in should we want to go to that standard. Steve.

SCHULTE: We only have one mic working tonight, so I'm going to do the best I can with this. The standard would be easy to change, we can do that with a word. We can go into the Administrative Manual and change that one hour to two hour very easily. The challenge in making this happen at some point in the future is all our trip reservations. This whole databank of trip reservations for every single development out there that has trips reserved, we have to change those 60 minute peak hour measurements to 120 minute peak hour measurements. So all of those individual developments we're going to have to go through and change those, and that would be a large undertaking. So at least for the near future we're on the peak hour basis.

LEBOWSKY: Are there any other questions about that issue?

USKOSKI: You can continue.

LEBOWSKY: Okay. I'm going to shift gears to the capital facilities plan, it's a complimentary element to concurrency. GMA requires that both the capital facilities plan and the concurrency standards be internally consistent. It's the projected guiding principles for CFP.

We worked with the funding group in Public Works to identify potential, what did they see were the potential funding sources. And as much as you can predict or not with the state legislature and the federal government, what was our revenue sources, what were the amounts in 2014 dollars over the next 20 years, we identified between 510 million to approximately \$540 million.

Before I go further, I should point out that in your binder you have a spreadsheet that's titled Capital Facilities Plan, and that's -- when I'm talking about capital facilities plan, I'm referring to that spreadsheet and that includes the projects.

COOK: Tab 9.

LEBOWSKY: Tab 9. Thank you, Chris. One of the principles also with the CFP is that it be fiscally constrained, that those revenue sources we identified can cover the costs.

I'm going to quickly go through the different categories. If you see the spreadsheet, Tab 9, there are four different categories. The Number I is the six-year transportation improvement projects. In terms of movable pieces, those aren't movable, those are funded projects.

Second are what we call the concurrency driven projects. When we looked at this new standard for a capacity based system, and we looked at our road system, projected out 20 years, what showed up in red and what was at that 90 percent capacity and above that was predicted over the next 20 years, and these are the projects that jumped off the map for us, and that's in Category Number II on the spreadsheet.

Number III are the new projects regional. We titled this regional partnership and urban holding projects. Projects with WSDOT, projects that we had to include on the CFP because of other land use actions for example where we lifted urban holding.

And then finally we have the transportation improvement program, the ongoing programs. And those include programs such as bridge repair, road preservation, rural road improvement, the sidewalks program, transportation and safety improvements.

We included with this update, with this new CFP, we included a new pot of money for urban development road program. We wanted with this new standard -- let me back up a minute. The new standard looks at links and it's less focused on intersections. We wanted to have flexibility in the CFP. If we identify an area of concern that's an intersection in the urban area, we wanted to have a pot of money for where that could be used to address any potential issues. And then traffic, finally traffic signal optimization.

Any questions on the handout on the spreadsheet?

USKOSKI: I actually do have one about under Section III, 179th Street and the I-5 interchange. So you guys are adding that to the six-year plan from 15th to Delfel, am I understanding you correctly?

LEBOWSKY: The 179th Street/I-5 Interchange, that's under regional partnership projects.

USKOSKI: So you'd have to get WSDOT on board before you could go forward with that, that you wouldn't go and improve that section without knowing what WSDOT's plans were to improve the intersection at --

LEBOWSKY: That is correct. That is correct. Steve.

SCHULTE: I just might add, the 15 million is for the non-state portion of that work. It's for the west side work where North Delfel comes into 179th, and it's for Union Road out to 15th Avenue, so it's the County portions of the work. The intersection proper on State right-of-way is assumed to be State funded and not shown on the chart.

USKOSKI: Correct.

LEBOWSKY: Are there any other, any questions?

BARCA: So are the projects that are listed, are they in some form of priority?

LEBOWSKY: No.

BARCA: No.

LEBOWSKY: No. Typically with -- and Steve could answer if you want to jump in here. Typically within each of these categories that's where you prioritize projects.

BARCA: So within the categories themselves they're prioritized?

LEBOWSKY: Correct. So if you looked on that spreadsheet, you have the Category I and the Category II, within Category I you have the projects prioritized, and that that would be a different process. The capital facilities plan, it's a big picture, long range look. Our funding group within Public Works, their job is to prioritize projects, to identify potential grant funding, and that can influence the priority of projects, you also have a policy direction given by the Board.

BARCA: So I guess that being said and coming back to the specific project that was just talked about, 179th at the I-5, that's on the top of the list, does that mean it is our highest priority within that Category III?

SCHULTE: No, it doesn't. There's no priorities on these sheets at all. So the top one on Roman Numeral III is the same priority as the bottom one. What happens in reality as time goes on and the needs become better defined and grant monies become, availability becomes better known, we could pick anywhere off the list. The Roman Numeral I projects, those are committed, they're largely funded, they're running on timelines, those are our near-term projects.

BARCA: Right.

SCHULTE: The Roman Numeral IV, those are the annual amounts we allocate for those ongoing programs, those happen every year. Within each of those categories under Roman Numeral IV there are priority lists behind each of those line items. So we have our priorities on bridge repair or we have our priorities already on sidewalks behind each of those line items. But for Roman Numeral II and III there's no priority there at all, time will tell which needs to go first, again based on grant funding, traffic growth in areas and things like that and safety issues.

BARCA: So, Steve, you said on Roman Numeral IV these were annual amounts?

MCCALL: Steve, we're not picking you up. I've got this other mic on. So we're not picking you up on this one.

LEBOWSKY: So for -- they're not annual -- I think what Steve means - just to clarify - is that for the ongoing programs this is over the total that you see, the total costs, that is over the 20 years.

BARCA: The 20-year horizon.

LEBOWSKY: The 20-year horizon. You would have to divide by 20 to get the annual amounts.

BARCA: So \$600,000 for sidewalks divided by 20 years.

SCHULTE: No.

LEBOWSKY: Times 20, sorry.

QUIRING: No.

SCHULTE: No. So the 600,000 in the estimated annual, that's the annual amount we'd like to fund for sidewalks and ADA, and over 20 years that is 12 million.

LEBOWSKY: Right. The total cost on the right-hand side, that's over the 20.

QUIRING: Right hand.

BARCA: I see.

SCHULTE: And then again, under each of those seven we have a prioritized list within each category, within each of those items which we're pursuing.

BARCA: Okay, thanks.

LEBOWSKY: Are there any other questions? Okay. So I mapped the CFP. What you see there is you have red and you have blue. Let's see. The red is the -- shoot. The blue is what's been completed. So you see the Salmon Creek interchange for example, those are completed projects in the CFP. The red are projects that are yet to be completed, and then the dots are the intersection projects.

And then on this slide. Again, you have the blue, the completed projects. You have the red, the future projects. And then there's a brown or a tan, those are the projects that were removed from the CFP to create the spreadsheet that's in your binder.

These are our next steps in this project. We have a hearing with the Board on August 19th. The adopted -- the CFP, should it be adopted, will be -- actually it will be adopted as part of the County supplemental update this year. And I'm going to move on to staff, the recommendation. Staff recommendation is that you approve the proposed Title 40 code changes as shown in your binder today along with the capital facilities plan. And I now conclude my presentation for any more questions that you have.

USKOSKI: Karl, do you have any questions or comments?

JOHNSON: No. I'm good.

USKOSKI: I would ask for a sign-up sheet, but do we have anybody in the public that wishes to testify? I see three of you out there. I'm counting you tonight. Okay. Seeing as how we don't have anyone, we'll go ahead and close the public comment period and turn it back to the Planning Commission for any thoughts, comments, discussion, questions.

BARCA: No questions.

QUIRING: No questions. They did an excellent job in the work session and answered a lot of questions then and have changed things in here, so...

USKOSKI: Karl.

JOHNSON: No. The same thing.

USKOSKI: Ron.

JOHNSON: Great job.

MOTION AND ROLL CALL

BARCA: I'm ready to make a motion.

USKOSKI: Okay.

BARCA: Okay. So I would like to make a motion that we approve the proposed Title 40 changes for capital facilities and also approve the capital facilities plan in one vote. Did I miss something in wording?

QUIRING: So was that something with the concurrency ordinance? That needs to be included.

BARCA: Oh, the Title 40 code changes of the concurrency ordinance.

QUIRING: I'll second it.

ROLL CALL VOTE

USKOSKI: Any discussion? Roll call.

JOHNSON: AYE

QUIRING: AYE

BARCA: AYE

USKOSKI: AYE

MCCALL: Passes unanimously.

V. OLD BUSINESS

USKOSKI: Okay. Moving on. Any old business? Any new business? Any comments?

VI. NEW BUSINESS

MCCALL: New business would be a reminder again that August 7th we're having the hearing at 6:30 for shorelines.

USKOSKI: Yes. So August 7th, 6:30 p.m., Shorelines Master Program Limited Amendment, August 7th, 6:30.

MCCALL: Yes. And then the second thing would be that the Board of Commissioners will be proceeding with the interview process for the empty seat on the Planning Commission on July 29th.

VII. COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION

VII. ADJOURNMENT

USKOSKI: Okay. Sounds good. Adjourned.

The record of tonight's hearing, as well as the supporting documents and presentations can be viewed on the Clark County Web Page at: <http://www.clark.wa.gov/planning/PCmeetings.html>.

Proceedings can be viewed on CTVTV on the following web page link:

<http://old.cityofvancouver.us/cvtv/cvtvindex.ask?section=25437&catID=13>.

*Minutes Transcribed by: Cindy Holley, Court Reporter/Rider & Associates, Inc.
Marilee McCall, Administrative Assistant/Clark County Community Planning*