

**CLARK COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF PUBLIC HEARING
THURSDAY, OCTOBER 15, 2015**

Public Service Center
BOCC Training Room
1300 Franklin Street, 6th Floor
Vancouver, Washington

6:30 p.m.

CALL TO ORDER & ROLL CALL

MORASCH: Okay. Good evening. And welcome to the October 15, 2015, Planning Commission hearing. I will call the meeting to order. The first item on the agenda is approval of the agenda. Does anyone have any changes they wish to suggest for the agenda on the Commission? All right. Hearing none. We'll move on with the agenda as written.

Approval of Minutes for August 20, 2015

The next item on the agenda is approval of the minutes of August 20, 2015. Can I get a motion to approve the minutes.

JOHNSON: I move we approve the minutes.

QUIRING: Second.

MORASCH: It's been moved and seconded. All in favor?

EVERYBODY: AYE

MORASCH: Opposed? Motion carries. Communications from the public. Is there anyone in the public that wishes to testify on a matter not on our printed agenda? Seeing no one, we'll move on to the first printed agenda item which is the Clark County Stormwater Manual and Code Update. Oh, sorry. Before we do that, Karl just reminded me I forgot the roll call. Sonja, can you give us a roll call.

ROLL CALL

BARCA: HERE
BLOM: HERE
JOHNSON: HERE
MORASCH: HERE
QUIRING: HERE
WRIGHT: HERE
BENDER: HERE

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS & PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION:

A. CLARK COUNTY STORMWATER MANUAL AND CODE UPDATE

The Planning Commission will consider the proposed update to the *Clark County Stormwater Manual* (CCSWM) and related codes for stormwater management. Clark County's Phase I Municipal Stormwater Permit, issued under the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System of the Federal Clean Water Act, requires the county to update its manual and related code to be equivalent to the state's *2014 Stormwater Management Manual for Western Washington*. The proposal would repeal Chapter 40.385 Clark County Code (CCC) and replace it with a new Chapter 40.386 CCC. Chapter 40.386 would adopt by reference the new CCSWM. The other stormwater regulation changes would update the Water Quality Code, Chapter 13.26A CCC, to harmonize with the new stormwater manual, and would also remove outdated language. Other proposed code updates to Title 40 would include references to the new manual and remove barriers to fully utilizing Low Impact Development (LID) techniques where feasible. The state Department of Ecology requires that Clark County's updates and revisions become effective by January 8, 2015.

For further information, please contact: Rod Swanson, Clean Water Division
National Pollutant Discharge Permit Manager: (360) 397-2121, Ext. 4561

Email: rod.swanson@clark.wa.gov.

MORASCH: Okay. Now moving on to the first printed item on the agenda, the Clark County Stormwater Manual and Code Update. Can we get a staff report, please.

BENTON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission. We presented to the Commission two weeks ago and we're here tonight for a decision and recommendation on the stormwater management manual. Every five years we're required by State law to update our stormwater permit. We receive a national pollution discharge elimination system permit every five years.

Our new permit is the '13-'18 cycle. Our staff has been working on this for nearly three years to have it ready to go, and we're required by law to have it adopted by the Board of Commissioners and any of the stormwater, any of the code changes to bring us into compliance with the new permit by the -- I believe it's the 6th of January and we're scheduled to go before the Board here in November for that final approval.

The last time I was here, we presented a very brief PowerPoint and I thought we might take you through that just quickly again, especially for those that maybe weren't here so you have a flavor of the overall project and where we're at, and then we'd like to be available, myself and my staff, to answer any specific questions that the members of the

Commission may have.

HOLLEY: I need to know who you are.

BENTON: I'm sorry. I'm Don Benton. I'm the Director of the Department of Environmental Services and that department is charged with implementing and complying with the code, so...

MORASCH: All right.

BENTON: I don't have a clicker, so I think I just have to ask you guys to click on so you can see it. I'll take you through some of the key project highlights here in this presentation. Next slide. So what has been involved in the code manual update.

SWANSON: Another one.

BENTON: The primary regulatory authority, of course, is the Department of Ecology who takes what the EPA puts out as the Federal Clean Water Act and the Department of Ecology then every five years moves on to us, the local authorities, the changes that they want to have. Here in Clark County, our local authority is the Board of County Commissioners. We are a Phase I permittee. There are five or six Phase I permittees in Washington State.

SWANSON: Six municipalities and WSDOT.

BENTON: Yeah. And WSDOT has their own as well. All the other cities are what we will call Phase II cities. They have come into the system later. The departments that are responsible primarily is our department, Department of Environmental Services. We comply every day with the permit, but we do it in conjunction with a whole bunch of other people here at the County. We work very, very closely with Public Works, Community Development, obviously Community Planning and with the PA's Office as well, and so there's a lot of folks here at the County that are involved in making this happen and all of them have been involved in this new book that many of you have in front of you, the new stormwater permit and the new codes.

We reached out to the stakeholders that are involved and we expanded the process this time over the last five-year permit to reach out even more so that we could get as many people involved as possible. We had a technical advisory committee that was created with consultants and engineers and technical folks here from the County. We had a stakeholder advisory committee made up of homeowner associations' representatives and there was, I believe, we had a school district representative, a number of builders and so on, a rather broad stakeholder committee.

And then, of course, we also utilized the Developmental Engineering Advisory Board which is created here to help advise the County on community development issues. So

those are the three primary groups that met on a regular basis to review our product, our output. Of course, we worked with a lot of other permittees as well as we went through the process.

The project is required by the Department of Ecology. We don't have any choices. We have to update our code every five years. Some of you may recall that we were involved in a lawsuit the last time we didn't do everything that they wanted us to do, so this time we're going to make sure that we avoid any lawsuits. We're going to do what Ecology has asked us to do.

Our goal was to create a unified and consistent single stormwater manual for development and redevelopment projects that not only meets the local needs but meets the requirements of the permit. And the key addition this year in the permit -- every year the regulators kind of hone in on one or two key provisions. This time the key change in the permit is what we refer to as LID or Low Impact Development, and that's been the primary change. It has required a lot of code changes, which is why we're before you tonight with these many code changes.

Low impact development is really kind of almost the opposite of what the things we used to try to do. We used to try to collect the water at the site, channel it, store it, clean it, slow it down and disburse it avoiding erosion. That costs a lot of money, build stormwater ponds, retain it, clean it, change the filters.

And so one of the things that changing science has dictated is that if we can infiltrate the water closer to the development site, it's cheaper. You don't have to build a lot of facilities. The ground is a very good filter and it puts the water back into the aquifer, which is where we need it, and that's really one of the primary keys, I think, is replacing the water in the aquifer rather than channeling it, filtering it and then running it off and running it out into a stream somewhere. The groundwater never gets to recharge, and so that's why we like the low impact concept because it helps us recharge our aquifer and it reduces our cost. It doesn't take a lot of cost off-site. The developers like that as well.

So we have added and changed all of our codes to Title 40 in our development regulations to remove the barriers to low impact development and we've rewritten the stormwater code to reference this new stormwater manual. Rather than having it all laid out in the code the way it was before, we now simply reference the manual that we're adopting as code. It makes it easier for developers to find everything in one place. If they want to know how to do a project, it makes the process simpler and cleaner, at least we hope so, and our stakeholders tell us they think it will too, so...

What do we do? We had five departments, numerous external stakeholders that I discussed earlier, the stakeholder advisory committee, the technical advisory committee. We hosted over 80 meetings to review the processes, the technical data, the design information. We hired a consultant, Otak, and our consultant is here tonight if you have any questions for Tim. Tim Kraft is here who's worked with us diligently through this

whole process. I also have two members from my staff. Both Rod and Jane are here who have worked on this diligently for three years. What you see before you is really a product of their very hard work. I get to come up here and talk to you about it, but make no mistake about it, this is not my work. This is their work and they've done a fabulous job, in my opinion, with this project.

If we fail to adopt the manual by the 8th of January, then obviously we'll be in noncompliance. So we're hoping that the Commission will ask the questions that you may have of us, we will try to answer them and that in the end, we hope that you will recommend to the Board adoption of this new code manual.

MORASCH: Well, thank you. You mentioned -- is that?

BENTON: That's it.

MORASCH: I see another slide pop up so I didn't want to cut you off.

BENTON: No. No. Well, I think it's important to tell you that the Ecology has already reviewed it.

MORASCH: Okay.

BENTON: Okay. They gave us some technical clarifications; we've corrected them. And as late as yesterday, Rod was working with them to get their final letter of equivalency and we now have that. So Ecology has given us a letter of equivalency that this manual is equivalent to the new permit, and that if this manual is adopted the way it is written, we will be in compliance. So that's very good news. The regulator has said we're okay according to them, so... I know you guys would want to know that, so... That's pretty much it.

MORASCH: Okay. All right. And you mentioned the DEAB. Is the DEAB recommending adoption as well, then, of the new manual or do they have comments?

BENTON: They don't -- they're not in a recommending position, but they have been involved, and our last presentation to them went smoothly, nobody had any -- I don't think there was any big heartburn. I didn't hear any. I mean, everybody --

SWANSON: There were a few questions about it.

BENTON: There were some questions, some clarifications, how does this work, how does that work, but there was no --

MORASCH: No objections?

BENTON: -- no heartburn, no defections, no, you know, well, we're going to have to

oppose this and we didn't hear any of that.

MORASCH: All right. Any of the Planning Commission have questions?

JOHNSON: I have a question.

MORASCH: Karl.

JOHNSON: Agriculture practices are exempt; correct?

SWANSON: Commercial agriculture is -- oh, by the way, I'm Rod Swanson. I'm Permit Manager for Department of Environmental Services.

In the NPDES municipal permit, it's a permit that's required under federal law, the State of Washington is delegated the authority for these permits. The stormwater permit is a municipal storm -- separate storm sewer permit, so it's for a drainage system that a municipality owns. It drains the surface water and doesn't include a combined sewer like the Portland system or the King County, Seattle systems do. And in the federal rules, as I understand it, agriculture is categorically exempt, and in the manual, commercial agriculture is also categorically exempt.

JOHNSON: Okay. But I just -- my question was, agriculture practices involving -- I'm on 40.386.010 of the draft, agriculture practices involve the working of land for production, so it's just the land. Would a building on an agricultural site be exempt?

SWANSON: No. No.

JOHNSON: It doesn't say.

SWANSON: It's not categorically exempt, no.

JOHNSON: Thank you. That was all I had.

MORASCH: Any other questions for staff?

BENDER: Yeah. The low impact development, I'm all for that. Is that going to affect, obviously, the building codes in the county?

SWANSON: The simple answer is no. What we've done is we've made one change to the building code to reference standards for green roofs.

BENDER: Explain green roofs to me.

SWANSON: Oh, I'm sorry. A green roof is basically a vegetative roof, so the purpose of it is to intercept stormwater as it falls as rainfall and either absorb it or retard its flow so

it doesn't run off quickly.

BENDER: Referring to commercial only?

SWANSON: It could be on a garage. It could be on a -- I saw one on a small building one time in a yard. They could be any structure could have them. They're not required. They are not required under the code and manual.

The basic approach for the LID from Ecology pursuant to hearings that were held a few years ago and an appeal of the permit is that the low impact development practices are deemed to be best available science or apply all known and reasonable treatment technologies. And so Ecology essentially was required to include them in the permit, so LID is mandatory where it's feasible.

And there's one particular minimum requirement that requires LID, but in the manual, there are long lists of infeasibility criteria for each LID feature. For instance, a bioretention facility, which is essentially a vegetative hole in the ground where the water runs and soaks in the ground, would be infeasible if the clay soils are underneath it. It wouldn't work there so you don't have to use it. Permeable pavement is infeasible for areas that have higher amounts of traffic than, say, a cul-de-sac or a very small subdivision or an industrial site. It would be infeasible there.

BENDER: Last question. What's the stance of Ecology on vault cartridge systems?

SWANSON: We actually have them in our manual now. Several of the proprietary systems are included. They've been in our manual since 2000. Ecology has a program, one of the few in the country, that tests emerging technologies for all different types of applications. It could be something that's used for controlling runoff sediment from construction, but they have a program that tests them. They have the actual manufacturers do their testing and submit the results to Ecology, and then once they meet the criteria for at least doing the treatment that's required, then Ecology gives them a general use level designation and they are allowed to be used in Washington. It's up to the individual municipality to decide if there's enough information about that particular proprietary object that it's deemed to be, say, a reliable object that doesn't require excessive maintenance or it's expensive to maintain, that type of thing.

BENDER: Yeah. That's my point. I was hoping that Ecology will use them as a last resort versus detention.

SWANSON: Yeah. I think just -- you know, I think with the development or the requirement to use low impact development, we'll see less and less of those things going in.

BENDER: Yeah, I think so too. Thank you.

SWANSON: Sure.

MORASCH: All right. Any other questions?

BARCA: I do have a question. Senator Benton, you mentioned the idea that we were hoping that by adoption of these rules we're actually lowering the cost of development, and you made mention of the fact that taking away barriers in the development process to utilize low impact development, and that made sense to me with what you said, until you said you're not changing any of the development standards. I'm a little confused on how we're going to allow the developers to lower their cost of development without changing any of the development standards allowing them to and somehow take advantage of these things.

BENTON: I'll take a shot at that and then we'll ask Rod. But I don't think we said we're not changing any of the development standards. Richard asked about the building code. The code the way it was written before makes it almost impossible to do LID because it's not what Ecology wanted in the past, and so we had to make changes to the code that would accommodate the LID provisions in this manual. So there were changes made that removed the barriers in the code that would have prohibited or made it impossible or more difficult to use LID. So those changes have been made and that's why we had the Development Engineering Board which is, you know, primarily a lot of builders and engineers and our stakeholder advisory group very engaged in this process.

But maybe Rod can elaborate a little bit because there's building code, development code. I mean, the whole -- the only reason we're before you is because we're changing code and it requires the Planning Commission to look at the code that we're adopting, and so we are changing codes. But, Rod, maybe you can drill down a little bit on that for them.

SWANSON: Sure. We have a 73-page ordinance here that has many, I will say, relatively small changes to Title 40, primarily in things like landscape screening, some parking things, like allowing curb cuts for a bioretention facility.

BENTON: Title 40 is the development code.

SWANSON: Title 40 is all of the development code except for the building code which is 14. Really the biggest thing that we did actually isn't part of this is work that was done a few years ago - Bill was involved in it - is we redid the road standards, and in that process, we made it allowable to use permeable pavement in roads and also change the standards to include what was called a flex zone, I believe, at the time and that makes it permissible to put bioretention facility inside the right-of-way, so that was a major thing. We would have had to do that in this code revision, but we didn't have to because we foresaw that coming a few years ago and included it in our, in the County's changes to the road standard.

So I'd say mainly what we've done, the mandate is in the stormwater code and we did a fairly exhaustive review. Berger Abam did a review of Title 40 to identify barriers and also places where you could maybe require LID in Title 40, and we ended up going through and removing barriers, and there really weren't very many because we didn't believe we needed to make mandates in Title 40 because the mandate is already in the stormwater code.

An example would be, you know, in a parking lot, between a road and a parking lot, there was a requirement to have a wall or a berm and we changed the code so that you could maybe put a wall with a bioretention facility there instead, and that's kind of the level of the changes that we were looking at. Maybe in a plaza you could use permeable pavement as landscaping instead of some kind of other pavement type, but we found very few barriers to the LID as we went through the code.

BENTON: The shorter answer would be we are changing development code. And the answer to Mr. Bender was we're not changing really building code. I think that's where the confusion came in.

SWANSON: Yeah. And there's also, in the packet of materials, there's a matrix of all the code changes that we made in the ordinance, and so if there's something in particular that you want to --

BARCA: That?

SWANSON: That thing there, yeah. Yeah.

BARCA: No, I think that answers my question.

SWANSON: Okay.

BENTON: Okay. Thank you.

MORASCH: Any other questions? All right. In that case, we'll open it up to the public hearing. Do we have a sign-in sheet?

WISER: I don't think anyone signed in.

JOHNSON: I don't think anybody signed in.

MORASCH: All right. It doesn't look like anyone signed up. We're going to double-check that. While we're doing that, if there is anyone in the audience that would like to speak to this issue, please come down now. All right. There's no one signed up and no one's coming down, so we will close the public hearing and I will turn it over to the Planning Commission for deliberation or a motion. Anyone want to make a motion?

BLOM: I **move to approve** adoption of the Clark County Stormwater Manual and Code Update.

QUIRING: I second.

BENDER: I second.

WRIGHT: Second.

MORASCH: It's been moved and seconded third and fourth and fifth to adopt the Clark County stormwater update. Is there any discussion on the motion?

BARCA: Our options seem limited.

MORASCH: Yeah. All right. Hearing none, Sonja, could we get a roll call.

ROLL CALL VOTE

BARCA: AYE
BLOM: AYE
JOHNSON: AYE
QUIRING: AYE
BENDER: AYE
WRIGHT: AYE
MORASCH: AYE

MORASCH: All right. The motion carries. Thank you very much.

BENTON: Thank you very much.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS & PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION, continued

CHANGES TO CLARK COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN & ZONING:

- 1. CPZ2015-00003 Battle Ground School District CFP** The Battle Ground School District is required by law to update its capital facilities plan (CFP) at least every four years. The plan projects revenues and numbers of students for a six year period. The School District has updated its CFP. It will be presented to the Planning Commission and the Board of County Commissioners for approval. The CFP is adopted by reference as part of the Clark County Comprehensive Plan.
Contact: Jose Alvarez (360) 397-2280, Ext. 4898
or e-mail: Jose.Alvarez@clark.wa.gov

MORASCH: And we will now move on to the next item on our agenda, changes to Clark County Comprehensive Plan and Zoning, Item Number 1, CPZ2015-00003, Battle Ground School District CFP. I think we're ready for the staff report.

ALVAREZ: Good evening, Commissioners. For the record, Jose Alvarez with Community Planning. Before you this evening are amendments to the capital facilities plan for nine of the school districts in Clark County. We're going to start with the Battle Ground School District. We're going to have a hearing for each one of the school districts. There's representatives from the school districts here.

Per County code, the schools are required to update their plans at least every four years and the proposed changes will be included with our comprehensive plan update and the proposed changes are not scheduled to go into effect until that's adopted, which would be effective July 1 of 2016.

So we are starting with CPZ2015-00003. The Battle Ground School District CFP meets the requirements of the Growth Management Act and the Clark County code which requires the plan to include standards of service, inventory of existing facilities, forecast of future needs, proposed locations and capacities of expanded or new facilities, a six-year financing plan and the application of the impact fee formula set out in the County code. There weren't any public comments.

There was a motion from the Development Engineering Advisory Board generally that expressed concern and surprise at the increase in the fees, particularly in Ridgefield, Washougal and Evergreen for multifamily. I'm going to have to repeat that at each of the hearings, so get used to it.

BLOM: We're talking about Battle Ground right now though; correct?

ALVAREZ: Right. But generally they had that concern. The motion wasn't as clear as it could have been.

MORASCH: The Battle Ground fee is going down, correct, for multifamily, if I'm reading this correctly?

ALVAREZ: Correct.

MORASCH: But single-family is increasing?

ALVAREZ: Correct. So based on the information provided and the findings in the staff report, staff's recommending approval of the proposed Battle Ground School District capital facilities plan and impact fees of \$6,397 for single-family and \$2,285 for multifamily. That's all staff has.

MORASCH: That's your report? Okay. Any questions for staff? All right. Hearing

none, I will open it up to the public hearing, and we have one person on the sign-in sheet for Battle Ground, MaryBeth Lynn.

LYNN: Hi there. I'm MaryBeth Lynn. I'm assistant superintendent of finance and operations with Battle Ground School District. You did a wonderful job of summarizing this. The capital facilities plan that we're asking Clark County to adopt identifies the facilities we need to build to serve our students and their families.

As reflected on Page 11 of the plan, which you have a copy of, we are planning on constructing two primary schools and two middle schools. We're also looking at the need to add capacity at the high school level. Anybody that's driven out in our area can see that new homes and apartments are coming in at a rapid pace. The cost to construct those improvements would be approximately \$97.5 million, and the majority of those costs would be paid for with bond proceeds that our voters must approve, and we would also use State match funds that we would qualify from the State. Of course, the State funding formula isn't the most user friendly formula and you have to have unhoused students before you even qualify for that State match, which is why you will quite often see a new school open and then next year you'll also see portables there.

So our voters expect that we will ask for impact fees to help fund a portion of the growth that's going on in our area, and with that, we also ask that you support that critical component of our facilities plan. We've calculated the impact fees and we're asking for, and our school board has approved the impact fees at this point, and we're asking for your approval or support for a single-family residence of \$6,397 and a multifamily rate of \$2,285.

MORASCH: All right. Thank you. Any questions?

JOHNSON: MaryBeth, really quickly for clarification, an unhoused student is a student that's in a portable; correct?

LYNN: Correct.

MORASCH: All right. Any other questions? All right. Well, thank you very much.

LYNN: Thank you.

MORASCH: I think you're the only person we have on the sign-in sheet for Battle Ground. Is there anyone else in the audience who wishes to speak on Battle Ground? All right. Seeing no one, we will close the public hearing on Battle Ground and I will turn it over to the Planning Commission for deliberation or a motion.

BARCA: I make a **motion to approve** as recommended.

BLOM: Second.

WRIGHT: Second.

MORASCH: All right. It's been moved and seconded to approve as recommended. Does anyone have any discussion on the motion? No discussion? All right. Can we have the roll call, please.

ROLL CALL VOTE

WRIGHT: AYE
BENDER: AYE
QUIRING: AYE
JOHNSON: AYE
BLOM: AYE
BARCA: AYE
MORASCH: AYE

MORASCH: All right. That one passes.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS & PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION, continued

2. **CPZ2015-00004 Camas School District CFP** The Camas School District is required by law to update its capital facilities plan (CFP) at least every four years. The plan projects revenues and numbers of students for a six year period. The School District has updated its CFP. It will be presented to the Planning Commission and the Board of County Commissioners for approval. The CFP is adopted by reference as part of the Clark County Comprehensive Plan.
Contact: Jose Alvarez (360) 397-2280, Ext. 4898
or e-mail: Jose.Alvarez@clark.wa.gov

MORASCH: The next item, Number 2, CPZ2015-00004, Camas School District CFP. Jose, take it away.

ALVAREZ: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chair. The Camas School District CFP meets the requirements of the Growth Management Act and Clark County code, again which requires the plan to include standards of service, inventory of existing facilities, forecast of future needs, proposed locations and capacity of expanded or new facilities, the six-year financing plan and application of the impact fee formula as set out in Clark County code.

There was no public comment, except for a motion from the Development Engineering Advisory Board expressing surprise and concern at the increase in fees, particularly in Ridgefield, Washougal and Evergreen multifamily. The --

BLOM: Jose, to clarify, they didn't include Camas? I mean, those multifamily fees are

doubling in Camas.

ALVAREZ: It wasn't included in the motion, but they did discuss that and, yes, they were concerned with Camas as well.

BLOM: Thank you.

ALVAREZ: Yep. So based on the information provided and the findings presented in the staff report, staff's recommending approval of the proposed Camas School District capital facilities plan and impact fees of \$5,371 for single-family and \$5,371 for multifamily. That concludes staff's presentation.

MORASCH: All right. Thank you. Any questions for staff? No? All right. I will open up the public hearing for the Camas School District CFP, and it looks like there's one person on the sign-in sheet, Helen Charneski. Did I say the last name right hopefully?

CHARNESKI: Yeah, good job.

MORASCH: Good.

CHARNESKI: Good evening.

MORASCH: All right. Welcome.

CHARNESKI: My name is Helen Charneski and I'm a contract and purchasing manager at Camas School District. In 2014, Camas School District served and enrolled 6,566 students, and in the next six years, we project that we will have about 7,614 students enrolled, and that equals an increase of about 1,048 students. Camas School District provides public education services in six elementary schools, two middle schools, one comprehensive high school, one alternative high school and we also have administrative offices, a transportation facility, a warehouse and a shop.

As shown in our CFP, we do not have vacant capacity in our existing schools to serve all the students that attend programs in the district. We are currently using 13 portables for classroom spaces. The primary issue the district has been facing is the increase in student population over the last six years. While other districts may have experienced a flat growth rate during the economic downturn, Camas School District experienced about a two percent per year increase in enrollment. While our last bond allowed us to address that increase in demand, we now have a need to house more middle and high school students.

The CFP we're asking the County to adopt, identifies the facilities required to serve our students and their families. As reflected on Page 8 of our plan, the next six years includes an expansion of a comprehensive high school, replacing the existing K-5 school that is about 50 years old, constructing a new elementary school and a new middle

school, plus expanding our bus parking and acquiring property. The total cost to construct all these improvements is 179 point -- approximately \$179.4 million.

The majority of the costs for these improvements will be paid for with bond proceeds of voter-approved taxes. We will also use funds we qualify for from the State, but we also rely on impact fees to pay a portion of the cost. Marnie Allen from ESD 112 has calculated our new school impact fees with updated data in our CFP. Our board approved the CFP in May and the impact fee amounts - sorry - and is asking the County to adopt the capital facilities plan and collect impact fees in the amount of \$5,371 for both single-family and multifamily residences. Thank you.

MORASCH: All right. Thank you. Any questions? I'm looking at your documents here. Any questions?

BARCA: I --

BENDER: I do.

BARCA: Go ahead, Richard.

BENDER: Your alternative high school, can you tell me what is being taught there, the function and purpose of?

CHARNESKI: Well, its general curriculum, I would say -- oh, I'm sorry.

MORASCH: Use the mic.

CHARNESKI: General curriculum, just as in the high school, it's just an alternative method of serving the students. They still get the same curriculum and still have the same requirements at the high school. It's just served in a different way. And it's a very small school. It's only capacity of 200 students. So it's a more personal environment, but the curriculum, I believe, is the same.

BENDER: Special Ed or Special Gifted?

CHARNESKI: They're served in their regular population. They would --

BENDER: No, I mean in the high school.

CHARNESKI: Yeah, they would serve them there too, they could, depending on the student. Any other questions?

JOHNSON: What elementary school or unit, what was the one 50 years?

CHARNESKI: That is Lacamas Heights Elementary. It's 1962.

JOHNSON: That's my old elementary.

CHARNESKI: Oh, is it? Uh-oh, I'm not going to say anything.

MORASCH: I guess I just have one question and it looks like the fee for single-family and multifamily is proposed to be the same amount, and if I'm reading this correctly, that's because you've calculated that the multifamily fee was way more, so you're basically reducing it down to the single-family just --

CHARNESKI: Right. The board had -- our board had a long discussion about that, maybe not feel comfortable asking the multifamily to pay more than a single-family home, so they decided to make them equal.

MORASCH: Okay. That makes sense to me. My next questions, and I'm just trying to understand the math, how did it get calculated so that why is the multifamily so much more?

CHARNESKI: I'm going to I think let Marnie address that for you since she's the one who calculated.

ALLEN: Good evening, Chair, members of the Commission. For the record, Marnie Allen. I'm employed by Educational Service District 112. I represent all the school districts and assist them with their capital facility planning in calculating the school impact fees.

In the Camas School District, there are two reasons why the multifamily fee is calculated at a rate that's significantly higher than the single-family fee. One reason is because there are more students living in multifamily housing that was built in the Camas School District over the last six years.

So the formula, for those of you that were here two weeks ago when we went through the formula, it allocates a percentage of the costs to build capacity for one student based on the number of students living in a single-family home or in a single multifamily unit. There were more students living in the multifamily unit.

But a significant and primary reason for the difference in the fee calculation is the formula provides a reduction based on property taxes that are paid in the district, and that discount in the formula for property taxes is calculated based on the average assessed value of a single-family home and the average assessed value of a single individual apartment unit.

So in the Camas School District, the average assessed value for multifamily property for one unit is \$77,000; the average assessed value for a single-family home is \$338,000. In the formula, that equates to here's the cost to construct schools for one student, here's

a reduction for taxes. For single-family, the reduction in the formula is 9,857; for multifamily, the reduction in the formula for taxes is 2,249. So the fact that the average assessed amount that's collected in property taxes from multifamily development in Camas is creating a significantly higher calculated multifamily fee amount. That's the same in the other districts where the multifamily fees are higher.

MORASCH: Okay. I think that answers my question. Any other questions?

BARCA: I do. I just want to explore this just a little bit further because when I look at from school district to school district, assessed values of particular homes are at different levels, Camas is higher than Battle Ground's, Battle Ground's ends up with a higher number for what it's putting out for impact fees than Camas chooses to do. We're matching multifamily to the single-family, so it expresses itself in the idea that there's less being collected in the form of impact fees for actually a greater demand in Camas and as opposed to a decision that was made in Battle Ground. And as we'll see as we go through the other municipalities, these are other choices that are being made as well. So to try and clarify, the assessed value of the multifamily, which is not actually the expression of the tax value, right, the way that we're looking at this?

ALLEN: It is. The average assessed tax value coming from Clark County is different for each district. It's each district's individual average assessed value.

BARCA: So it has to do something then with the number of available units because Camas has many more units than Battle Ground?

ALLEN: No. It's based on each district has whatever developed multifamily properties in their district boundaries, and then the County Assessor's Office tells us here's the value, the tax assessed value of those developed multifamily zoned properties in the Camas School District. Some will be in Clark County; some will be in the City of Camas. And then that will be different in the City of Battle Ground. So it's based on what's built and the tax assessed value of what's built in those jurisdictions.

BARCA: Okay. So as I read this, it says that for Battle Ground, the assessed value in multifamily is 85,400.

ALLEN: Yes.

BARCA: For Camas it's 77,215.

ALLEN: Yes.

BARCA: Based on the way that you explained it to me, I would have expected Battle Ground's to be as high or higher than Camas' expression and the cost per multifamily resident in Battle Ground is showing up at 2689; the cost per multifamily resident in Camas is showing up at 12,160.

ALLEN: Because the piece I didn't talk about in the tax credit is it's also based -- the amount that the district collects in taxes is based on the average assessed value and that district's tax levy rate. So the tax levy rate in the Battle Ground School District is 86 cents per thousand. The tax levy rate and therefore the amount of taxes that are paid in the Camas School District was \$2.97 per thousand. So taxpayers are paying a higher rate. They've approved bonds and agreed to pay more in taxes, so that's the other piece of the tax credit portion of the formula.

BLOM: But I think if I heard you correctly at the beginning, you also said there's a higher density of students in multifamily in Camas than there is in Battle Ground, which also impacts the formula. Did I hear that correctly?

ALLEN: Yes.

BLOM: Okay. Does that make sense?

MORASCH: Which number is that in the --

BARCA: Yeah, that's the part I was asking about before.

ALLEN: The number of students?

MORASCH: Yes.

ALLEN: The SF, Student Factor. So in the Camas School District, if you look down at multifamily, the student factor, well, just in Battle Ground, .066; in Camas .338 in elementary school. There's a lot of kids that moved into apartments in the elementary school in Camas.

MORASCH: So looking at Camas, it says .123 for the multifamily for high school. Okay. You got to go all the way across here.

ALLEN: Yeah.

MORASCH: The single-family is .136.

ALLEN: Camas elementary school.

MORASCH: I'm looking at the high school. It looks like there's -- is a higher number in that fraction means more students per unit?

ALLEN: Yes, it does.

MORASCH: So you got more actually in the single-family at least for high school but

less in middle school and less in elementary school. Is that --

ALLEN: That's right.

MORASCH: Okay.

BARCA: Yeah, because we see multifamily. So the younger children are in the multifamily.

MORASCH: Okay. Any other questions?

BARCA: You know, all of this just comes because it's really fishy to see two numbers that are exactly the same. You know that, right?

ALLEN: I know.

BARCA: People that don't know anything about anything, they do know that two numbers shouldn't look alike.

ALLEN: Well, here's what I'll say. The Camas School District spent a lot of time debating it and there were many on the school board that felt like the higher calculated amount is what the school board and the county and the city should collect, but many of them realized the difficult policy decisions that have to be made and the impacts on affordable housing, so their board decided not to ask for the full calculated amount. In Battle Ground, on the other hand, they did ask for the full calculated amount. The formula doesn't authorize them to collect more, so...

BARCA: Yeah. I get that. It's just that --

ALLEN: Okay. I just want to make sure that you get all the background.

BARCA: -- it's a funny thing when you see two numbers exactly the same.

ALLEN: Next time add a dollar, would you.

CHARNESKI: I will. Or subtract one, absolutely.

MORASCH: All right. Any other questions? All right. Thank you. I think that's all we have on our sign-in sheet. Is there anyone else that wants to talk about Camas?

BARCA: We got nobody.

MORASCH: Nobody? All right. We will close the public hearing and turn it back over to the Planning Commission for deliberation or a motion.

JOHNSON: I **move that we accept approval** of the Camas School District's capital facilities plan.

BARCA: Second.

MORASCH: It's been moved and seconded. Is there any discussion on the motion?

BLOM: Yeah.

MORASCH: Go ahead.

BLOM: So I want to say I appreciate the fact that Camas looked at what the impact is on affordable housing. I don't like the fact that the multifamily impact fees are almost doubling, if not doubling in Camas. I think it's a problem with a crummy formula in that we have an issue of Camas is one of the more expensive places in Clark County to live and as a result more families are pushed into multifamily, and by doubling that impact fee, it's now going to make it even more difficult for families that want to live in that area to be able to afford to live in that area.

That being said, though, I appreciate the fact that you reduced it from the maximum allowable amount down to at least be even with the singly-family. I think the single-family increase is reasonable. So thank you to the school board for taking that stance.

MORASCH: All right. Any other discussion? All right. Well, then I will just add that I agree with what John said and I'll leave it at that, and we'll do roll call.

ROLL CALL VOTE

WRIGHT: AYE
BENDER: AYE
QUIRING: AYE
JOHNSON: AYE
BLOM: AYE
BARCA: AYE
MORASCH: AYE

MORASCH: All right. Camas passes. And that moves us on to the third one, and I misplaced my agenda under all these tables and numbers, so... All right. Evergreen, yep, CPZ2015-00005, Evergreen. Jose.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS & PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION, continued

3. **CPZ2015-00005 Evergreen School District CFP** The Evergreen School District is required by law to update its capital facilities plan (CFP) at least every four years. The plan projects revenues and numbers of students for a six year period. The School District has updated its CFP. It will be presented to the Planning Commission and the Board of County Commissioners for approval. The CFP is adopted by reference as part of the Clark County Comprehensive Plan.
Contact: Jose Alvarez (360) 397-2280, Ext. 4898
or e-mail: Jose.Alvarez@clark.wa.gov

ALVAREZ: Thank you, Commissioner. The Evergreen School District CFP meets the requirements of the Growth Management Act and the Clark County code which requires the plan to include standards of service, inventory of existing facilities, forecast of future needs, proposed locations and capacities of expanded or new facilities, a six-year financing plan and the application of the impact fee formula as set out in the Clark County code.

Again, the only public comment was the motion from the Development Engineering Advisory Board, they expressed concern and surprise at the increase in fees particularly in Ridgefield, Washougal and Evergreen particularly multifamily.

Based on the information provided and the findings presented in the staff report, staff recommends approval of the proposed Evergreen School District capital facilities plan and impact fees of \$6,100 for single-family and \$7,641 for multifamily. That concludes staff's presentation.

MORASCH: All right. Any questions for staff? Hearing none, we'll move on to the public hearing. Susan Steinbrenner, you're the only person on our sign-in sheet.

STEINBRENNER: Good evening. I'm Susan Steinbrenner. I'm the Director of Facilities for Evergreen Public Schools. Evergreen public schools served about 26,343 students last year. In the next six years, we anticipate growth of about 700 students. We are up about 100 from where we were October 1st of last year, so that's right on par.

I appreciate that Marnie went through Evergreen's formula in the work session two weeks ago and took some of the hard work away. There are a couple of things I'd like to point out, though. We were as surprised on the multifamily fee as you guys are to see that going up. I made a chart, and I can leave this with you if you want, the blue shows single-family student generation rates 2003, 2005, '7, '9, '11, '14 and '15, the red shows the multifamily. So what we're seeing is a lot more kids coming out of multifamily homes than we've ever seen in the past, which is what drives our multifamily rate up. I can -- I don't know if you guys want to see that.

MORASCH: Do we have that already or is that new?

STEINBRENNER: It's new, yeah. I can leave a copy with you, if you want.

MORASCH: Yeah, we'd probably need a copy for the record if we're going to introduce it.

STEINBRENNER: Yeah, there you go.

MORASCH: Maybe we'll want to pass it around so we can look at it and then we'll give it back to you, Sonja.

STEINBRENNER: So just looking at the student generation rates that's calculated, we hired a consultant to look at the developments over the last five years and they match up our student addresses with the new developments that were constructed over a five-year period, from 2009 to '14. Multifamily, there were 290 units built, which generated 34 kids. That very next year, so the five-year period between 2010 and 2015 which is what's included in our capital facilities plan, there were 816 multifamily units built which generated 300 students. That's almost an elementary school. Of course not all of those are elementary kids, that's K through 12. But that's the kind of growth that we're seeing with multifamily in our district. That's been one of our big challenges, mostly in the City of Vancouver, not so much out in the county, but we're seeing a lot more multifamily with a lot more kids coming out of them, so...

Our plan identifies one new elementary school to serve growth of 375 elementary students. We do plan on replacing the middle school and increasing the capacity, but only of 86 students. It should be noted that because some of the planned improvements remedy an existing deficiency, only the portion of the added capacity is included in the impact fee calculation, so you're not paying for the replacement of the whole middle school, just the added capacity for 86 students.

And then the same with the high school, we included the addition to accommodate another 238 high school students. As shown on Page 13, the approximate cost to serve growth is \$30 million, and I think as mentioned before, that comes from the passage of bond proceeds, our State match for unhoused students and then impact fees. Marnie calculated our new school impact fees with the updated data in our capital facility plan and our board has reviewed and approved those and is asking the County to adopt \$7,641 per multifamily unit and \$6100 per single-family unit.

MORASCH: Okay. Thank you. Any questions? No questions? All right. Thank you very much. Is there anyone else who would like to speak on Evergreen in the audience? No one? Okay. Then I will --

QUIRING: Mr. Chair, I do have a question.

MORASCH: You do have a question. Oh, sorry.

QUIRING: I just wanted to ask, we heard from Evergreen -- I mean Camas, that their school board made a determination to lower that multifamily. Did your school board say anything about this? I mean, were they concerned about that at all?

STEINBRENNER: They discussed that at length during our work session with the Board. At that time, we actually had to change the boundaries on five new family developments that are right around Endeavor Elementary School. We cannot accommodate them at that school. We had to shift them to another elementary, and they felt that the impact from multifamily is real and that they wanted to pass that on, so... They did discuss it and decided to -- I guess the good thing is our numbers are different.

QUIRING: Yes. Yes.

BENDER: I have a question. The 2015 stats between single residence and multi, any theory on why that's happening?

STEINBRENNER: You know, I'm not sure why that's happening, if people lost their homes and moved into multifamily homes. I'm not really sure what that shift is.

BENDER: That would be my guess also.

STEINBRENNER: Yeah.

JOHNSON: One of the things I'd like to point out, and I'm a school teacher in Battle Ground so this is kind of sensitive to me, but I appreciate what your board did pointing out McCleary and also relating it to the reduction of class sizes that are supposed to go to 17 to 1. I think this is, in some cases, it's kind of a no-brainer in the context of where are we going to put those. Interestingly, which is scary and it plays out in all the districts, I'm sure, is that we see 175 percent increase in the (inaudible) populations, students living in poverty. Those numbers are just driving this monster that is going to crash. And so, I understand trying to balance this. It's not pretty.

But the significant changes that has happened to education in the last, I don't know, two or three years, and not just to mention these things, but Common Core and TPEP and blah, blah, blah, blah, blah - I get to say these things up here now - but the fact that it's getting complicated, it's getting expensive and the mandates are going to have to be dealt with or it's going to be a mess, schools are going to need to be built, and so we need to be prudent on how we're going to do it.

And I too appreciate, I hope your board looked at that because if that trend plays out in Evergreen, it's going to play out in Vancouver. It's going to play out in Battle Ground. It's going to play out in Hockinson and Camas, and then we've got some big issues to

tackle, so... I like the first part of this which kind of spelled out what's happening in education.

STEINBRENNER: Thanks. Our capital facilities plan does not address McCleary. Our student/teacher ratio per contract is 25 to 1. Our actual count which shows up in the capacity is 23.25 students per teacher in the elementary, so that's kind of included in the capacity counts, but, yeah, we're not sure what to do, so...

JOHNSON: We're not even -- I looked at that and went uh-oh. I mean, we're not because we're not --

STEINBRENNER: Yeah. When we go --

JOHNSON: Yeah. And, again --

STEINBRENNER: -- 1 to 17, that's going to have a big impact.

JOHNSON: Exactly.

MORASCH: Okay. Any other questions? All right. With that, we will then close the -- well, actually before we close the public hearing, I had a question for staff. You said that DEAB was not supportive of three school districts and one of them was Evergreen because they thought the multifamily fee was too high. My question is, did they have any specific problem with the math that they pointed out? Did they suggest a different number or was it just a general the fee's too high?

ALVAREZ: No. And just to be clear, they didn't say that they weren't supportive. They expressed concern and surprise at the increase. They -- I think before the motion, there was -- they were neutral, but they just wanted to let you know that and to encourage you to be analytical about the numbers presented and to ask questions of the districts.

MORASCH: Okay. But they didn't have any specific problem with the numbers that they pointed out?

ALVAREZ: No.

MORASCH: I guess that's my question. Because that's the Development Engineering Advisory Board, these are engineers and people that are dealing with math a lot more than maybe some of us on the Planning Commission. So I wanted to know if they pointed out any math errors, anything they thought the math wasn't done properly?

ALVAREZ: No, it was just a former planning commission member who encouraged you to thoroughly go through the information.

MORASCH: Okay. Thank you. All right. Any other questions of either staff or Ms.

Steinbrenner?

BARCA: No.

MORASCH: All right. No more questions. Thank you. We will close the public hearing and I will open it up to either deliberation or a motion.

WRIGHT: I make a motion we approve the Evergreen CFP as presented.

QUIRING: Second.

MORASCH: All right. It's been moved and seconded. Is there any discussion on the motion?

BARCA: Just for the record, Mr. Chair, I think at the conclusion of this I'd like to have a moment to talk about just the whole concept of affordable housing and all of the choices that we make individually and how they all stack up about affordable housing, but this isn't the appropriate time, so...

BLOM: Why not?

BARCA: Why not have it right now?

BLOM: Well, I don't know. What are you going to say? It might be relevant.

BARCA: I'm going to wait till later.

BLOM: Okay. I'll talk about it now. I appreciate what the school boards have done in putting this together, and I don't fault them for this. That's their job to advocate for the schools. I think it's our job to make a recommendation as a Planning Commission taking into consideration a wide range of issues, one of those being affordable housing. And when I look at almost a \$5,000 increase almost, was it doubling a few minutes ago, a huge increase for Evergreen, that's not taking into account affordable housing. That's making it harder for people that are already having a challenging time.

In talking about what the boards decision, they said they were just going to pass this on, that money, that cost is not being passed on to, you know, a rich corporation that owns huge, you know, apartment buildings. They're not going to take that cost. They're just going to take it and pass it on to the next tenant as a rent increase. And just doing rough math in my head, I mean, that's at, you know, 15 to 25, \$30 probably a month increase in rent to someone that's already having to probably not be in the place that they necessarily want to be in. So I will not be voting in favor of this. I think that they should have followed the example of Camas and said you know what, that's not going to be helpful for the bigger picture for what we need in our district and our community.

MORASCH: Any other discussion? Ron, did you want to --

BENDER: I want to encourage --

MORASCH: Okay. Dick, go ahead.

BENDER: Okay. Evergreen School District has portables that have seen full generations go through them and that, to me, is not the way to remember going through elementary, middle school as a student. And I realize that the affordable housing is a very important issue, but on the other hand, the school districts are tied as to how they fund these things. So I am going to vote for the proposal. I do think that we should come back to the affordable housing issue, though, because that has definitely gotten worse, not better.

MORASCH: All right. Anyone else? Karl.

JOHNSON: You know, it's just it's a tough decision. John, I respect what you're saying, though, but again, being on the inside looking out, so to speak, I teach in a modular, okay, and it's difficult. It's not difficult for me; it's just difficult. It's different. You're on an island. So I just think that with all the funding concerns that the school has, and I appreciate how you led this out, it's almost like the districts got their hands tied, that we've got to start looking at our schools differently. And in some respects in some of the districts, it's almost adversarial. I'm not saying it is here, but we're looking at something that is so difficult to do, and as a teacher, it does affect learning.

So, yes, this is a cost, but we have to choose, you know, where we're -- what's important. Our State constitution demands it. It's the primary duty. And I understand what that means, but at the same time I look at it and I say, look, we have an obligation to do this somehow, someday, and I think really what it's about is where the funding is coming from, whether it's impact fees, whether it's taxation, some districts are property poor, some districts are just cannot keep up with the amount of money that's required. Battle Ground, I was there when we failed three levies. I was buying supplies, you know.

I mean, so there's this element that I go there's a real face here. Okay. We ask our parents, those same parents to go buy more supplies that we should be supplying, so that \$30 a month could be that or it's \$30 or \$40. And so it's -- again, it's not so much as a right/wrong as it is there is another side that is brutal right now and we have to make choices in our society, and I think this is a big one. It's telling.

BLOM: No. I totally agree and I think we need to find better ways to fund schools and I would be supportive of that, but I think that needs to be broad-based. This is putting it on - we'll talk about this more when it comes to Ridgefield and some of their single-family - but this is putting it on a small segment of the population that's buying into either a new apartment complex or renting into a new apartment complex or buying new single-family housing.

If we have these broad arranging financing issues for schools, which I 100 percent agree we do, the right answer isn't to just put it on a small segment of the population that needs to get into an apartment and the only option is the one that is just built because vacancy rates in Clark County are below four percent, I mean closer to three percent, and now we're going to push their end up because they have no other option, that's not the way to do it. It's not to do on the backs of the people that can least afford to do it which is what tripling the multifamily impact fee is going to do.

I mean, it's going to -- you know, it's a small drop in the bucket. I mean, we talked about this two weeks ago that impact fees are a pretty small portion of the overall capital facilities plan. This isn't going to fix the problem. All's it's going to do is make it harder on the people that can't afford it.

WRIGHT: I'd like to make a comment that even though we can look at these fees and be a little bit shocked or even uncomfortable with the dollar amounts, when we get to the bottom line, we really don't have the technical understanding of how the numbers were developed nor do we have the operational responsibility that is given to the board members of these school districts to operate their systems. And so I don't think it's responsible to question these numbers that have been adopted by an independent public body that operates their systems. We go back to the point of having growth pay for growth and this is just one small way that that happens, totally inadequate, but it is a small help, so I will support these motions.

MORASCH: All right. Any -- Eileen, any other discussion?

QUIRING: No, I'm fine.

MORASCH: Okay. Not from this side? No? All right. I will just say that I agree with what John said. I think the issue has been adequately debated, so I don't really have anything to add to what John said, but I agree with what John said. So if there's no further discussion, we will have a roll call on the motion.

ROLL CALL VOTE

WRIGHT: AYE
BENDER: AYE
QUIRING: AYE
JOHNSON: AYE
BLOM: NO
BARCA: AYE
MORASCH: NO

MORASCH: The motion carries. So thank you everyone. That brings us to the next one, which is Green Mountain School District, CPZ2015-00006. Jose.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS & PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION, continued

4. **CPZ2015-00006 Green Mountain School District CFP** The Green Mountain School District is required by law to update its capital facilities plan (CFP) at least every four years. The plan projects revenues and numbers of students for a six year period. The School District has updated its CFP. It will be presented to the Planning Commission and the Board of County Commissioners for approval. The CFP is adopted by reference as part of the Clark County Comprehensive Plan.

Contact: Jose Alvarez (360) 397-2280, Ext. 4898

or e-mail: Jose.Alvarez@clark.wa.gov

ALVAREZ: Thank you, Commissioner. The Green Mountain School District CFP meets the requirements of the Growth Management Act and the Clark County code which requires the plan to include standards of service, inventory of existing facilities, forecast of future needs, proposed locations and capacities of expanded or new facilities, a six-year financing plan and the application of the impact fee formula set out in the Clark County code.

Again, the public comment, motion from DEAB was to express concern and surprise at the increase in the fees, particularly in Ridgefield, Washougal and Evergreen multifamily.

Based on the information provided and the findings in the staff report, the staff recommendation is for approval of the Green Mountain School District capital facilities plan and impact fees of \$3,387 for single-family. That concludes staff's presentation.

MORASCH: All right. Thank you. Any questions for staff?

JOHNSON: And, again, that's no change?

ALVAREZ: Correct. That's their existing.

JOHNSON: That's their existing.

MORASCH: All right. And Green Mountain, there's nobody signed up, but does somebody want to -- somebody's coming down. So please come down, state your name for the record.

ALLEN: Marnie Allen from ESD 112 for the record. I forgot to sign up for Green Mountain, I apologize. For those of who that aren't familiar with the Green Mountain School District, it's a very small, very charming, fun to visit school district. You kind of go almost up to Cowlitz County, Woodland, get off and go up in the mountains.

They have one K-8 facility, about 140 students. They don't experience a significant amount of growth because they're entirely rural, but they have seen growth as new houses have been built. On average, they were getting all K -- at the whole K-8 level,

about .67 students per new single-family home that had been built. In the last four years, they were able to build a permanent, not your typical traditional modular, but a modular type classroom that added capacity for 40 students. They anticipate that they will see maybe about seven new students with new houses that have been built coming into the district over the next six years.

BLOM: Seven new students over the next six years, did I hear that right?

ALLEN: Yeah. That's just an average out of --

BLOM: Per year or total?

ALLEN: Total, because there's only 140 total enrolled in the district. So it's --

BLOM: That's a five percent increase.

ALLEN: Exactly. It's small, but they do -- they did have to get their voters to approve a bond to build the school. It's a small rural community. All of the tax burden falls on their voters so, therefore, they're asking that the County continue to collect impact fees in their current amount. The calculation was done. I think it produced a fee that was maybe a little bit higher, but they feel like with the bond that got approved, the classroom they added and these fees, they can continue to maintain their facilities and serve the growth.

MORASCH: All right. Any questions?

WRIGHT: Did they discuss raising the multifamily fee to match the single-family fee?

ALLEN: Fortunately they have no multifamily so they didn't have to worry about it.

MORASCH: Any other questions? All right. Thank you very much.

ALLEN: Thank you.

MORASCH: Is there anyone else in the audience that would like to testify on Green Mountain? Seeing no one coming forward, I will close the record on Green Mountain and turn it over to the Planning Commission for a motion and/or further discussion.

BLOM: **Move to approve** the recommended impact fees.

JOHNSON: Second.

MORASCH: It's been moved and seconded. Is there any discussion on the motion? All right. Hearing none, we'll have a roll call.

ROLL CALL VOTE

WRIGHT: AYE
BENDER: AYE
QUIRING: AYE
JOHNSON: AYE
BLOM: AYE
BARCA: AYE
MORASCH: AYE

MORASCH: All right. Green Mountain passes. Thank you everyone. And we will now move on to Hockinson, CPZ2015-00007. Jose.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS & PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION, continued

- 5. CPZ2015-00007 Hockinson School District CFP** The Hockinson School District is required by law to update its capital facilities plan (CFP) at least every four years. The plan projects revenues and numbers of students for a six year period. The School District has updated its CFP. It will be presented to the Planning Commission and the Board of County Commissioners for approval. The CFP is adopted by reference as part of the Clark County Comprehensive Plan.
Contact: Jose Alvarez (360) 397-2280, Ext. 4898
or e-mail: Jose.Alvarez@clark.wa.gov

ALVAREZ: Thank you, Commissioner. The Hockinson School District capital facilities plan does meet the requirements of the Growth Management Act and the Clark County code which requires the plan to include standards of service, inventory of existing facilities, forecast of future needs, proposed locations and capacities of expanded or new facilities, six-year financing plan and an application of the impact fee formula set out in Clark County code.

Again, the public comment, the motion was from the Development Engineering Advisory Board expressing concern and surprise at the increase in fees particularly in Ridgefield, Washougal and Evergreen multifamily.

Based on the information provided and the findings presented in this staff report, staff recommends approval of the proposed Hockinson School District capital facilities plan and the impact fees of \$6,080 for single-family and \$2,781 for multifamily. That concludes staff's presentation.

MORASCH: All right. Thank you very much. Any questions for staff before we open it up to public hearing? All right. Seeing no one, Sandra Yager, you are signed up for Hockinson.

YAGER: Good evening, and thank you for allowing us to be here.

MORASCH: Thank you for coming.

YAGER: I'm Sandra Yager. I'm the Superintendent of the delightful Hockinson School District. We last year served about 1841 students. It's a delightful district filled with great kids, an awesome staff. We are looking -- we have a district of three schools, an elementary, middle school and a high school.

As you know, our community last year just approved a bond to build a new middle school and that has been a great source of (inaudible) increase and (inaudible) support for the facilities that we have. We are also completing a little bit of an arrangement of the high school, but our elementary school is our oldest, will be our oldest building with the greatest need. So we -- actually, our board approved these fees, but we were really careful to look through -- our intent was really to try to keep it as much as we had it as close as what it was.

We like to see the continued growth in our district. We don't see great growth. It's a very -- it's a place where when you move in, you never want to leave, so people -- we are considered like an aging community because we just stay, you know. We just get older and live there forever. So we are really excited because there's two new developments going on, and that is what is going to cost the increase in our students in the next few years.

So as you can see for our calculation, we only used our elementary school because it will be the school that will have the greatest need in facilities and that gave the opportunity for our board to maintain as close to the impact fees as we had before.

MORASCH: All right. Thank you very much. Is there any questions? No one has any questions? All right. Thank you for coming.

YAGER: Thank you.

MORASCH: Is there anyone else that would like to talk about Hockinson? No? All right. I will close the public hearing on Hockinson and open it for deliberation and/or a motion.

QUIRING: I'll move --

BARCA: **Motion to approve.**

JOHNSON: Second.

MORASCH: All right. It's been moved and seconded to approve Hockinson CFP. Any discussion on the motion? No? All right. Can we have a roll call, please.

ROLL CALL VOTE

WRIGHT: AYE
BENDER: AYE
QUIRING: AYE
JOHNSON: AYE
BLOM: AYE
BARCA: AYE
MORASCH: AYE

MORASCH: All right. Hockinson passes which brings us to Ridgefield, CPZ2015-00008.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS & PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION, continued

6. **CPZ2015-00008 Ridgefield School District CFP** The Ridgefield School District is required by law to update its capital facilities plan (CFP) at least every four years. The plan projects revenues and numbers of students for a six year period. The School District has updated its CFP. It will be presented to the Planning Commission and the Board of County Commissioners for approval. The CFP is adopted by reference as part of the Clark County Comprehensive Plan.
Contact: Jose Alvarez (360) 397-2280, Ext. 4898
or e-mail: Jose.Alvarez@clark.wa.gov

ALVAREZ: Thank you, Commissioner. The Ridgefield School District capital facilities plan meets the requirements of the Growth Management Act and the Clark County code which requires the plan to include standards of service, inventory of existing facilities, forecast of future needs, proposed locations and capacities of the expanded or new facilities, a six-year financing plan, an application of the impact fee formula set out in the Clark County code.

Public comment, again the motion from Development Engineering and Advisory Board expressing concern and surprise at the increase in fees particularly in Ridgefield, Washougal and Evergreen multifamily.

Based on the information provided and the findings presented in the staff report, staff is recommending approval of the proposed Ridgefield School District capital facilities plan and impact fees of \$7,900 for single-family and \$4,900 for multifamily in 2016, and \$11,200 for single-family and \$6,947 for multifamily in 2017. That concludes staff's report.

MORASCH: All right. Thank you very much. Any questions for staff?

BARCA: Jose.

ALVAREZ: Yes.

BARCA: What criteria would you use to not approve a capital facilities plan from the school district?

ALVAREZ: If there was obvious error.

BARCA: A math error?

ALVAREZ: Yeah. As long as they're within the formula and adhere to the requirements in the code, which they have.

BARCA: Then it's automatic.

ALVAREZ: Yes.

BARCA: Okay. Thank you.

WRIGHT: Jose, a question for you. I think this was brought out at the work session a couple of weeks ago, but I may have forgotten. Are these impact fees going to be revised again with the new comp plan that's developed and adopted in 2016 or is there a timeline with a date certain where these are going to be looked at again?

ALVAREZ: So these are adopted under the current plan and they'll go into effect after we adopt that. If there are changes to the plan, the school districts can come back and modify their plans. They're required to come back at least every four years, but they could come back sooner if there are changes to the plan that have significant changes and require some modifications.

WRIGHT: Thank you.

MORASCH: All right. Any other questions for staff before we open the public hearing? Okay. Well, with that, I will open the public hearing and there is no one on the sign-in sheet, but I assume someone does want to come talk about this. Please state your name for the record. Spell it if it's difficult to spell.

MCCANN: Good evening, Commissioners. Nathan McCann, that's M-c-C-a-n-n, and I'm the Superintendent in the Ridgefield School District. Thank you for this opportunity to come and speak a little bit about the impact fee recommendation in Ridgefield. The Ridgefield School District served approximately 2314 students.

HOLLEY: Whoa, slow down.

BARCA: No, slow down.

HOLLEY: You got to slow down because I'm taking down what you're saying. I can't go that fast.

MCCANN: All right. You just have to ask me to slow down. That's all you have to do. I hear you.

The Ridgefield School District served approximately 2314 students in 2014. The primary issue the district is currently facing is one of excessive growth which I think makes Ridgefield reasonably unique. In the next six years, we anticipate there will be 3,633 students enrolled which is an increase of approximately 1,319 students or nearly a 60 percent growth rate. We provide public education and services right now in two elementary schools, a middle school and one comprehensive high school. All four of our schools are currently at capacity and three of the campuses currently have portables on them.

As shown in our CFP, we do not have any vacant capacity currently. The CFP we are asking the City of Ridgefield and Clark County to adopt identifies the facilities we need to build to serve our students and their families. As reflected in the CFP on Page 9, we're planning on constructing new schools to serve student populations within the Kindergarten through 8th Grade band as well as expanding services at Ridgefield High School campus that serves students in grades 9 through 12.

We very conservatively estimate those costs to be in the line of \$75 million. The majority of the cost of these improvements will be paid for with bond proceeds or taxes that our local voters must approve, (inaudible) see these funds we qualify for from the State. Marnie Allen has calculated the new school impact fees with the updated data in our CFP.

Our locally directed Board of Directors reviewed the CFP, spent a great deal of time including two study sessions looking at our capital facilities plan and impact fees and has recommended a \$4,900 per multiunit in 2016 fee and \$6,947 impact fee in 2017 per multifamily unit, and a \$7,900 per single-family unit in 2016 graduated to \$11,200 in 2017.

I appreciate the difficulty of this process and how it has very competing needs that you're asked to address. Our Board of Directors worked very hard on this and respectfully requests your approval. And I'd be happy to entertain any questions you may have.

JOHNSON: Did you say 16 or 60 percent?

MCCANN: 60 percent.

JOHNSON: 60 percent, 6-0.

MCCANN: I think it's 59 to be precise.

JOHNSON: So 59. And your high school, your new high school, is that at capacity already?

MCCANN: It's not a new high school --

JOHNSON: A remodel.

MCCANN: -- that was the remod to the high school, correct. Yes. All four of our campuses are currently over capacity.

BLOM: What's your current bond rate compared with the other schools?

MCCANN: Tax rate you're talking about?

BLOM: Tax rate, yeah. Sorry.

MCCANN: It's two. It's the 351 is the total. It's 20- -- it's 205 or 206 currently.

BENDER: Yeah, the majority of the houses that are being built, I know you're going through a very large growth spurt in the last five years, what would you classify the median income for those houses, not income, but the cost for those new houses?

MCCANN: I would say the average house within the Ridgefield School District at this point is somewhere approximately around \$325,000 and rising.

BENDER: And rising. How about the -- I didn't know Ridgefield had multifamily residence. Are they building new ones?

MCCANN: Yeah. In the very south there has been historically limited multifamily housing. There's just a little bit of it that's currently constructed. But in the southern section of our district as you go into Salmon Creek south of 179th, there are multifamily, multifamily housing units that are going in there and there's a likelihood that more will -- more construction will happen in that area.

BENDER: Classified more as a condo-type of development?

MCCANN: Well, this is 109 unit, one- to three-bedroom complex, so while I wouldn't expect it to be overrun with K-12 age students, I do think three-bedroom multifamily housing is right for families that may either be younger families or families that can't afford a home and would like to be in the Ridgefield School District.

BENDER: Thank you.

MCCANN: Thank you.

WRIGHT: What was your thinking as far as the step rate increase?

MCCANN: That's a great question. Thank you. The board was concerned in the last capital facilities plan they kept the rate artificially lower than the ceiling for the formula had allowed and there was a great deal of discussion. Keep in mind, these are the elected leaders of the district, and I also appreciated your comment on the local control earlier, and they wanted to both be respectful of the fact that we were asking for clearly a considerable increase in impact fees and impact fees within the City of Ridgefield are already very high and thought a graduated increase might be one step towards trying to address competing needs and particularly on the multifamily housing.

WRIGHT: Thank you.

MCCANN: Thank you.

MORASCH: I have a question. It looks like on the 2017 number, your single-family is almost the calculated amount, a little bit less, but then on the multifamily, it's quite a bit less. Now, we heard earlier from Camas that they just -- that multifamily was going to be too much so they said let's just have the same amount. That was a policy decision. Can you tell me a little bit -- I mean, obviously that Ridgefield also made a policy decision to reduce the multifamily -- can you tell me a little bit about how they came to that number.

MCCANN: Two things. They certainly were concerned about the multifamily and what that will do to rental rates, and I think that that was really an appropriate comment that you made earlier and the board would certainly agree with that. Number 2, we wanted to be equitable in the rate increases, so the percentage increase then between the single-family and multifamily between 2016 and 2017 is a percentage. It's the same in both the multi and the single-family to create some equitability while trying to continue to keep the impact fee based on the formula. Flawed or not, it's the formula that we're required to go by to keep the multifamily artificially lower.

BARCA: Dr. McCann, can you talk about your current bonding threshold and where you're at and the idea of the citizens of Ridgefield taking on a greater burden with school bonds as opposed to this method of financing.

MCCANN: Well, we have about \$44 million in indebtedness currently and we have a bonding capacity of roughly \$100 million right now, maybe just a little bit north of that. Assessed valuation is growing reasonably rapidly in Ridgefield both as property values increase and as additional improvements come online pretty quickly. One of the most, I think, succinct things one of our board members said that I have thought about many times is for both good and bad, for both the good and the bad of it, this is the cost of living in Ridgefield currently.

Ridgefield's a town where a lot of the infrastructural improvements have been delayed for

many years as growth was stunted during the recession, and the nice thing about having new infrastructure is it is new and it is ready to deal with the needs of the here and now. The downside of that is it is an added additional burden on the citizens, either be it increases in taxes or impact fees, which I think some people would very fairly argue is double taxes. It's certainly a cost that's borne both by the builder and eventually by the owner or the renter. I can expand on that more, if you'd like me to.

MORASCH: Sure. Sure.

MCCANN: I feel like --

BARCA: Well, you answered my question because I was really looking at the gap, but if there's somebody that wants to expand on that. Nope. I think you've answered my question.

MORASCH: Right. Yeah. It's up to you. If you want to -- if you have anything further to add, we'll certainly give you the opportunity to --

MCCANN: Well, so again, and maybe - thank you for that - and maybe this would be I think the one other thing my board would want communicated. This was really difficult. And, again, I'm a government teacher by training and so I love good governance and they struggled with this. They took this extremely seriously. It's one of their most important elected responsibilities.

They also felt fundamentally that that while the capital, the impact fees will never fund nor are they intended to fund the complete cost of new construction, that it was unfair with the growth demands that are being caused by new citizens to Ridgefield not having the impact fees more in line with what the formula calls for, so they were artificially lower than they should have been for too long. The board made a policy recommendation that they felt that needed to get closer in line with where they should be.

MORASCH: All right. Thank you. Any other questions? All right. Thank you very much.

MCCANN: Thank you.

MORASCH: Is there anyone else in the audience who wishes to testify on Ridgefield? Come forward now and give your name for the record.

ALLEN: Marnie Allen from ESD working with and representing the Ridgefield School District, and Dr. McCann did a great job explaining what's going on in Ridgefield. He's new to Clark County. He's new to this process, and the thing that I know those of you that have lived in Clark County are familiar with is what happened in the Evergreen School District back in the 2000s when growth - maybe it was even earlier in the 2000s, early 2000s - but when growth just took off and they were unable to buy enough portables

to get the bonds passed to even have adequate facilities to house students.

Well, what's happening in Ridgefield when you look at their plan and you see that their current enrollment is 2,200 and in just six years they're going to be 3,600 students, there's significant rapid growth going on in Ridgefield and they're needing to build schools at the elementary, middle and high school level and they're trying to do things a little bit differently than what happened before to stay ahead of and keep up with that growth.

So they're coming forward to you with these are the costs and impacts that the growth is going to have on our schools and so, you know, the number may seem high. It may be surprising to DEAB. It may be difficult for the County and ultimately the City to understand. It's a real number based on impacts in that district, based on the cost to construct schools and the growth that they're going to see and what they need to build schools to serve students. So I just wanted to kind of give you that context.

MORASCH: All right. Thank you. Any questions from the Planning Commission? No? All right. Thank you very much. Anyone else want to talk about Ridgefield? No? All right. With that, I will close the public hearing on Ridgefield and turn it over to the Planning Commission for deliberation or a motion.

BARCA: Okay. This is the place that I said I was going to come back and talk about --

MORASCH: Affordability because I have that on the agenda for the end.

BARCA: Yeah. Well, I think this is the right place. I see what the school district chose to do about stepping in to the pricing and that piece of innovation, to me it makes, it makes good sense. The volume of each step to me is a problem looking at it from the Planning Commission standpoint because I see us starting to help enforce the thresholds of where people go to choose to live based on pricing, and Ridgefield is continuing to raise that price to get in to the community.

If their tax base based on bonding is equitable throughout the community, then it's really just the price of admission going in now we're starting to talk about. And to me, we've already seen some boards take bold action, some take no action. I think this choice that I see the school board making here puts me in a position of the belief that we're going to get back what we can based on the new people that come in, but we already talked about it being too low for the community for an extended period of time which tells me that we gave a pass to the people that were previously coming into the community.

I hoped to see maybe a more equitable solution than what I saw with Ridgefield, and it just seems to be too much even in the context of a single-family dwelling going up to \$11,000. We already know that that's going to get tacked on to the price. There's only going to be certain types of homes that are going to be built that can absorb these kinds of numbers, and what we're saying then is we're going ahead and approving that type of pricing structure and putting that into the community.

As we I think all have said earlier, this is not a school board problem by itself, but we've heard different boards take different types of actions on it and very cognizant of the idea of the impact different boards have made different decisions. I just find this one excessive for what the community standard is and going forward. And so I'm hoping when we talk about affordable housing, we're also going to be talking about what choices there are and how we make that equitable across the community. That's my speech.

MORASCH: Go ahead, John.

BLOM: Just to add on to that really quickly, a \$4,000 increase on a house for someone that's doing typical financing comes out to about 18 bucks a month extra on their mortgage payment for the life of their loan. We have a State constitution that caps property tax increases to one percent a year. I don't even know what percentage that is, but it's got to be 10, 20 times higher than a one percent increase comparing to someone that purchased prior to this going -- compared to someone that's purchasing with these new rates.

And we have a short housing crisis, housing shortage -- excuse me -- in Clark County and I've already heard in conversation several developers in Ridgefield saying if this goes through, if their projects don't pencil, they're going to walk away. So we already have low inventory. It's hard to find houses. People are having a hard time getting into a place, and now this kind of fee increase is going to make that even more difficult, so... I'm again going to oppose this increase.

MORASCH: All right. Anyone else?

JOHNSON: Yeah. My problem is is that the 60 percent growth rate will still be there. The lack of facilities will be there and either the price, the cost, it's competing policies is what we have here, not because it's going to be borne by somebody, whether it's a taxation for the bond or in the impact fee.

So I think the discussion is -- I mean, what's going to happen here is the school is either going to have to be built, schools in any of these districts, and if not, then like I said, we are saying it's a -- you know, we'll have a second class, education will be second class. It won't be important. These are not numbers that someone is saying, well, we want this. These are needs. These are real needs that will come forward and I think especially in Ridgefield.

And, again, I think it's the same debate we had before, John, where we're going back and forth. It's that I think I kind of look at it backwards where I say the schools have been hit so hard for so long that they're desperately trying to catch up, but in the end, it's what we value, and in this case, 60 percent, if those numbers do bear out, that's scary.

And so, no, I don't like -- I don't like the number, but it seems to me that every board

wrestled with that, every elected board wrestled with that and said, listen, we understand. We tried to make balance. We didn't just throw these numbers out there. That they came up and said, okay, this is what we think is best for their community.

And so, you know, like I said, I err on what we do with our schools. They have taken hit after hit after hit. They continue to do so. The funding mechanisms are not there, even we're, you know, right now we're struggling with that, and in the end, who suffers? The child suffers. The child that is put in a portable suffers. The teacher that has to unrealistically maintain academic requirements because we what. I know it's a lot of money, but schools are important, like police are important, like fire is important, but they are most important in this state dictated again by our constitution, so... I'll get off my soapbox, John.

BLOM: No. I just express what I'm thinking in a different way. Going back to I took education classes in college and you talk about hierarchy and needs. You have to have the stable households. And if we are constantly making affordable housing more and more difficult to find, you're making the education job even harder.

So I understand what you're saying about the importance of education, and I don't doubt that at all and I think we need to fund it. But I think that if you make housing to the point where it's more and more difficult to afford, then mom and dad have to go out and get a second job or work part-time and I think having -- taking some of that burden off of the parents as the providers will do a lot for education just as much as having an extra classroom.

Maybe not -- I didn't say that very well. But I think that that need of having affordable housing, that's important too. If we have a kid that constantly has to be moving around because they can't afford to live at each place after a year, that's an issue that's going to impact education as well.

JOHNSON: I think now we're getting close. Quick rebuttal. Where I'm at is that the next thing, then, is where is that money going to come from? Taxation, a bond? That still puts the same pressure you're talking about. So we're not really arguing about the money. We're saying where do you want it to come from, because it's going to -- the same affect is going to happen whether it's a levy, a bond, that district and that community is still going to bear that at some level, so...

Again, I don't think this is - and I hope you understand what I'm saying - I don't think this is so much a, well, we want to give this or not. I think this is about competing policy issues that we really have to come to grips for. Obviously you know where I stand. You know, I want to advocate for the child. I want to keep the focus on the student, never forget it, and that's what I do every day. And so in this case, yes, society has to bear that somehow, John. Go ahead, rebuttal.

BLOM: I don't think it's fair to say you're the only one advocating for the child, but that's

okay. I'll let you have that point.

JOHNSON: That's what I do.

BARCA: Commissioner Johnson.

JOHNSON: Yes.

BARCA: I do believe when we talk about this, this is the choice, as you say. We put it up front in the impact fee or we do it in the form of a bond. It's going to get done either way. To me, I believe throughout the community, the more equitable we are in impact fees, then allows us to go back to the people that are being served by the school district and asking them to be up front about the needs and paying for those in the form of the bonds and then it's by choice.

As Dr. McCann said, either way it appears to be a tax. You basically reiterated the same thing. But one you get to choose as taxpayer and the other one you don't. And up to a certain point, I think we all see that the growth has to pay something, but when we get to this place where DEAB brings up the point about how great the impact fee changes are, we look at policy decisions that one board makes compared to another and there are options. And that's, I believe, what we're talking about. Not whether it gets funded or not, it's just where it's going to get funded.

MORASCH: Eileen.

QUIRING: Okay. Just looking at the extreme growth rate that's going to happen and the fact that the school board in previous years decided not to have their -- you know, this full impact upon the people - and I agree that it's a very high impact fee - you know, the 2017 number is, you know, an even higher impact, but not everybody has to live in Ridgefield. Ridgefield is not the only place for people to buy houses or live in apartments and so some people can choose to live there.

And if builders can't pencil it out, they will walk. That's just how it is. But others may come and charge more. I mean, the -- I have a concern for affordable housing too, but, you know, it's a big community and people don't have to live in Ridgefield.

BENDER: I don't think it's the position of this committee here to try to homogenize or make homogeneous the affordable housing. As Eileen said, people don't have to live in Ridgefield. Ridgefield has skewed itself to builders like Cascade West, et cetera, who have chosen to go there and build higher end homes and the board has chose not to put the fees on. But I do know that everything from the sewer systems there to streets to roundabouts has had to be brought up to standards by other fees that are being charged to the builders. And if people can't afford it because it is a high end, it is a high income area, they won't go there. And I used an example over in Oregon, Lake Oswego, okay, so people that live in Lake Oswego can afford to pay the higher impact fees.

BLOM: It seems there's a misconception that Ridgefield is a higher end community. It's a nice area, but if you want affordable new construction, Ridgefield is the least expensive option of the suburbs. I mean, look at neighborhoods like Pioneer Canyon, some of those right off of Pioneer, that's the best place to find new housing under 325. I mean, it's the only place when I'm showing clients, they end up in Ridgefield. You can't find it in Camas.

QUIRING: They're also over 500 and 600.

BLOM: There is some of that too, but there is also quite a bit in closer to I-5 that is some of the more affordable new construction in Clark County.

WRIGHT: I appreciate Richard and Eileen's comments about choice and I think when you look at this in kind of a market perspective, people do have the choice of where they would want to move to, where they want to buy a new home. If the Ridgefield School District has made a big mistake here and priced themselves out of the market, then they will suffer the consequences of that and their policies will change. Perhaps their school board composition will change. And that's the beauty.

I have a real problem second-guessing what the process of the school district has gone through because they really have the responsibility to fund these schools and to face their electorate and also to make the right decisions for their community, which they certainly have a much better understanding of than I do, so... I see the high numbers and I will choke out a vote of support for it nevertheless.

MORASCH: Any other discussion? I'm really torn on this one. You know, on the one hand you have 60 percent growth rate and this school board made a policy decision to reduce the fees for multifamily pretty significantly, and so I appreciate that. On the other hand, I kind of agree with John and --

BARCA: Ron.

MORASCH: -- Ron. So those are my comments. Any other discussion before we go to a motion -- I mean, a vote? All right. We've already had a motion and it's been seconded, so there's no more discussion. Could we have roll call.

QUIRING: No, we haven't.

BENDER: No, we haven't had a motion.

MORASCH: We haven't had a motion?

BENDER: I make a motion --

MORASCH: All right. I'm getting tired. We're going to take a break after this one

because I think I'm getting a little worn out here. All right. Can we have a motion?

BENDER: I make a **motion** that Ridgefield School District's CFP plan be accepted.

JOHNSON: I second it.

QUIRING: Second.

MORASCH: All right. It's been moved and seconded to accept the Ridgefield CFP. Now, is there any further discussion on the motion now that we had a motion? All right. Can we have a roll call, please.

ROLL CALL VOTE

WRIGHT: AYE
BENDER: AYE
QUIRING: AYE
JOHNSON: AYE
BLOM: NO
BARCA: NO
MORASCH: NO

MORASCH: The motion carries. So thank you everyone. And that brings us to the next item, but I think we've been at it for -- we have three more items, plus we have affordable housing discussion that Ron wanted to have, or do you feel like you've adequately had it?

MORASCH: All right. So we have three more items. I'd really like to take like a five-minute break, so...

MORASCH: Let's break for five minutes. We will adjourn for in five minutes. Thanks.

(Pause in proceedings.)

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS & PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION, continued

- 7. CPZ2015-00009 Vancouver School District CFP** The Vancouver School District is required by law to update its capital facilities plan (CFP) at least every four years. The plan projects revenues and numbers of students for a six year period. The School District has updated its CFP. It will be presented to the Planning Commission and the Board of County Commissioners for approval. The CFP is adopted by reference as part of the Clark County Comprehensive Plan.
Contact: Jose Alvarez (360) 397-2280, Ext. 4898
or e-mail: Jose.Alvarez@clark.wa.gov

MORASCH: Well, welcome back to the October 15, 2015, Planning Commission hearing. And we are going to continue with Item 7 on the agenda, CPZ2015-00009, Vancouver School District. Jose, staff report.

ALVAREZ: Thank you, Commissioner Morasch. The Vancouver School District capital facilities plan meets the requirement of the Growth Management Act and the Clark County code which requires the plan to include standards of service, inventory of existing facilities, forecast of future needs, proposed locations and capacities of expanded or new facilities, a six-year financing plan and application of the impact fee formula set out in Clark County code.

There was, again, the public comment was the motion from the Development Engineering Advisory Board expressing concern and surprise at the increase in fees particularly in Ridgefield, Washougal and Evergreen multifamily. I just want to have point something out to you that in your packet, apparently the Camas determination of nonsignificance was included in the Vancouver section. There were no comments on that either, but just wanted to point that out for clarification.

So based on the information provided and the findings presented in the staff report, staff is recommending approval of the proposed Vancouver School District capital facilities plan and impact fees of \$2,880.75 for single-family and \$2,381.93 for multifamily. And that concludes staff's presentation.

MORASCH: All right. Thank you. Any questions for staff? No? Okay. We will then open up the public hearing, and we have one person on our sign-up sheet, Jennifer Halleck. Did I pronounce that right?

HALLECK: Halleck.

MORASCH: Halleck. All right. Please come and state your name for the record and tell us about the Vancouver CFP.

HALLECK: Well, thank you. I'm Jennifer Halleck. I'm the Capital Facilities Planner with Vancouver Public Schools. Our school district serves about 22,500 students, that's 21 elementary schools, four middle -- excuse me -- six middle schools, four high schools, two 6-12 and then alternate learning, Flex Academy and such, Home Connect, a few others. Our deficit for capacity for students resides only at the elementary school level. We have a current deficit of 1,111. Of that, 151 of those students are relative to new growth for the next six years. So our capital facilities plan is based on elementary only for 151 elementary students.

Just like the other school districts, we go through a capital facilities comprehensive plan. We engage with the demographer, E.D. Hovee, who projects our student enrollment based on a number of factors, one of which for Kindergarten is age-bearing, age of

women of bearing children for our Kindergarten enrollment, and then a series of other inputs and data but relative to cohorts of students going through the system.

2011 was the last time that we came before you as an increase which our board had approved at that time for capital facilities improvements and our board approved in February of 2015 the proposed rates that were discussed this evening, so... If you have any questions of me.

MORASCH: Is there anyone else who wants to speak on Vancouver? All right. Hearing, seeing no one coming down, we will close the record on Vancouver and I will turn it over to the Planning Commission for deliberation or a motion.

BLOM: **Move to approve** Vancouver CFP.

BARCA: Second.

MORASCH: It's been moved and seconded to approve the Vancouver CFP. Any discussion on the motion? All right. Can we have a roll call, please.

ROLL CALL VOTE

WRIGHT: AYE
BENDER: AYE
QUIRING: AYE
JOHNSON: AYE
BLOM: AYE
BARCA: AYE
MORASCH: AYE

MORASCH: All right. Vancouver CFP passes. That brings us to Item Number 8, CPZ2015-00010, Washougal School District.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS & PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION, continued

8. **CPZ2015-000010 Washougal School District CFP** The Washougal School District is required by law to update its capital facilities plan (CFP) at least every four years. The plan projects revenues and numbers of students for a six year period. The School District has updated its CFP. It will be presented to the Planning Commission and the Board of County Commissioners for approval. The CFP is adopted by reference as part of the Clark County Comprehensive Plan.
Contact: Jose Alvarez (360) 397-2280, Ext. 4898
or e-mail: Jose.Alvarez@clark.wa.gov

ALVAREZ: Thank you, Commissioner Morasch. The Washougal School District capital facilities plan meets the requirement of the Growth Management Act and the Clark County code which requires the plan to include standards of service, inventory of existing facilities, forecast of future needs, proposed locations and capacities of expanded or new facilities, a six-year financing plan and application of the impact fee formula set out in the Clark County code.

Again, the public comment was the motion from Development Engineering and Advisory Board which expressed concern and surprise at the increase in fees particularly in Ridgefield, Washougal and Evergreen multifamily.

Based on the information provided and the findings presented in the staff report, staff is recommending approval of the Washougal district, school district capital facilities plan and impact fees of \$5,600 for single-family and \$5,800 for multifamily. That concludes staff's presentation.

MORASCH: Thank you. Any questions for staff? All right. No questions? We will now open up the public hearing on the Washougal School District CFP, and I have Joe Steinbrenner on the sign-in sheet.

STEINBRENNER: Good evening. I'm Joe Steinbrenner, Facilities Director, Washougal School District. Here's a brief overview of our CFP for 2015. Washougal School District served approximately 3,104 students last year, 2014 enrollment. Primary issues our district has been facing are in regards to providing facilities for student enrollment exceeding our building capacities.

In the next six years, we anticipate there will be 3,389 students enrolled, which is an increase of approximately 285 students. We provide public education and services in three elementary schools, two middle schools and one comprehensive high school. We also have an administrative office, transportation facilities and one alternative high school.

As shown in our CFP, we do not have vacant capacity in our existing schools to serve all the students that attend the programs in our district. We are currently using 27 portable classrooms. The CFP we are asking the County to adopt identifies the facilities we need to build to serve our students and their families.

As reflected on Page 9 of the CFP, we are planning on constructing a new elementary school, a new replacement middle school, a new replacement Excelsior High School, which is our alternative school, add high school portables for capacity, a future school site. Most of our growth is heading to the north. We do not have a school site in that direction now. A maintenance facility warehouse, transportation facility on the Kerr property and improvements to our Fishback Stadium.

Total cost to construct these improvements is approximately \$57,301,000. The majority

of these costs for these improvements will be paid for with bond proceeds or taxes that our voters have approved. We also will use funds we qualify for from the State. We won't receive State funds until we have unhoused students and we pass a bond.

Our voters expect that we will request impact fees to fund a portion of the cost for the schools, so the impact fees we have calculated and are asking you to support are a critical piece of our facilities plan and ability to serve our growth. The facilities -- the fees that we have calculated are \$5,800 per multifamily unit and \$5,600 per single-family unit. These fees were adopted by our board in May. Any questions for me?

MORASCH: I have one question. It looks like your calculated multifamily amount was quite a bit more, but like Camas, you made a policy decision to reduce it. My question is, why didn't you just make it the same as the single-family, why the \$200 more?

STEINBRENNER: Yeah. Our board was kind of split on that and some of our board members felt that the fees should even be higher for that, for the multifamily because of the impact and that was just the number that --

MORASCH: It sounds like a compromise.

STEINBRENNER: Yeah. They just decided that that would be a fair number.

MORASCH: Fair enough. Any other questions? No other questions? Thank you very much. Is there anyone else in the audience who would like to testify on Washougal CFP? Seeing no one, I will then close the public hearing and turn it over to the Planning Commission for deliberation or a motion.

BARCA: I **move to approve** Washougal School District CFP as written.

BENDER: **Second.**

MORASCH: It's been moved and seconded. Any discussion on the motion? All right. I have one comment to make and that is I agree with what John said at the very beginning about Camas and I kind of feel like Washougal did the same thing. I mean, there's a \$200 increase which I think is a fine compromise, so I will support the motion. Any other discussion before we have the roll call?

BLOM: Yeah. I'll just say I'm going to support this. I mean, it bothers me that it's doubling, but I understand there's challenges with the formula and I'm guessing it was probably maxed out at the last time, so, you know, the overall increase is 2700 bucks. It's about double, but, you know, they're constrained by what they have, so I do appreciate the fact that they did reduce where they could, maybe would like to see them reduce a little bit more on both, but, you know, good job.

MORASCH: All right. No more discussion? All right. We will have the roll call then,

please.

ROLL CALL VOTE

WRIGHT: AYE
BENDER: AYE
QUIRING: AYE
JOHNSON: AYE
BLOM: AYE
BARCA: AYE
MORASCH: AYE

MORASCH: All right. So Washougal CFP passes. And that brings us to Item 9, the CPZ2015-00011, La Center. Jose, last one.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS & PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION, continued

- 9. CPZ2015-00011 La Center School District CFP** The La Center School District is required by law to update its capital facilities plan (CFP) at least every four years. The plan projects revenues and numbers of students for a six year period. The School District has updated its CFP. It will be presented to the Planning Commission and the Board of County Commissioners for approval. The CFP is adopted by reference as part of the Clark County Comprehensive Plan.

**Contact: Jose Alvarez (360) 397-2280, Ext. 4898
or e-mail: Jose.Alvarez@clark.wa.gov**

ALVAREZ: Last but not least. Thank you, Commissioner Morasch. The La Center School District capital facilities plan meets the requirements of the Growth Management Act and the Clark County code which requires the plan to include standards of service, inventory of existing facilities, forecast of future needs, proposed locations and capacities of expanded or new facilities, a six-year financing plan, an application of the impact fee formula set out in the Clark County code.

Again, the public comment was the motion from the Development Engineering Advisory Board expressing concern and surprise at the increase in fees particularly in Ridgefield, Washougal and Evergreen multifamily.

Based on the information provided and the findings presented in the staff report, staff is recommending approval of the La Center School District capital facilities plan and impact fees of \$4,111 for single-family and \$5,095 for multifamily. That concludes staff's presentation.

MORASCH: All right. Thank you. Any questions for staff? No questions? All right. With that, I'll open it up to the public hearing. We don't have anyone signed up, but we

have one person coming down.

ALLEN: Thank you, Chair Morasch, and Planning Commission. For the record, Marnie Allen from ESD 112. Superintendent Mark Mansell from the La Center School District was anticipated to be here tonight. I'm not sure where he is, so I'd like to just testify a little bit about the plan to summarize it for you to tell you what I know about the plan.

The La Center School District serves approximately -- well, 1,575 students. They have elementary students K-5 in two different buildings, middle school 6-8 in one building and a high school. They've seen some growth. It flattened with the recession, but it's picking up with new housing development. They anticipate increased enrollment of about 200 students over the next six years.

The bulk of their growth is going to be at the elementary level. Their capital facility plan calls for construction of a new elementary school. It's on a piece of property that they thank you very much for recommending be included in the urban growth boundary in La Center. Their plan also calls for some other capital improvements, but the improvements to add capacity for growth are primarily at the elementary school level.

Their fees were calculated with the new data in their plan. The single-family fee went down because there were fewer students living in the single-family homes that were built there in the last five years. If we were to calculate their fee again in two or four years and there's a new housing stock, that demographic may change and the fee would go back up.

The multifamily fee went up because of that significant increase in number of students in multifamily housing. In the La Center School District, there's not a significant amount of multifamily housing built, so they use a countywide average and that countywide average is high and that causes the multifamily fee to go up. I'll be happy to try to answer any questions that you might have, if I can.

MORASCH: All right. Are there any questions? No questions? All right. Thank you very much. Is there anyone who wants to testify on La Center? All right. Seeing no one, then I will close the public hearing and turn it over to the Planning Commission for deliberation and/or a motion.

JOHNSON: I think one of the things that is unique about La Center is that they have hardly no commercial and zero industrial tax base, so they rely on this. They're kind of unique, in a unique position, and so I know that Mark Mansell has tried a number of political maneuverings maybe to change his district's boundary and has not been successful, so... I think this is very important for the La Center School District.

BENDER: Yeah, Karl, would the Indian reservation be contributing to this?

JOHNSON: Yeah, from what I understand, and again I'm in that district, but that is going

to put a significant burden on the district. And so with that limited industrial, no industrial base and very limited commercial, that that's the thought. But, again, you know, that's been the thought for a while too, you know.

BENDER: Does that explain the higher fees for the multifamily versus the single?

JOHNSON: I think, like you said, I don't think there's a lot of multi -- there's not a lot of multifamily in La Center, but, you know, it seems to be those numbers are interesting that we saw from Vancouver or Evergreen, you know, what's happening with multifamily just across the board, they seem to be doing something, I'll use the word strange, but I don't think that would be any different for La Center, no.

BENDER: Thank you.

MORASCH: Any other discussion? Any motion?

JOHNSON: I **move that we accept** the recommendation for the La Center CFP as written.

WRIGHT: Second.

MORASCH: All right. It's been moved and seconded. Is there any discussion on the motion? All right. Hearing no discussion, we'll move to the roll call.

ROLL CALL VOTE

WRIGHT: AYE
BENDER: AYE
QUIRING: AYE
JOHNSON: AYE
BLOM: AYE
BARCA: AYE
MORASCH: AYE

MORASCH: All right. The motion carries. Thank you everyone. That brings us to the end of our public hearing items on our agenda. And there's no -- we have no old business that we have. Do we have new business, Ron? Did you want to talk further about affordable housing or did you have your issues discussed?

OLD BUSINESS

None.

NEW BUSINESS

BARCA: I think at this point in time we have adequately addressed our concerns and I'm hoping that we can have a larger discussion with staff about policies and what we can actually do compared to just ranting about it. We do have the words encourage in a lot of policies, and when we talk about encouraging affordable housing, our actions that we're able to actually take, what we can exercise in choice seems to be quite limited, but I think a lot of that is our own decisions. So in the future, yes, I would love to have a further in-depth discussion about that.

MORASCH: Is that a suggestion that we have a work session or --

ALVAREZ: I would like to say that we do have the comprehensive plan policies that are going to be coming before you sometime within the next three months and housing chapter is going to be one of them. There are --

MORASCH: All right. So we may already have a work session. Are we planning to do a work session on that?

ALVAREZ: We would do a work session on that. I would say that a lot of -- there are a lot of tools in that chapter to try to encourage affordable housing. A lot of things that are in the plan have not been implemented, so there's, I think, room for discussion and action to try to address some of those needs.

MORASCH: All right. Well, that sounds like a plan. Be prepared when the housing comes up for affordable housing to be on our radar for further discussion then.

WRIGHT: If I could add a comment on that too. I think it would be interesting to see a comparison of all the factors that influence housing costs, for instance, the stormwater manual we approved tonight, big cost there per unit that you really don't see when you buy a house or the costs of roads, for instance.

ALVAREZ: And I know that we did sort of an analysis along that vein maybe ten years ago in trying to identify all of the impact fees and permitting costs relative to the cost of housing and it wasn't a large percentage.

MORASCH: Has that been updated since the pre-European settlement flow control standard which wasn't adopted tonight that was part of the lawsuit that was discussed earlier that was sort of forced down our throats?

ALVAREZ: Yes, it was pre-new stormwater regulations.

MORASCH: Yeah. I'd be interested to see if those figures could be updated.

ALVAREZ: We can see about that.

WRIGHT: It would probably be interesting information for the new board however that's constituted as well.

COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION

None.

ADJOURNMENT

MORASCH: All right. Any other comments from members of the Planning Commission? All right. Hearing none, we are at the end of our agenda, so we are now adjourned. Thank you very much everyone.

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 CTV 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.

Sonja Wiser, Administrative Assistant, Clark County Community Planning