



Clark County Planning Commission
Steve Morasch, Chair
Ron Barca, Vice Chair
Bill Wright
Eileen Quiring
Karl Johnson
John Blom
Richard Bender

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 17, 2016

BOCC Hearing Room
1300 Franklin Street, 6th Floor
Vancouver, Washington
6:30 p.m.

CALL TO ORDER & ROLL CALL

MORASCH: All right. Well, welcome to the November 17, 2016, Planning Commission hearing. I'd like to call the meeting to order and ask for a roll call, please.

ROLL CALL

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

GENERAL & NEW BUSINESS

A. Approval of Agenda for November 17, 2016

MORASCH: All right. I don't think we have any amendments to the agenda. Can I get a motion to approve the agenda.

WRIGHT: So moved.

BLOM: Second.

QUIRING: Second.

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

EVERYBODY: AYE

MORASCH: Opposed?

B. Communications from the Public

MORASCH: All right. That brings us to communications from the public. Is there anyone in the audience tonight that would like to speak on an item that's not on our printed agenda?

ANDERSON: Not on the agenda?

MORASCH: Not on the agenda. All right. Seeing no one, we will close communications from the public and open up the public hearing on this matter, Revisions to the Parks Capital Facilities Plan and Park Impact Fee.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS & PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION:

Revision to the Parks Capital Facilities Plan and attendant Park Impact Fees

Description: Consider changing the phasing of the increase in Park Impact Fees. A change in the phasing of Park Impact Fees may also require changing the Parks Capital Facilities Plan. The Board of County Councilors adopted a new schedule to increase the Park Impact Fees, with 80% of the new Park Impact Fees going into effect January 1, 2017. This change had occurred as part of the 2016 Comprehensive Plan Update. The Board is now considering adopting a more gradual phasing in of the increase in Park Impact Fees.

**Staff Contact: Laurie Lebowsky, Laurie.Lebowsky@clark.wa.gov
(360) 397-2280 ext.4544**

Laurie Lebowsky, are you going to be giving the presentation?

LEBOWSKY: Both myself and Bill Bjerke, head of the Parks Division.

MORASCH: All right. Thank you. Please proceed.

LEBOWSKY: Commissioners, the item before you tonight is CPZ2016-00009, Revision to the Parks CFP and Attendant Park Impact Fees. And as mentioned, Bill Bjerke and myself will be giving the staff presentation. And then we're going to have a -- I'm going to have a PowerPoint presentation along with my presentation. Just a second.

So just a little bit as far as the presentation tonight, I'm going to give you background on why we're here tonight discussing this item again. We're going to discuss the options as far as park

impact fee increases. And then finally, we will go over the implications of the options briefly and then ask for PC's recommendation to the Board. Next slide.

As you may recall, the Planning Commission had previously made a recommendation to increase the park impact fees that was part of the 2016 comprehensive plan update. Park fees had not been increased since 2003. The Parks Advisory Board had reviewed the consultant report at that time about park impact fees and made a recommendation to increase them gradually over a three-year period. The PC's vote on the fee increase was 4 to 3, but it was supported what the Parks Advisory Board had recommended, the three-year gradual increase. Next slide.

So the Board had adopted the Planning Commission's recommendation. Their vote for the fee increase was a 3 to 2 vote. The Councilors in their deliberation on the fee increase, however, had indicated that they wanted to revisit how the phasing of the new rates. Staff had determined that the way to change the phasing of the park impact fee rates in a way to avoid the new rate going into effect 2017 would be through an out-of-cycle comprehensive plan amendment which will be adopted at the same time as the County budget per RCW 36.70A.130, which is why we're here tonight for the PC recommendation. Next slide.

These are the park impact fee districts. The white ones are the ones, those are the areas that are located in the unincorporated county jurisdiction. Next slide.

These are the currently adopted PIF rates. And as you can see, it's broken down for single-family and multi-family and it shows the gradual increase. Next slide.

We as far as investigating another way of phasing in the fee increase, we looked at four different scenarios and these are the four different scenarios. First being a five-step, 20 percent per year increase. I included in the table the reference in the consultant report that's in your binder. I believe that's Tab 3. And then the four-step increase which is 25 percent per year. Five-step, you have a 60 percent initial increase and then 10 percent subsequent year. Three-step, 50 percent initial increase and then a 25 percent per year increase. Of course, the fifth alternative is what was already adopted -- what's already adopted. Next slide.

So this table shows the estimated five-year revenue totals given the currently approved implementation scenario. The impacts on revenue range from 1 to \$6 million and reduced revenues depending on what implementation scenario is adopted. The scenarios show the impact of deferring revenue on the private share, and you can see the total amounts at the far right column. Next slide.

I just took the information from the previous page and put them in a pie chart, so the blue on the pie chart shows the private share and then the rest is the public share and the different

revenue sources.

BJERKE: On the public share, we went through and analyzed what the public share components were made up of, that's you see all the little slices on the left side of the pie charts. Most of those revenues that came in were fairly well fixed. We went back several years and got an average of what we had collected in these different components and the one thing that remains static was grants that went back -- we actually went back 30 years, and the average was about \$268,000 per year. It was more, more some, less other years, but the average was about \$268,000, so that stays static, as well as the other slices, if you will, or the other public share components.

The one that's variable is the REET, and so that one you'll see that it's affected with the difference scenarios up here with the public share versus the private share, and so that one you're going to see that one is narrowing and widening as the difference scenarios are shown here.

LEBOWSKY: Next slide. This is our plan amendment process and timeline. We had a work session with the Board in September. We met with the Development Engineering Advisory Board. That was the same day as our work session with the PC. We're going to have a second work session with the Board on November 30th and then the hearing with the Board is on December 6th. We -- let's see. You have copies of the SEPA and the Commerce notifications in your binder.

We, as far as public comments, we received an e-mail from DEAB, which you all received a copy of. An e-mail from Barbara Anderson, co-chair of the Parks Advisory Board. And then tonight we just received a memo from Aho Construction regarding PIF. So next slide.

This is the scenarios again for Planning Commission for your recommendation. The top four being the ones that we investigated, the alternate scenarios. The bottom being what's currently adopted. There are implications, obviously, of whatever scenario you choose, and the implications at least at the Board's final action may require that we update our comprehensive plan.

As you may recall, the parks plan is a chapter in that comp plan and we may have to go back and revise it. Bill may have to go back and revise the County budget, the parks budget, and then the other implication would be revision to the parks capital facilities plan. Next slide.

This concludes our staff report, and Bill and I are here to answer any questions that you may have.

MORASCH: All right. Thank you. Any questions?

WRIGHT: Yes. I had a question on about the pie charts and the delta in the revenues that you said vary between 1 and 6 million. Is that over the five-year period that normalizes the rates or is that --

BJERKE: Yes.

LEBOWSKY: Yes.

BJERKE: Yes.

WRIGHT: Any look at what it would be over the 20-year planning cycle for the entire plan?

HOLLEY: I didn't hear you.

WRIGHT: At all?

HOLLEY: I heard the first part, but not the second part.

WRIGHT: I was wondering if the analysis was just over the five-year period until the rates normalized or if it had also included a look at the total 20-year projections.

BJERKE: Yeah. This is only for the five-year look. We did not project out to the 20 years. If we look at beyond the six-year priority plan, there's not a lot of -- we don't have any values placed on a lot of those projects in the future. And so we can assume that with each passing year, and it depends on what kind of revenues we get that make up these percentages, they may vary sometimes widely, you know, over, say, the next 10 or 15 or 20 years, but this is just strictly a five-year look.

WRIGHT: So if an option is adopted that has potentially significant lower revenues in the five-year period, then you'd be trimming projects out of the capital facility plan to match that or your operating plan for the five-year period?

BJERKE: Yes. Essentially we'd have to take the projects, whatever projects that are in the six-year or the five-year plan and push them out into the 20-year plan.

WRIGHT: Okay. Thank you.

MORASCH: Any other questions?

QUIRING: I just want to clarify, when the presentation was done, I believe it was maybe in the work session, I don't think we've had any kind of a hearing about this parks prior to the comprehensive plan just in the last few months here, but it was stated that how Clark County is

doing compared to other areas as far as our parks and the recreational facilities that we have in the county and you told us how that was calculated.

LEBOWSKY: Was that, Commissioner Quiring, was that the level-of-service and how the adopted level-of-service for parks compared to the national standard?

QUIRING: Yeah, I think so.

BJERKE: Yeah. Okay. So the national standard is or it has been traditionally ten acres per thousand and that was broken up between neighborhood parks, community parks and open space. The County's adopted standard has been six acres per thousand for at least two to three parks comprehensive plans and that is broken down to two acres of neighborhood park property, three acres of community park property and one acre of urban open space per thousand people.

QUIRING: Okay. Thank you.

MORASCH: Any other questions?

All right. Well, with that, I will open it up to the public testimony, and the first person on the sign-in sheet is Steve Madsen. Steve, you know the drill, but give us your name and spell your last name for the record, and welcome to the Planning Commission.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

MADSEN: Thank you. My name is Steve Madsen, M-a-d-s-e-n. I am general counsel for Aho Construction here in the City of Vancouver.

I'm here tonight for a fairly straightforward reason. First of all, it's to support the five-step, 20 percent increase in the PIF rate. That's the technical reason. The practical reason I'm here is that one of our developments in PIF District 6, I believe it's approximately 265 lots, at the full rate of the fee that's going to be imposed, and this development should house according to the County's numbers about 732 people, that project will generate approximately \$1.5 million in park impact fees. That's over \$2,000 per man, woman and child and that's an extraordinary number. That's an incredible move-in fee.

On the comments that I made, and again, I kind of came to this fairly recently with the work session recently by the Councilors, so I apologize for not having this to you sooner. You know, I kind of used some internet numbers that might be a little specious only because they're probably on the low side because of recent interest rate rises, but you can already see where we're at in terms of the affordability of the median house versus median household income, and all this does is send it in the wrong direction.

According to the County's quarterly development report, the County approved approximately 380 single-family building permits in the third quarter of this year. They approved approximately 64 new lots. East Vancouver is one of the easiest places in the county to develop from an engineering standpoint. It's got good infiltration. The soils are good for the new organic BMP requirements that are being enforced. As you go farther out, it's going to be more and more difficult and more and more expensive to develop. It's going to put increase pressures on our local housing prices. We would encourage you to take the slow road on this.

Those are my comments. I'm happy to answer any questions if you have any.

MORASCH: Any questions for Steve? All right. Well, thank you for coming.

MADSEN: Thank you.

MORASCH: Next on our list is Barbara Anderson.

ANDERSON: Barbara Anderson, A-n-d-e-r-s-o-n. I can't remember, was I supposed to give my address?

MORASCH: You're not anymore.

ANDERSON: Oh, okay. All of a sudden I --

MORASCH: We used to do that, but now we just like to spell the name for the court reporter is all.

ANDERSON: The brain just slipped out and it was like.

I just have a little two-sided, one-page handout for you because I really have a lot to say and there isn't time, and I realize that, but I am deeply concerned that the PIF adjustment recently adopted is, once again, being scrutinized for revision today or delay, if you will, by stretching it out. And I'm here to really urge you to reaffirm your support of the previously adopted three-year implementation at 80, 10 and 10. And I'll give you some good reasons why I feel that this is a critical juncture for us.

PIF, while it's eligible for annual revision by State statute and it follows a very standard calculation that everybody in the state uses so we're no different than somewhere else, if we take and we extend the delay any further, because we've already gone 13 years without an increase, okay, and I have to say that what appears to be on the surface a huge jump in the PIF really is not when you put it into perspective, that it's this long delay that has caused us to have a huge gap there. And if we went back in 2007, we were good soldiers. We were told the

bubble has burst and even though we were putting in for a PIF increase at that time, they said you need to have the good of the community at heart, and we really do.

So we said, yeah, you're right. If people are struggling to stay in their homes, we need to pull back and not make this request at this time. If we had done that, if we had stuck with it and put it through, at this time we'd actually be reducing the PIF. So that's a significant key right there that we have gone without those monies these past 13 years. So we look at what's national standards. We've set ours up at 60 percent of that, but we're not even meeting those standards yet.

When we worked on the comp plan this past year, one of the questions that came up was if you're not meeting the standards, maybe the standard is too high. Okay. So we really spent a great deal of time agonizing over should we reduce that standard so that we could at least look a little better, and we decided, no, that the sacrifice of lowering standards simply to make an attainable goal really in the long-term would be a great disservice to this community.

Because when we look at, for example, PIF District 10, which is the area up around Salmon Creek, it's the northern boundary of the UGA that PIF affects, when Bill went out looking for land now this past year to keep us out of concurrency, we actually didn't quite make the date, but it was a struggle to not go into concurrency because the land isn't there.

Now, why weren't we out there prior to this? Because we didn't have the money. And I will tell you that once that land is sold, it's gone. We can't afford to delay and put us in even further behind so that we can't at least secure those lands while land is available. Home prices in Washington accelerated quickly from 2002 to '7. We saw that nice big bubble there. That was really wonderful and it's represented in this table that I gave you on the back of your handout, because I'm a facts and data girl here.

But one of the things that's really significant when you look at it is that in 2016 year-to-date the average sales price on homes is 325. That's even higher than 2007 at the peak just before the bubble broke, and yet what we are getting is the builders coming back and saying this is going to make homes, you know, beyond affordability. Well, when you look at the way that the house prices have increased and that one of the key things when people go to buy a home is parks and schools, right, well, we can't provide those parks to make those homes desirable.

When business -- I mean, we have a strong impact on the economy here because when businesses look to relocate here, they want to be able to bring in really well-qualified people. Well, the well-qualified people, if they come in and the livability is down, it does not make it a desirable setting.

So I gave you some very positive statistically proven facts along the bottom here that real property values are positively affected by parks, that we receive municipal revenues based on

the property values, meaning property taxes go up, it attracts retirees that want to be there because it's, you know, good fun things to do and those knowledge workers, they're key in bringing new business in here. That's what makes people attracted to purchase a home.

And so I'm really kind of blown away that the least desirable, the most negative impact of all the scenarios up there, and I will tell you that like you, our team agonized when we looked at what the calculation actually came out and we saw the real dollars of what the new PIF rate would be, we felt that pain and that was why we said we can't hit them with it all at once. We need to stagger it. But our greatest fear was if you do it too slowly, we end up in five years in the same mess we're right now in. It doesn't make sense.

So I just urge you to balance all of those into what is a very difficult situation for you to deal with, but it's really critical to our community and the livability here in Clark County, it is. Thanks for your time.

MORASCH: All right. Well, hey, thank you. Before you leave, let me check and see if anyone has any questions for Barbara? No? Okay.

ANDERSON: No.

MORASCH: All right. You're free to go. Thank you.

ANDERSON: Okay. Thanks.

MORASCH: Thanks for coming. Kelsey Potter.

POTTER: Kelsey Potter, P-o-t-t-e-r, like Harry is what I usually say. So good evening and thank you for allowing me to share my thoughts on the proposed PIF increase.

I'm here tonight to encourage you to keep it at the amounts and implementation schedule listed in the comp plan. PIF fees have not been raised in 13 years. The Park Department has tried to make due with no increases for over a decade. Due to the housing crash in '08 and the subsequent great recession, the Parks Department has continued to limp along on an outdated fee structure. With the economic steadily gaining strength and the housing market booming in Clark County, now is the time to raise the PIF fees.

Clark County has already set its level-of-service at 60 percent of the national standard for parks and open spaces, that's a D. To not increase PIF fees will surely tip us into the F category. We should not fail county citizens and limit their access to parks and open spaces. I know the Developmental and Engineering Board is encouraging the accounting of schools and parks that are in private developments to be added to the level-of-service we provide, but I'd like to stress that private housing development parks are just that: they're private. So if you are in a

neighboring area and you're not in that development, you cannot come and use that park technically because they're paying for it.

Furthermore, schools are inaccessible at least eight hours a day, nine months out of the year. You cannot really add that into your accounting. I can't access a park with my 3-year-olds Monday through Friday from 7:00 to 3:00. So really if you are going to add those in, you're really not increasing the level-of-service.

As Barbara mentioned, two things that businesses and housing developments look at before settling or building in the community are the quality of schools and the quality of parks. Those are two things research has shown time and time again that attract people to a community. As the county continues to grow, so too must our park system. No one likes raising fees, but in terms of the economic, the overall economic development of our county and the overall health of our citizens, we need to increase the PIF fees. The PIF fee provides the money for the acquisition and the development of parks.

I personally can attest that my husband and I bought our house right down the street from a park property that hadn't been developed, Sorenson Park, and we waited from 2011 was when we were supposed to start and the brakes got pumped because of the housing crisis and there were no PIF fees going into our fund, so we've waited and waited and waited and we are so close to having a park and our neighborhood is beyond overjoyed. So from a personal level I can testify that I bought my house because I was going to be right next to a park.

So I'm urging you guys today to support healthy communities, good economic growth and the citizens of Clark County by recommending there be no changes in the PIF increase and implementation that's currently in the comp plan right now, so...

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

Dr. Milada Allen.

ALLEN: Good evening, Commissioners. I'm Milada Allen. Post Office Box 61552, Vancouver, WA, and I'm here tonight wearing many different hats, one of them is as the Felida Neighborhood Association president that has been involved with now eight parks within the area.

And I agree with everything that Barbara Anderson had said. I will not repeat a lot of it even though it was part of my speech; however, I do need to stress the fact that we were at 60 percent of level-of-service, we did not have any PIF increases since 2003, and when I was sitting right there in 2007 for the comp plan review, we had the developers saying, hey, don't raise our fees, not until after the recession. Well, we're after recession now and, however, we are way behind as to what level-of-service that we had lowered it to, but also as to what PIFs are being

collected. And, of course, if you calculate 16 years times 5 percent per year increase that should have been part of the good business as we went, that would be at 80 percent today.

In the meantime, the prices of all that land have gone up, so the acquisition costs have gone up for the parks, that's if they can find that piece of property. They had also are spending a lot more time for the -- a lot more money for development as well because the prices have gone up. They also have to pay permit fees. They are, quote, unquote, de facto developers for public good, so they are part of our community as well as the developers are. And we understand why they would not want to pay up front for something that is part of the quality of life within which they operate, within which they're selling the homes that they develop and within which PIFs are being collected. Those PIFs are part of the cost of house, that's for sure, but it is a very small price considering the value added.

And then also there's a lot of partnerships that go on that have to contribute to that particular amenity because there's not enough PIF money. Even if we did collect it at 100 percent now, there's not enough money to develop it because of the wait of the delay in PIF increases over all those years. You had recommended to the Board of Commissioners that they adopt the proposed plan as was presented to you by Parks Advisory Board and, of course, that's the 80, 90, 100 percent increase, which is very reasonable, considering that we have not been really keeping up with that.

And in addition, every realtor advertises and every developer advertises, for example, in Felida Neighborhood Association areas, that there are parks out there. There are amenities out there so, therefore, the curb appeal is much bigger as you probably know. And one of the things that we look at is healthy communities. Healthy communities, healthy choices, healthy places to go to and also to be exposed to outdoor sports, recreation, instead of the Pokemon on their little iPods.

Parks are places to go to. Parks are places to gather in and to meet your neighbors and to make this community a lot better place to be because people connect in those parks. People get healthy, exercise in those parks. And you should come to the 4th of July parade and after-parade celebration in Felida Park and see about 5,000 happy faces with smiles from ear to ear, and that event is for kids from 2 to 92 and all of them enjoy that day in the park. And they say, why do we stay at home? We can come here. We can meet people. We can cooperate, collaborate as well as meet our backdoor neighbor.

So this is something that makes livable communities and the developers should be behind building those parks because that is a value added, not just to the community, but also to them because they will be more successful in selling those homes in a very quality-oriented neighborhood.

Also, I think you should consider that there is what's called the Engrossed State Bill that passed

through the House of Representatives as well as the Senate, Washington State Senate, and I don't know if you have been briefed about the possibility of the increased cost of administration, not just for the county as a whole, but also for the parks, and that talks about delaying or deferring collection of fees, impact fees until after the inspection report for occupancy, let's say, for the single-family dwelling has been approved. That could mean 2 years to 20 more years before you will even see one cent of that PIF that would be proportionally calculated on the impact of the development on the community and also PIF collection at the time when it's very much needed and 16 years behind.

I urge you to tell the Board of Clark County Commissioners and to recommend to them that they re-adopt the fee schedule that they had already adopted, and it only makes good business sense as fiduciary responsibly official action to re-adopt the fees as they were already adopted. That would mean -- I think it's the Alternative No. 1; is that correct? Is that the Alternative No. 1? But it's the 80, 90, 100 percent. So I urge you to do that for your community, for your county and for the officials as well because they also use our parks.

So thank you so much and the future generations of little kids will thank you as well.

MORASCH: All right. Thank you. Any questions? All right. No questions. No questions tonight.

Well, that takes us to the end of our sign-in sheet. Is there anyone in the audience that didn't sign the sheet but wants to come up and testify on the park impact fees?

Seeing no one, we will now close the public hearing and I will turn it back over to the Planning Commission for any follow-up questions you might have for staff or deliberations.

RETURN TO PLANNING COMMISSION

QUIRING: Well, I just want to clarify then what I asked about level, when you say level-of-service, this is that 60 percent. We're at 60 -- when you say level-of-service, this is you're counting community, name the three again.

BJERKE: Yes. It's 60 percent. Actually, it's at six acres per thousand is what it is.

QUIRING: Yes. Okay.

BJERKE: And that is broken down between two acres of neighborhood park property, three acres of community park property and one acre of open space property per thousand residents.

BLOM: So trails are not included in that level-of-service at all?

BJERKE: No, they are not.

QUIRING: And apparently the private parks aren't included and planned unit development parks are not included. And I understand that they are private. I understand they're private, but they also serve the individuals who live in the area, so...

BJERKE: Yes.

QUIRING: They're serving people.

BJERKE: Right. And we don't include them right now. Listening to DEAB when we met with them, there might be some scenarios where that might be possible as long as a standard is met, you know. So right now our standard for a typical neighborhood park is three to five acres. We're willing, because acreage is getting more difficult to find, to decrease that size to, say, two acres, but it has to have a certain amount of amenities.

When you think about, you know, a lot of people going to a particular site, it has to meet the test of time as well and so when we build a park, we build them to last 30 years, you know, without any major reconstruction and so the -- so that's why the standard is pretty rigid right now. It has been our standard for many years. So if we start bringing in smaller parks, is it really going to serve the public's interest?

And so when we went through the PROS Plan, we did the open houses, we went through stake -- several stakeholder meetings and there were so many people that came to us, and in the back of the PROS Plan, you'll see hundreds and hundreds of different comments and, you know, if we could, we'd put all the 20-year plan in with the 6 because there's so much need out there for parks and different components.

Trails were huge, although it's not measured for trails. We do try to meet the public's need by building trails each year. PIF is not included in that, but there is a strong, strong push for trails as well as community centers and there's more parks.

People want to be able to walk to a park from their neighborhoods. They don't want to walk more than a half a mile, and that's actually not just here in Clark County, but it's actually more broad, different counties, different states, you kind of see this. At the national level, you actually hear this same common theme that people want to be able to walk to a park and not have to load their children into a car and drive them. And so a half-mile radius for neighborhood parks, two-mile radius for community parks and, of course, community parks are drive to parks as well as walk to, and then you get the regional parks which serves, like, a ten-mile radius and so...

A lot of different plans in the future that people want to see in our parks, features, you know,

mountain biking courses, tracks, we've got the equestrian communities that definitely want more trails. There's a lot of things out there that people want and so our Parks Advisory Board had to make decisions as to what went into that six-year plan, what was the most critical priorities and that's what you see.

QUIRING: Yeah. I understand that people want things, that I'm sure were not ever at a loss for what people want. It's what we're able to pay for, and when I hear that this development that's putting in 275 lots, 732 people for, you know, it really amounts to \$5400 per lot and \$2,000 per person in that particular development, that is heavy for a house for each home, and it does serve a lot of people, not just those people. So I think the wants are always going to outweigh actually the ability to be able to provide it. I think that a lot of people do love the trails and Vancouver actually has some pretty very nice trails existing and if they aren't counted in this, they should be --

BJERKE: They are.

QUIRING: -- because there are some very nice long paved trails that I've been on that are great, so...

MORASCH: Following up on the trails, does the County use PIF money to fund the construction of these trails? They can't, can they?

LEBOWSKY: No. No, we can't.

BJERKE: We can't do that, no. It's for park property. We can actually -- we can pay for trails that are within parks, but the trails that connect parks together, we can't use that money for that.

MORASCH: And legal question, why is that? Is it because it's not part of our standard?

LEBOWSKY: It's not in the code. Our code doesn't, as far what it says as far as PIF, it does not go to trails and I don't believe it goes to regional parks either --

BJERKE: Correct.

LEBOWSKY: -- it's to neighborhood and community parks.

MORASCH: All right. So that's something that we could change if we amended our code?

BLOM: I think it's an RCW issue; right?

COOK: I'm not sure about that, and I would -- I'm wondering whether trails are subsumed in

the transportation area.

LEBOWSKY: Yes and no. You can have trails in your -- and there are trails in the transportation plan for the bicycle and pedestrian master plan. We also have trails, of course, in the parks plan. For one thing, when you have them in both plans, you can apply for grants for either transportation grants for trails or recreation grants for trails, if they're in both plans.

COOK: Christine Cook, Deputy Prosecuting Attorney. I'm here to respond to Commissioner Quiring's suggestion that private property could be included in the count of park land for the issue of whether the level-of-service standard is met.

RCW 36A -- I'm sorry -- 36.70A.070 Subsection (3) discusses the capital facilities plan element of the comprehensive plan. This is, in general, the statute of required elements in the plan. Sub (3) is the CFP, and it says that a capital facilities plan element - this is what's required - a capital facilities plan element consisting of: An inventory of existing capital facilities owned by public entities showing the locations and capacities of the capital facilities. And then next, (b), is a forecast of the future needs for such capital facilities. Again, owned by public entities. Proposed locations and capacities of expanded or new capital facilities.

This statute is about public parks, public capital facilities, not about privately owned facilities where a PUD with, you know, five or six homes and some green space can exclude everyone else from setting foot there. My backyard is enjoyed by myself and my family and people that I invite over, but I can exclude everyone else from that area. It's not public. And when you're talking about capital facilities for purposes of comprehensive planning, those facilities are to be public.

QUIRING: So schools could be included.

COOK: Schools theoretically could be included. Of course, they own their property and so they would have to -- that would require interlocal agreements between the county and the school districts and some way of sharing them. You can't -- because they are not open to the public at all times, but in order to use them for parks, it is a possibility and in some locations that's done. I don't know whether the school districts are willing to do that here.

BJERKE: We have three parks that are -- that we have agreement with schools, so we have neighborhood parks that are also on school property. We have two other parks, one that's being built right now, Sorenson, which abuts a future school property, as well as Sunset Elementary is next to a five-acre park property, and so we have potentially five relationships right there with a school.

Talking to Jennifer Halleck with the Vancouver School District, I asked her that question, what are your thoughts about, you know, engaging with parks in the future? And she thought it

was a great idea, but obviously depending on the scenario, there are restrictions, you know, like what Kelsey had stated, the public really can't go on to school property during a school day, but it is open during the other times, so there are restrictions there.

We do have park properties that are actually -- that the County owns right next to school property so you have both, and so the kids can come over to the school property, but people can't go on to school -- or onto the park property, but the kids can go onto school.

COOK: So, Bill, it looks like parks is actively pursuing that kind of sharing --

BJERKE: Sure.

COOK: -- and that is certainly something that can be done.

BJERKE: And we're also looking at public/private partnerships, you know, that's out there. We do have a HB Fuller which we've had in our inventory for many years and it's used by Hazel Dell Little League, 18 acres and it's on private property that we have a stake hold in by agreement, so... All Saints -- or not All Saints -- yeah. All Saints Episcopal Church, we have a mini-mod soccer fields there on their property and then we're looking at future areas there as well, so... We're always looking for opportunity to build our parks using different methods, so public and private partnerships in the future is one of those.

QUIRING: Yeah. I think my -- should let you -- but just as, you know, as a train of thought here, I understand the technical issues of a capital facilities plan and what the RCW has to say about it and that's part of the planning and why we're taking these impact fees.

I think one of the things that I've been thinking since this, you know, we had a work session is the actual reality of what is out there, whether it has to do with collecting it for impact fees to create other parks, I'm thinking about the livability and the availability to various people in our community whether it's publicly available or not.

I still think of a -- I don't think of my backyard as any neighborhood park, but I do think of a neighborhood park that would be in the, you know, among the subdivision as being a park for the public in that subdivision and their friends that happen to come over.

And so I guess what I'm thinking is let's not eliminate some of what we already have and then and try to create more that cost more in the long run and maybe that we can't keep, you know, have upkeep for. I just think it's, you know, I wasn't necessarily thinking of the very intricate piece of capital facilities plan in the comprehensive plan. I was thinking about an overall. Do we -- is Clark County really only at 60 percent level? That's what I was thinking is that I think that we should be able to count some of those, whether we do that for collecting impact fees or not.

MORASCH: Bill, I think you got a question.

WRIGHT: Yes. I understand that PIF is designated or allocated partially for acquisition and then partially for development.

BJERKE: Correct.

WRIGHT: Is it possible to structure it, restructure the present formula so that more of the PIF that's collected goes towards acquisition in the early years so that we don't lose the opportunity to take some of these spots that could vanish in the next few years, and then in the future as the rates come in and the rates rise, then pursue the development of those areas?

BJERKE: Actually, back in 2014 both the PIF acquisition and the development funds were combined which gave us the latitude to either use the funds coming in from that point thereafter for either acquisition or development, so it gives us that latitude.

WRIGHT: Very good.

BJERKE: Prior to that, prior to 2014, a lion's share of the monies that came in were for acquisition and a smaller portion were for development, and so all too often, we came up short when it came to development because, you know, the money was there for acquisition, and so I'm really happy to see that the Councilors in 2014 did combine those two funds.

WRIGHT: Thanks.

MORASCH: I have a quick question about you said 60 percent. We're at 60 percent of the national standard or we're at 60 percent of our own standard?

BJERKE: We're at -- okay. We have --

MORASCH: Can you explain what you meant by that 60 percent.

BJERKE: Okay. So six acres per thousand is what -- and so of that, we're at 67 percent. Or here, I'll look it up real quick so I can give you some accurate figures.

LEBOWSKY: Well, the national standard for parks, or I think the Parks Association is ten acres per thousand population. The county's --

MORASCH: That's the 60 percent then because we're at 6, 6 versus 10 is 60.

LEBOWSKY: Correct.

BLOM: Where are we in relation to meeting that standard?

BJERKE: So of the six acres per thousand, we're at 60 percent current performance of urban neighborhood parks towards reaching acquisition standard and 42 percent towards the development standard of that six acres per thousand.

MORASCH: Who adopted that national standard or who published that standard?

BJERKE: Who published that?

LEBOWSKY: It's a national --

BJERKE: National Park Service.

LEBOWSKY: Parks and Recreation.

BJERKE: So it stems from the National Park Service and goes down from there, and so it is not a national standard now. It has been traditionally. That's been the standard across the United States, and many years ago we actually adopted a lower standard than that, so the six acres per thousand.

MORASCH: And do you know how other jurisdictions in the area Portland, Seattle, Tacoma, what standard do they have?

BJERKE: All over the place. Some of them have higher standards than we do; some are at or below our standards. It depends on the economic area.

LEBOWSKY: Bill, when we were combined with City of Vancouver, wasn't that the standard at that time --

BJERKE: Yes.

LEBOWSKY: -- and the City of Vancouver still has that standard?

BJERKE: Correct. Yeah. I think --

MORASCH: Yeah, that standard. The six per thousand or ten per thousand.

BJERKE: Six acres per thousand.

MORASCH: So we're the same as the City then.

BJERKE: That's in the urban area. It's ten acres per thousand for the rural, so...

LEBOWSKY: And in terms of PIF, that applies only to the unincorporated Vancouver urban growth boundary. It does not apply to the rural area. We do not collect PIF in the rural area.

MORASCH: Okay. All right. Thank you.

John, did you have questions?

BLOM: Yeah. So one of the concerns that I have is whether or not the PIF fees are really the only thing that's preventing the six-year plan from becoming reality. So my question is, if you got a blank check, let's say, on the PIF fees, do you have the maintenance dollars to actually maintain all of this and the capacity and bandwidth within the department to? I mean, there's a lot of parks to develop here in six years. I mean, how much of this if the PIF fees weren't the issue would actually happen or would it all happen if you had the PIF money?

BJERKE: We're working on that right now. We have a decision package in with the Board so that if we have actually a few decision packages in. I've told you Commissioners before our dilemma that we had when all the general fund parks went over to the MPD side and started burdening that budget. A decision package that we have currently right now in front of the Board that should be decided upon on December 6th is to take a look at our GCPD rate that we've been charging at the 22 cents per thousand rate and with the possibility of going to 23 cents per thousand plus using bank capacity, and what that will, essentially, do is provide us \$640,000 in maintenance funding for the 2017 year and that will offset that those parks that are currently in the GCPD that should not be there.

Those parks are not going to go back to general fund. General fund cannot afford to maintain those parks, so that whole discussion is off the table, and so we had to take a look at what can the GCPD do. And so back in 2005 when the taxpayers voted on that levy, they voted on a 27 cents per thousand levy rate. We've been at 22 cents per thousand for many years now and so that levy rate has not been increased for several years, so there is bank capacity. So that decision package is asking for one percent increase to 23 cents per thousand plus one percent in bank capacity, so that is our method of trying to solve the maintenance issue, that will allow us to afford additional parks.

MORASCH: Karl, do you have any questions?

JOHNSON: No, I don't have a question. I just had some comments.

I'm kind of am looking at it backwards that it was sent back to us for potential adjustment from -- from the Commission or from our Council. So I'm with you, Eileen, boy, that's a lot of money. I'm really looking at how much this burdens the building industry and how much the individual home buyer, and so I'm inclined to think that - and if I'm getting ahead of myself here, just stop me - but I'm inclined to think that there's a reason and rationale that the

Councilors sent it back to us was to look at that big bite right up front, so...

I understand the need. I am so sympathetic to the parks and what they are having to deal with and catching up, but at the same time, we seem to be in a tenuous position also. I understand maybe we look like we're coming out of the recession, but we're wobbly and I would hate to put some undue pressure on the building industry. So I'm inclined to want to think to spread this out a little more.

One comment, though, and I kind of feel the same way, and I know this is maybe a little off topic, but we have two Councilors that are going to be seated and I'm always at the end of the year nervous. I was last year when we were dealing with the big alt four thing, and I just always wanted to turn it over to the next group, the next elected official, go, okay, let's get some more of those eyes on it, so... I wouldn't be opposed to saying could we wait until those Councilors are seated, two of which are here, and then that decision has, you know, a right -- not the correct set of eyes, but the new set of eyes on it, so...

MORASCH: I think we have legal counsel wants to make a comment on that.

COOK: Yeah. We're in a bit of a bind. If it is to change before it goes into effect on January 1 of 2017, it needs to be adopted as a change concurrently with the adoption of the County's budget. Otherwise --

JOHNSON: Which is when, January?

COOK: December 6.

JOHNSON: 6.

COOK: Yeah. Otherwise, it has to be changed in our annual docket and annual review process which goes into effect once a year. The new comp plan is going into effect on January 1, 2017. The next change wouldn't go into effect until January 1, 2018. So that is an option, put it off to the docket process and then there would be the newly constituted Council looking at it, but it would mean that the current 80 percent PIF rate would be paid through 2017.

LEBOWSKY: So, Commissioner, so the options that we presented in the presentation were options that you could pursue that would preclude the new PIF rate from going into effect.

COOK: Right. Because that was the direction from the Council basically. They --

LEBOWSKY: Right.

QUIRING: They asked for it.

COOK: They didn't want to have the 80 percent being paid, I think, in 2017 if it was just going to change a year later.

JOHNSON: Right.

LEBOWSKY: Right.

MORASCH: But the issue raised by DEAB, that's sort of a separate issue and that could be deferred to a new Council and further discussion down the road.

COOK: What you're counting for level-and-service and things like that?

MORASCH: What should the level-of-service be, what should we -- you know, should we rethink that, should we give more emphasis to trails, look at the RCWs on that? I mean, is the definition of park, does it have to be square or can it be long and thin --

QUIRING: Yes.

MORASCH: -- you know, those sorts of things.

COOK: I think, yeah.

MORASCH: I think that's beyond anything we could really decide tonight anyway, because if they were going to look at that, that would take a broader discussion and something that the new Council could look at.

COOK: Well, how long do you want to stay tonight?

MORASCH: In addition to the -- you know, what they do with the fees on December 6th I guess is my point, yeah.

COOK: Yeah.

MORASCH: Okay.

BLOM: So what now?

MORASCH: Well, any other deliberation?

BLOM: Do you want to deliberate or do you want a motion?

MORASCH: I'm ready for a motion, unless anyone has any further deliberation.

WRIGHT: I'd propose a motion to accept scenario 2. I believe that was the one that DEAB recommended.

BLOM: Is that the five-step, 20 percent?

JOHNSON: Is that 20, 20, 20?

WRIGHT: Yes.

BLOM: I'd second.

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

QUIRING: I'd just -- go ahead.

WRIGHT: Yeah. I just wanted to make it clear that I'm kind of disappointed to have to make that motion because I'm very impressed with some of the testimony tonight, especially from Barbara and here we have a public advisory board that we're ignoring their recommendation. Of course, we've been ignored many times, and the Board of Councilors is free to, of course, ignore us again, but it still troubles me that we're in this deep of hole and we're going to take this long to dig out, and I just hope if this is adopted all the way through that the parks folks will focus on acquiring properties before they're forever gone and catch up later on with the build-out, so...

QUIRING: And my comment is that I actually voted against the 2016 comprehensive plan, so I would have been against this particular PIF in the first place, but I am going to support slowing down the steps needed to -- needed to help the parks, so...

BLOM: So I would -- go ahead, Karl.

JOHNSON: You go first.

BLOM: All right. I would look at it a little bit differently and I see the sudden jump as, you know, if we take the 80 percent as what was originally put through is kind of buying a house that's too big that you can't afford to maintain it, you know. You can -- someone may be able to afford and go buy a 4,000-square foot house on five acres, but it doesn't do any good if you can't maintain and take care of it. So I think we need to work on both of those things over the next couple of years.

This kind of slows down phase-in so that we can work on the maintenance side of it and make

sure that as we build and develop these parks, one, we have the capacity to actually use that money that we are collecting because that is going to go into the price of housing and then we can maintain them in keeping -- keep them looking good in good condition.

MORASCH: Karl.

JOHNSON: Yeah. Bill, I just, you know, you've done some great work and your advisory board too, and I am -- I don't know, it's my heart is always with you guys. I just see you digging out there and trying to figure out and putting pieces together, and I will say for the record that I think, not on purpose, but you've been ignored, you know, I mean our parks. I will disagree with Commissioner Quiring on this. We need to fund our parks. We need to find a reliable source of income that not only procures them but funds them, and we dance this dance a lot and I don't want to discourage the advisory board from doing the great work because you can tell you guys have poured your heart and soul into this, so...

The big bite is what scares me, you know, and I'm looking ahead and trying to see what kind of -- what does that do to the person trying to buy a house? And I do realize that parks make people want to buy their house. That's a part of the -- the schools and parks, I hear it all the time, but so it's kind of this quandary here. I totally support the PIF fees in general and I strongly recommend that we start paying a little bit more attention to our parks. That said, I'm, you know, the 20, 20, 20 is what I think is most responsible.

QUIRING: I just want to clarify. You misstated what I stated. I said I was against the comprehensive plan therefore would have been against, this was a part of the package of the comprehensive plan.

JOHNSON: So you would have been against the PIF fees?

QUIRING: I was against the entire plan and it was in there. I'm not bifurcating it out. Now that it is bifurcated out and I'm going to vote for it, I didn't want it to be misunderstood that I was somehow going back on how I voted the last time. Did I just confuse you?

JOHNSON: Yeah, more. You're either for the PIF fees or not for the PIF fees.

QUIRING: I'm going to be voting yes for these PIF fees. When it was in a larger bill, I voted against it. So it seems like a waffle. It's not a waffle. I am all for parks and I think that it's wonderful that we can start funding them and maintaining them and purchase more of them, as long as we have the funds to do it.

I am concerned especially about the rapid increase. My concern is that the housing affordability when these fees are going to go on to homes that are going to be built and the price of housing is going up all the time and fees are going up all the time, and so that's part of

the concern too is that these new homes are going to be bearing the burden for the larger population.

MORASCH: All right. Any other comments before we call the roll? All right. Can we have the roll call, please.

ROLL CALL

WRIGHT: AYE
QUIRING: AYE
JOHNSON: AYE
BLOM: AYE
MORASCH: AYE

MORASCH: All right. Well, thank you all for coming. That concludes our public hearing. And that moves us on to new -- old business. I don't think we have any old business.

OLD BUSINESS

None.

NEW BUSINESS

New? New business, yeah, we have new business. We have two of our members here are at their last hearing. Do either one of you want to say anything? This is your last. I want to say I will miss you both here, but I'm looking forward to your service as County Councilors.

QUIRING: It's been a pleasure to serve on this Commission.

MORASCH: All right. Karl, did you have something you want to say?

JOHNSON: Hold on. That's what I want. I'll miss them.

BLOM: You took Karl's fun.

MORASCH: Oh, I'm sorry, Karl. I stole your thunder.

JOHNSON: You took my fire, man. No, I just -- I appreciate both of you. I appreciate your -- I always come to these things with my ideas in my head, you know, and then someone will say something that will really make me think, and I think debate is beautiful when you have open-minded people talking back and forth and trying to make the right decision, and both of you have been that way and it's been a joy and I wish you the greatest luck in the bigs, but have

fun and we'll miss you here very much and I mean that sincerely.

MORASCH: All right. Thank you, Karl. Anyone else?

WRIGHT: You will be missed and it's been great working with you, but I'm sure we'll see you around the halls.

QUIRING: Yeah.

MORASCH: Yeah. And at that those joint hearings.

QUIRING: And we'll be listening to all of your recommendations especially.

BLOM: It's been a pleasure to serve the last three years and I appreciate that this Board, you know, we've had some heated discussions over the times, but we walk out the door and, you know, we're back working together on the next one, and I appreciate that from all of you.

ADJOURNMENT

MORASCH: All right. Thank you. Anything else? All right. Well, thank you all for coming. We are now adjourned.

The record of tonight's hearing, as well as the supporting documents and presentations can be viewed on the Clark County Web Page at:

<https://www.clark.wa.gov/community-planning/planning-commission-hearings-and-meeting-notes>

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

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

Minutes Transcribed by:

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

Sonja Wiser, Administrative Assistant, Clark County Community Planning