



Clark County Planning Commission

Karl Johnson, Chair
Ron Barca, Vice Chair
Rick Torres
Steve Morasch
Bryan Halbert
Matt Swindell
Bryant Enge

CLARK COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION REMOTE HEARING THURSDAY, AUGUST 20, 2020 6:30 p.m.

CALL TO ORDER

WISER: Karl, you can begin the meeting.

Opening Statement & Rules of Procedure:

JOHNSON: Okay. Good evening. I'd like to call this online public meeting to order for Thursday, August 20th, 2020. My name is Karl Johnson and I am the chair of the Clark County Planning Commission.

Due to the COVID-19 Coronavirus pandemic, regular meetings and public hearings of the Clark County Planning Commission will be held in a virtual meeting room, this will allow for safe participation by commission members, staff and the public.

The role of the Planning Commission is review and analyze comprehensive plan amendments, zoning changes and other land use related issues. We follow a public process including holding hearings during which the public has an opportunity to provide additional perspectives and information.

In legislative matters, the role of the Planning Commission is strictly advisory. The County Council will hold separate meetings, consider our recommendations and make a final determination.

The procedures are as follows: The Planning Commission will conduct a public hearing tonight, take testimony regarding the matter being considered. All public comments received by mail or e-mail before the beginning of this hearing will be entered into the record.

The staff will go first tonight and will present information about the application to the Planning Commission. The Commissioners may then ask questions of staff. Next, we will invite the applicant to speak. Then members of the public who wish to provide comment will be called in turn.

When we get to the public comment, we will provide more detailed information. Please keep your remarks brief and to the point. You will have three minutes to speak. Remarks should be directed to the Planning Commission as a body, not the audience, staff or applicant. This is not an appropriate time to question staff or the applicant. Please do not repeat testimony that has already been provided.

At the conclusion of the public testimony, the applicant may take up to three minutes to respond, after which the public portion of the hearing will be closed. Staff may then respond to the testimony and the applicant and the public. The Commission will then deliberate and make a recommendation to the Council.

Before we begin the hearing, Planning Commission members and staff, please ensure that your microphones are turned off or muted unless you are speaking. Planning Commission members please remember to turn your video camera on throughout the night's meeting. Audience members, you are all muted. You will only be unmuted if you wish to speak during the public comment period. Please show respect to the people testifying tonight whether or not you agree with their comments.

Next, I would like to see if anyone on the Planning Commission would like to disclose any conflicts of interest? Seeing none, we will start the roll call of PC members who are present for the meeting, please say I'm here after Sonja calls your name.

ROLL CALL

BARCA: I am HERE
ENGE: HERE
HALBERT: I'm HERE
JOHNSON: I'm HERE
MORASCH: ABSENT
SWINDELL: ABSENT
TORRES: ABSENT

GENERAL & NEW BUSINESS

A. Approval of Agenda for August 20, 2020

JOHNSON: Moving on to general and new business, can I have a motion for the approval of the agenda for August 20th, 2020. Please raise your hand if you would like to make a motion and do the same for the second.

HALBERT: (Raising hand.)

JOHNSON: I have Bryan with a motion. Can I get a second.

ENGE: (Raising hand.)

JOHNSON: Bryant with a second. There's been a motion and a second. Sonja, please take a roll call vote on the motion.

ROLL CALL

BARCA: AYE
ENGE: AYE
HALBERT: AYE
JOHNSON: AYE

WISER: There are 4 ayes

B. Approval of Minutes for January 16, 2020

JOHNSON: Good. Motion passes 4/0. Next I'd take a motion on the approval of the minutes for January 16th, 2020. Please raise your hand to make a motion and to second the motion.

BARCA: (Raising hand.)

JOHNSON: I see Ron Barca with a motion.

ENGE: (Raising hand.)

JOHNSON: Mr. Enge for a second. We have heard a motion and a second. Sonja, please take a roll call on the motion.

ROLL CALL

ENGE: AYE
BARCA: AYE
HALBERT: AYE
JOHNSON: AYE

WISER: There are 4 ayes and 0 nos.

C. Communications from the Public

JOHNSON: Motion passes 4 to 0. We are now taking communications from the public. This is

for strict -- communications -- this is for communications from the public for those items that are not, I repeat not on our hearing today.

For attendees using their computer or Webex application or would like to speak on a non-hearing item, please utilize the raised-hand icon. You do this by opening up the participation window, round participant icon at the bottom of the screen and selecting the hand icon in the lower-right hand portion of the screen.

Staff will know those attendees during the public comment period who have raised their hand by selecting the hand icon. When you are acknowledged, you will be unmuted. If you wish to retain the ability to be a party of record on this matter or to challenge or defend any decisions made on this matter, please spell your name and provide your address for the record.

For attendees using the telephone audio only option you need to press 3 to raise your hand. You will hear a message that says you have raised your hand to ask a question. Please wait to speak until the host calls on you.

When you are acknowledged, you will be unmuted and you will hear a message that says you have been unmuted. When you have finished your comment, press 3, lower your hand, you will hear a message that says you have lowered your hand. Please note, public comment is limited to three minutes per person in order to accommodate all speakers.

As a reminder to my colleagues, when you want to be recognized to speak, please indicate to the chair by raising your hand. Larisa will now mute or unmute people with raised hands one at a time. If attendee provided name, Larisa will read off the name before unmuting; otherwise, she will indicate she is unmuting the next caller.

JOHNSON: Larisa, are there any more public comments?

SIDOROV: None at the moment.

JOHNSON: Seeing none, we will close the public comment portion of the hearing. If there are no more communications from the public, we will move to our first item on the agenda which is the open space and timberland applications. Hunter Decker will now give a summary of the staff report and recommendation.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS:

A. OPEN SPACE & TIMBERLAND APPLICATIONS

The Planning Commission will consider staff recommendations for approval or denial of one Open Space application, OPS-2019-00001, for Current Use Assessment pursuant to Chapter 84.34 of the RCW. Clarice Erkenbeck seeks reclassification under the Soil Conservation category for property located at 6813 NE 384th Street, La Center, Washington, The criteria for Open Space classification was established by Resolution No. 1977-10-32, adopted November, 7, 1977 and Ordinance No. 1982-02-65 adopted March 17, 1982, and Ordinance No. 1996-02-30, adopted February 27, 1996.

Staff contact: Hunter.Decker@clark.wa.gov or (564) 397-4852

DECKER: Thank you, sir. Yes. Good evening, Planning Commission. This is Hunter Decker, staff who reviewed the current use program applications for this 2019 to 2020, and so I'm going to go ahead and give a brief overview of what is open space, pretty much the background and the process as well as who's enrolled and the different types of categories we have and what timberland is about and then get into the general criteria and the application itself.

Next slide, please. I don't know if it looks like that on your end but what is open space. So it's something the Washington State Legislature recognize and created a law that maintains and preserves and conserves adequate open space lands for the enjoyment and natural resources as well as the scenic beauty, economic and social well-being for the state and its citizens. It's governed by state, both State statues and our own code, Open Space Taxation Chapter.

And so the law provides three classifications, and we're going to be talking about open space land, there's farm and agricultural land which is not part of this review and timberland.

Next slide, please. So kind of the background and process is the current use program is administered by our Assessor's Office and Public Works Department does the review. Applications are received throughout the year and then reviewed near the end of the calendar year for the preceding next tax assessment.

And as required by the State code they are processed in the same manner as the comprehensive plan amendment and all requests are required a Planning Commission review and approved by Clark County Council, and this is the 33rd year that the County's reviewed these assessments.

Next slide, please. And so this was enacted in 1970 and allows their property owners to have their property in one of these current use taxations rather than the highest and best use. And current use evaluation is something curtailment or an element of current use valuation would result in a reduced tax rate for all affected local jurisdiction taxpayers and would otherwise be the case, it is not in that increase in tax revenue.

And so the other way if the land were assessed at reduced values, the under, under the current use program, the tax rate could increase for other taxpayers in the district.

And something else that's in the application Open Space Taxation Act is a Public Benefit Rating System and that's an acronym for PBRs and what the Clark County's legislator authority, they have the ability to establish this for these types of classifications and right now we do not have this program and the Assessor's Office has developed a task force to evaluate that option.

Next slide, please. And so here's kind of the enrollment, what we have a, we've got a map here, the green being the timberlands applications and the yellow being the open space lands. In 2019 you can see that we have nearly 9,000 acres with almost 600 owners, and timberland we have 17,000 and 1600 owners.

And so as of this August 13th, you know, looking at these values, and myself I am not an assessor so I couldn't go into depth too much, but with these values you can see what kind of a difference is between what we value as current use and market value.

Next slide, please. And here are the open space categories. Here you can see Clark County's on the left hand and I color coded to what is similar to the Washington State's overall offerings programs that can be in it. And so again it could be enacted by our Clark County Council and so being with offering more of these other categories.

Next slide, please. And here is timberland category which stands on its own and that classification is limited to the five acres which is exclusive of one-acre home site and so that could mean like a six-acre parcel with one-acre home site could have five acres of deferred forest land on their property.

Next slide, please. General approval criteria requires a different parcel size. Open space at least ten contiguous acres and that's exclusive of a home site and the different exemptions would be the timberland which I spoke about as well as the historic and archeological site categories which could be left on five acres.

And everyone is enrolled in the Clark County Vegetation Management Weed Control Program and any more information is also offered through these, the website there, and it's made of five members that are the weed board and 11 employees.

Next slide, please. And so we have one request this open space assessment year. We didn't receive any timberland applications, and so we conducted the review with the one application against the different categories here in the open space classification. In 2019 fees here you can see what the fees are and the due and where the code is related.

Next slide, please. And we'll get right into the project here. Here is an aerial 2019 overview of the surrounding area with the application center there outlined in blue with the different

categories of the Class II soil and the 80 percent food and fiber qualification which we'll talk about here in a little bit.

Next slide, please. Here you can see an overlay of the zoning and comprehensive growth management plan with the different categories. It's zoned R-5. Next slide, please. And here it is against the different already approved timberland and open space applications which are in the vicinity.

Next slide, please. And so this request is a transfer from the farm and agricultural classification into the soil conservation category of open space. The applicant requested 21.23 acres of their ownership of 25.56, and after staff review we only find that 12.66 acres qualify and that's because of a Class II soil that's on the property.

It is still in a at least 80 percent food and fiber production. And this is located out in La Center and it lies within our jurisdiction. And as I indicated before, it is Rural 5, and again the category is based on the promotion of conservation of soils.

Next slide, please. So here's Finding 1 which is part of the code where tracts must contain the 10 acres of at least a Class I or II soil as identified by the Soil Conservation Service Office. After a GIS review, there is Class II Hesson clay loam and it's greater than 10 acres, it's 12.66 as the outline.

Next slide, please. And Finding 2 at least 80 percent of that tract must be in the food and fiber production. And after an on-site review, 80 percent, .09 percent, which comes out to 10.14 acres is still in a food and fiber production.

Next slide, please. Each parcel of the tract meets this criteria as you can see outlined in bullet points, that in the remaining acreage in each parcel would not qualify as it doesn't meet any other open space category. And so out of that 21.23 acres that were applied for only 12.66 acres meet that criteria, and so therefore the difference of 8.57 acres will need to be removed from the farm and agricultural program.

And after these findings staff finds that we recommend approval of those 12.66 acres. Next slide, please. And I'm here to answer your questions.

JOHNSON: Okay. If you have any questions for the staff, and what I'd like to do is call each one of you and just if you have something you'd like to say, go ahead. I'd like to start off with Ron Barca. Ron, do you have any questions or statements for staff?

BARCA: I have no questions. I would like to commend Hunter on a very thorough presentation. I appreciate him taking the feedback from our work session and working it into the presentation, I thought it was very comprehensive. Thank you, Hunter.

DECKER: Thank you.

JOHNSON: Bryan, did you have any comments?

HALBERT: Yes. First I'd like to echo Ron -- I'm getting feedback here. First I'd like to echo Ron's statement about the background process and the current enrollment in the program. And one question I do have, Hunter, is conservation of soils, I didn't catch the definition of that, is that just to preserve open lands as soils ready for food and fiber? And I'll mute.

DECKER: Yes, that's a good question, and it is what the category is about, is protecting that Class I or Class II soil and it's one of the, I guess, you know, the best soils that the conservation office finds for farming for I guess, you know, future use if so be, and that's what I, you know, believe to be as the answer.

JOHNSON: Bryant Enge, do you have any questions?

ENGE: No questions, Karl.

JOHNSON: Okay. Thank you. Well, back to me. Just really quickly, what is the difference between Class I and Class II soils out of curiosity?

HUNTER: One thing I couldn't actually answer that question tonight, I'm one of-- my background is I'm strongly a county forester, I couldn't necessarily speak to the soils other than they may have a better site class where Class I maybe that grows a better stock that has a better soil and nutrients versus a Class II but it's just as good I think might be a possible answer.

JOHNSON: Yeah, that was just out of curiosity. Okay. Any other comments from Planning Commission, get your little hand up in the air? Christine, you have your hand up in the air.

COOK: Thank you, I do. Yeah, class, the soil classes are determined by the Natural Resources Conservation Service, so there is a book, an enormous book that lists all the soil classes and describes their characteristics.

JOHNSON: Okay. Thank you.

COOK: You're welcome.

JOHNSON: The applicant, do we have the applicant? The applicants may now provide testimony. Do we have anybody from the applicant? Okay. Seeing none, I'm going very slowly. I'll begin a brief summary of the public participation process we will follow so you can understand how you can participate in the hearing during public testimony.

To be a party of record. You must submit written testimony before, during or prior to the close

of a public hearing or provide public -- excuse me -- provide oral testimony at the public hearing or request in writing to be a party of record.

No person shall be a party of record who has not furnished their name and accurate post office mailing address or e-mail address. Written comments received as of August 20th, 2020, were submitted to the Planning Commission members listed on the Planning Commission website. We will now take public testimony just as we did earlier this evening.

Once, again, for attendees using their computer or Webex application, if you would like to speak on a non-hearing item, please utilize the raised-hand icon put up on the screen photo. Staff will only acknowledge these attendees during the public comment period who have raised their hand by selecting the icon, using the hand icon.

When you are acknowledged, you will be unmuted, please state and spell your name, provide your address of record. Please note, public comment is limited to three minutes per person in order to accommodate all speakers.

For attendees using the telephone, the audio only option, you'll need to press 3 to raise your hand. When it's your turn to comment, Larisa will unmute you and you will hear a message that says you have been unmuted. Please state and spell your name and provide your address for the record. When you have finished your comment, press 3 to lower your hand. Again, you will hear a message that says you have lowered your hand.

Please note, public comment is limited to three minutes per person in order to accommodate the speakers. Larisa will mute/unmute people with raised hands one at a time. If attendee provided name, she will read off the name before unmuting, otherwise she is unmuting the next caller.

Public Testimony

Larisa, are there any more public comments?

SIDOROV: I see no public comment at the time.

Return to Planning Commission

JOHNSON: Okay. Seeing none, we will close the public testimony portion of this hearing. Staff may now respond to the testimony which there is none. The Commission will now deliberate and make a recommendation to the Council. The Commission will take deliberation or a motion.

Again, does the Planning Commission have any comments, and I will call each Planning Commissioner once again, and I'm just going to go through your name, you can say yes or no if

you have a comment. Ron Barca.

BARCA: No additional comments and I'm going to make a **MOTION** to approve as written and presented.

JOHNSON: Thank you, Ron. Bryan. Bryant, sorry.

ENGE: No comments and I'd like to **second** that motion.

JOHNSON: Okay. And, Bryan, do you have anything? Bryan Halbert.

HALBERT: I have no comments at this time.

JOHNSON: Okay. And I have none. Seeing that we have a motion and a second, I will now accept the motion. Please raise your hand -- okay, we did that sorry.

Sonja, would you please take roll call calling each Planning Commissioners' name after which we will vote yes or no on the motion.

ROLL CALL VOTE

BARCA: AYE

ENGE: AYE

HALBERT: AYE

JOHNSON: AYE

JOHNSON: So seeing that we have 4 yes votes and no no votes, the motion passes. The next item on the agenda is CPZ2019-0030, Shoreline Master Program Periodic Update. Jenna Kay will now give a summary of the staff report and recommendation. Jenna.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS, continued

B. County Comprehensive Growth Management Plan 2015-2035, Chapters 40.440, 40.450, and 40.460 Clark County Code (CCC), and the shoreline designation map:

1. Proposed changes to the Comprehensive Plan would update the introductory/background text of the Shoreline Master Program chapter, correct scrivener errors, add the Shoreline Designation Map to Appendix B – Figures, and update the comprehensive plan legislative history in Appendix H.
2. Proposed changes to development code would revise code text related to the following topics: critical areas, floating homes and on-water residences, freshwater docks,

aquaculture, public boat ramps, shift in the ordinary high water mark (OHWM) due to restoration, administrative authority and responsibility, and scrivener errors.

3. Proposed changes to the shoreline designation map would incorporate revised flood maps (that took effect Jan. 19, 2018) for the Washougal River, Little Washougal River, and along the Columbia River from the City of Washougal eastward to Skamania County; correct the shoreline jurisdiction boundary near Lacamas Lake; remove some wetlands near Shanghai Creek not in shoreline jurisdiction, but currently included on the shoreline map; add Carty Lake which is currently missing from the shoreline map, but in shoreline jurisdiction; refine the shoreline map near the confluence of the Lewis and Columbia Rivers, and update the shoreline map to incorporate current Department of Natural Resources water feature layer.

This proposal is part of the Clark County mandatory periodic review of its Shoreline Master Program (SMP). The county has elected to use the optional process for joint review of the proposed amendments with the Department of Ecology. This joint review is allowed by the Shoreline Management Act (Chapter 90.58 RCW) and the Shoreline Master Program Guidelines (WAC 173-26-104). Comments submitted at this public hearing will be considered both by the county Planning Commission and the State Department of Ecology.

Staff Contact: Jenna Kay, jenna.kay@clark.wa.gov or (564) 397-4968

KAY: Thank you. Good evening. As Karl said, my name is Jenna Kay and I work in the Community Planning Department and I'm the Project Manager for the Shorelines Master Program periodic review which is CPZ Number 2019-00030.

I'm joined this evening also by Oliver Orjiako and also by Brent Davis. Brent is the Community Development Department of the -- Brent works in the Community Development Department and is the County's Shoreline Administrator, so he leads the implementation side of the Shoreline Master Program.

I would also like to mention that Kim Van Zwalenburg, a senior shoreline planner with the Washington State Department of Ecology is listening in this evening.

This hearing is considered a joint Planning Commission and Department of Ecology hearing. So while Ecology staff will not be providing a recommendation on the proposal as the Planning Commission may do this evening, Ecology will be listening to any public testimony provided and considering it in their decision making later on in the projects process. This joint hearing is allowed under the Shoreline Management Act Chapter 90.58 RCW and the Shoreline Master Program Guidelines in WAC 173-26-104.

Next slide. For the benefit of the public who may be watching or listening this evening, I will provide background information on the project, summarize public comments received, outline

what is in the proposal and review staff's recommendation.

Next slide. Now the Shoreline Management Act was passed by the legislature in 1971 and adopted by voters in 1972 to protect shoreline resources. The Shoreline Management Act provides an overarching framework of goals and policies which emphasize water dependent uses, environmental protection and public access.

Implementation of the Act is through local shoreline master programs, developed and adopted locally, approved and adopted by the State Department of Ecology. Clark County adopted its first Shoreline Master Program in 1974 and updated its program in 2012. Shoreline Master Program policies are included in Chapter 13 of the comprehensive plan. Regulations are included in Chapter 40.460 of Clark County Code. There's also a shoreline map, the current version which is shown here. The Shoreline Master Program only applies to unincorporated areas in Clark County that fall under shoreline jurisdiction.

Next slide. So, Clark County is undertaking a periodic review of its Shoreline Master Program as required by the Washington State Shoreline Management Act in RCW 90.58.080(4). The Act requires each master program be reviewed and revised if needed on an eight-year schedule established by the legislature.

The review ensures the program stays current with changes in laws and rules, remains consistent with other plans and regulations and is responsive to changed circumstances, new information and improved data. Ecology provides a periodic review checklist which summarizes amendments to State laws, rules and applicable updated guidance that may trigger the need for local Shoreline Master Program amendments during periodic reviews and staff have followed the review procedures outlined in WAC 173-26-090(3)(b) using the checklist to document our master program review consideration and to determine if local amendments are needed to maintain compliance.

The next slide. The County Council adopted a public participation plan for the project in September 2019. County staff collected informal feedback in fall 2019 through community outreach activities and developed an initial draft proposal towards the end of 2019. A further revised proposal was published for a 30-day public comment period in early 2020, that feedback was reviewed and another version of the proposal was developed which is before you for your consideration today.

Next slide. From August 2019 through July of 2020 written comments were received from approximately 32 individuals and groups. These comments were provided to you in Exhibit 5 of your hearing material. A summary of comments received during the 30-day comment period was provided in Exhibit 6.

In that summary document you can see the approach staff used when reviewing comments and deciding whether or not and how to address them in this proposal. We sorted through

comments and categorized them in four ways. There were comments that were more questions or items that didn't necessarily lend themselves to -- sorry, my screen froze for a second, one moment.

Okay. So there were comments that were more questions that didn't really lend themselves to questions that were or through questions and response or research that really didn't lend themselves to any change in the Shoreline Master Program. There were also comments that would require a change in State law in order for local government to implement the idea, so those suggestions are being passed forward to the County Council and Department of Ecology as policy considerations are not included in the proposal before you today.

There was also feedback that seemed like it needed to be addressed in this periodic review because it's consistent with Ecology guidelines and the Shoreline Management Act and in order to keep our Shoreline Master Program current and accurate and with complete scientific information, those types of changes are incorporated in the proposal before you today.

And then finally as you may have seen in the comments, there were also many policy suggestions and those we are sharing with County Council for their consideration. Community Planning is recommending that should any of these topics be of Council interests, that these policy items be addressed in Community Planning or Community Development work programs as additional future conversations or projects as the items are significant in nature.

So those are all the comments basically over the past year of towards to July 20th. And then since July 20th up until this hearing today we received four additional written comments from individuals and/or groups that were shared with you all and posted to the Planning Commission website. We believe that Planning Commission members have read all submitted comments and will be considering them during your deliberation this evening.

Next slide. For members of the public who may not have reviewed all of the comments, typically we've heard about a variety of items most of which are listed on this slide.

Next slide. Before you tonight is a proposal to amend the Clark County Shoreline Master Program in the Comprehensive Growth Management Plan 2015-2035; Chapters 40.440, 40.450 and 40.460 of Clark County Code and the Shoreline Designation Map. I will be brief about each item in the proposal, but I'm glad to go into any of them in more detail in response to your questions later on this evening.

The first batch of amendments I'll review are items that are needed to improve the county's Shoreline Master Program consistency with current Shoreline Management Act, laws and rules.

The proposal includes an amendment to update the cost threshold for freshwater docks to determine at what dollar amount a freshwater dock requires a shoreline substantial development permit versus being exempt from requiring one. The proposal often includes

amendments to the residential uses section to address how to handle the possible relocation of legally established floating homes and on-water residences. There is also an amendment proposed to clarify that legally established on-water residences are a conforming use. The proposal includes amendments to help clarify the procedures for granting relief from a shoreline restoration project within an urban growth area resulting in a shift in the ordinary high water mark.

Next slide. The proposal includes amendments to better align with permit filing procedures and use of return receipt requested mail on permit submittals to the Department of Ecology. The proposal includes an amendment in the recreational uses section to allow public boat ramps to be located in a floodway. And the proposal includes adding Carty Lake to the shoreline map. Carty Lake falls under the jurisdiction of the Shoreline Master Program but it's currently missing from the County's shoreline map.

Next slide. This slide shows the current shoreline map on the left and the proposed map change outline on the right. Carty Lake is mostly located outside of the city of Ridgefield and the City is responsible for adding the portion of the lake within the city boundaries to its shoreline map.

The next slide. The proposal includes several amendments related to bringing the Shoreline Master Program wetland regulations into alignment with current State wetlands guidance. Minor revisions to Chapter 40.450 of Clark County Code which is the County's Wetland Protection Critical Areas Code or Critical Areas Ordinance are proposed and if adopted will be incorporated into the Shoreline Master Program by reference. More significant changes are proposed directly in the Shoreline Master Program in Chapter 40.460 of Clark County Code and will be addressed in the Wetlands Critical Areas Ordinance during a future separate project.

Next slide. So in Chapter 40.450 Clark County Code which is the chapter on wetland protection the following amendments are proposed: There is a correction to the habitat corridor buffer standards to apply only to wetlands with habitat function scores higher than five on the rating system form. This amendment would bring this code section into alignment with current wetland standards and with an oversight in previous revisions that we're working to bring our code into alignment with current guidelines.

There's also a clarification on wetland delineation information requirements. And there is an amendment regarding functionally isolated buffer areas. These are areas that are functionally separated from a wetland and do not protect the wetland from adverse impacts.

For instance, if there were a road in a wetland buffer depending on the situation it's possible that road is functionally isolating one side of the buffer on one side of the road from the buffer and the wetland on the other side of the road. The proposed amendment for these functionally isolated buffer areas would remove vertical separation as a de facto characteristic for exclusion from buffers otherwise required.

In the Critical Areas Ordinance where the code covers buffer standards and authorized activities, the activities in a buffer section states that regulated activity not involving stormwater management, road and utility crossings or a buffer reduction via enhancement are allowed in the buffer if all of the following conditions are met, and then the text goes on to describe those conditions.

This proposal includes an amendment to delete the language via enhancement and instead references the Code Section 40.450.040(C)(1) which points to the whole reduced buffer width modification code section which includes enhancement but also other items. An amendment is proposed regarding wetland mitigation to offset buffer function if full buffers cannot be provided.

So the additional wetland related amendments that I'm going to discuss are those that will apply to Clark County Code Section 40.460.530(G), so this is the wetland section of the Shoreline Master Program regulation.

Typically wetland buffer widths are determined by the Shoreline Administrator in accordance with the standards in the Wetlands Critical Areas Ordinance; however, there are some wetland buffer width exceptions. For instance, there are buffer width exceptions regarding urban plats as described in Section 40.450.030(E)(3) and if adopted this proposal would make those exceptions not apply in the shoreline management area.

So that section on urban plats basically is saying that wetlands and wetland buffers shall be placed within a non-buildable tract with the following exceptions: (a) creation of a non-buildable tract would result in violation of minimum lot depth standards; or, (b) the responsible official determines the tract is impractical; and, (c) where the responsible official determines the exception in (a) or (b) apply -- if those items within either (a) or (b) apply in residential lots, those then may extend into wetlands and wetland buffers provided that all requirements in the Wetlands Critical Areas Ordinance are met.

So in shorelines instead of that urban plat exception section applying, mitigation sequencing must be applied instead of those exceptions, and so this change would help bring the Shoreline Master Program into alignment with current wetland guidance.

There are also adjusted buffer width standards in the Wetlands Critical Areas Ordinance where under certain circumstances the width of a wetland buffer may be adjusted. This proposal would amend the Shoreline Master Program so that there's a maximum width reduction of 25 percent from the required buffer at any location within the shoreline management area and this proposed change is also to help bring the Shoreline Master Program into alignment with current wetland guidance.

Also related to adjusted buffer width standard, this proposal would amend the Shoreline Code

so that two sections of the Wetland Critical Areas Ordinance would not apply to the shoreline management area. The first code section which is 40.450.030(E)(4)(b)(2) refers to distinct portions of wetlands with reduced habitat functions not being subject to habitat function buffers when certain criteria are met.

And in the second code section is 40.450.030(E)(4)(c) which relates to setting maximum buffer areas when adjusting buffer widths on wetland permits. So those two sections not applying in the shoreline management area would help bring our Shoreline Master Program into alignment with current wetland guidance. Next slide.

HOLLEY: Jenna, I need you to slow down a little bit, please.

KAY: Okay. So a few more wetland related amendments. These are still in Chapter 40.460, so in the Shoreline Master Program regulations. So the proposal includes a clarification that the wetland buffer reduction allowed in the Critical Areas Ordinance shall only be approved within the shoreline management area if all of the applicable land use intensity modification measures listed are proposed.

The noted, the code section that's referenced in that amendment is to a section of the Critical Areas Code that discusses land use intensity modification measures that basically can be implemented to reduce buffer width, and the proposed text also notes that low impact development design buffer standard measures in this code section do not apply towards reducing buffers in shoreline management areas. The proposal also includes a clarification that the avoidance minimization and mitigation sequence applies to wetland buffers in addition to the wetlands themselves.

And for stormwater facilities allowed in buffers of wetlands with low habitat function which is less than six points, the proposal would require that these facilities be located in the outer 25 percent of the wetland buffer cannot degrade existing function and must blend with the natural landscape.

For required wetland mitigation ratios in the Wetland Critical Areas Ordinance, this proposal would make it such that Section 40.450.040(D)(4)(c)(4) does not apply in shoreline jurisdiction. This referenced section states that in wetlands where several wetland classifications are found, each classification can be scored and rated separately and then the mitigation ratios are developed based on that rating approach; however, this statement is inconsistent with current wetland mitigation and rating guidance and the proposed amendment would for this -- for that Wetland Code not to apply in shorelines would help bring our Shoreline Master Program into alignment with current guidelines.

And the last wetland amendment is to clarify that alternate wetland mitigation credit option include the current in-lieu-fee program. Okay.

So now next slide. So the next batch of amendments I will review are those items that would improve consistency with other plans and regulations. The proposal includes an amendment to update the shoreline map to incorporate the revised flood maps for the southeastern portion of the county that went into effect in January of 2018.

Next slide. This slide shows the current shoreline map on the left and the proposed map change outlined on the right. I would like to note that in preparing for this hearing tonight I did catch an error in Exhibits 1 and 3 that showed the new proposed shoreline map and that all of the changes shown on this slide on the right side weren't showing up in those exhibits, so we did fix it and republished it as soon as we caught the issue and we did double-check that we procedurally did contact all of the right property owners and neighbors to these areas, so the issue was just in the exhibits themselves.

Next slide. The proposal also includes an amendment to fix inconsistencies between the current 100-year floodplain and the boundary of the shoreline jurisdiction along Lacamas Lake.

The next slide. This slide shows the current shoreline map on the left and the proposed map change outline on the right. And then similar to my note about the last map change, also we caught an error in those map exhibits of these changes not showing up, so we fixed that and double-checked, we procedurally contacted everyone correctly, those are the only map errors that we did note. Okay.

Next slide. The proposal also includes an amendment to add a statement to the aquaculture section in the Shoreline Master Program to reference a 2018 law, RCW 77.125.050, that prohibits marine net pen aquaculture activities for nonnative finfish species unless these activities are performed under a lease of state owned aquatic lands in effect on June 7th, 2018.

The proposal also includes an amendment to revise text in Chapter 40.440 of Clark County Code which is the County's habitat conservation chapter and the habitat conservation section of the Shoreline Master Program to improve clarity on defining priority habitat and species areas and updating the best available science documents listed.

The proposal also includes an amendment to update the Shoreline Master Program Critical Area Code section to fill in missing ordinances and the date of the most recent ordinance for each critical area.

Next slide. The proposal includes an amendment to revise the makeup of the shoreline management review committee and internal county committee that reviewed all projects requiring a shoreline substantial development permit, conditional use permit or variance. The proposal includes an amendment for shoreline projects for the concurrent Type III land use action such as the -- such that -- okay. Sorry, let me start that one over.

The proposal includes an amendment for shoreline projects for the concurrent Type III land use

action such that the shoreline management review committee may cede its authority to the Hearing Examiner to help streamline county processes.

Next slide. The next batch of amendments is for items in response to new information. The proposal includes incorporation of updated Department of Natural Resources water feature data in the shoreline map, this includes updated water body layer and labels. The proposal also includes an amendment to remove a section of wetlands from the shoreline map near Shanghai Creek.

Next slide. This slide shows the current shoreline map on the left and the proposed map change outlined on the right. The supporting documentation for this change was provided in your hearing materials in Exhibit 13 and it explains how this area of wetlands does not technically meet the definition of being with shoreline jurisdiction.

Next slide. The proposal includes amendments to update the shoreline map near the confluence of the Lewis and Columbia rivers to integrate new data collected on properties in the area.

Next slide. And this slide shows the current shoreline map on the left and the proposed map change outlined on the right, and there was a lot of supporting documentation for this change provided in Exhibits 10, 11 and 12 of your hearing material.

Next slide. Additionally, there are a handful of amendments proposed that are housekeeping in nature in both the comprehensive plan and Shoreline Master Program Code, I won't walk through those right now but I'm glad to answer questions on them.

Next slide. So in the staff report you have reviewed staff findings on the proposal in regards to each of the four evaluation criteria established in WAC 173-26-201 and these criteria need to be met in order for the County's Shoreline Master Program amendments to be approved by the State Department of Ecology.

Staff found that the proposal meets all four criteria and is recommending approval of the proposal before you. Thank you for your consideration of this proposal and I'm glad to answer any of your questions. Thank you.

JOHNSON: Okay. With that said, does any of the PC have questions? It looks like we're changing it here to just use your raised hand function to indicate that you would like to ask a question.

Seeing no questions to staff, we will now open the hearing for public testimony. Written comments received as of August 20th, 2020, were submitted to the PC members and posted on the PC website. We will now take oral testimony just as we did earlier this evening.

For attendees using their computer or Webex application, if you would like to speak on a non-hearing item, please utilize the hand-raised icon put up on screen, a photo. Staff will only acknowledge those attendees during the public comment period who have raised their hand by selecting the hand icon.

When you are acknowledged, you will be unmuted, please state and spell your name and provide your address for the record. Please note, public comment is limited to three minutes per person in order to accommodate all speakers.

Attendees using the telephone, which is the audio only option, you need to press 3 to raise your hand, and when it's your turn to comment, Larisa will unmute you, you will hear a message that says you have been unmuted. Please state and spell your name and provide your address for the record. When you have finished your comment, press 3 to lower your hand, you will hear a message that says you have lowered your hand.

Please note, public comment is limited to three minutes per person in order to accommodate all speakers. Larisa will mute or unmute people with raised hands one at a time. If attendee provided name, will read off name before unmuting. Otherwise, will indicate she is unmuting the next caller.

Public Testimony

Larisa, are there any public comments?

SIDOROV: As of right now I see one public comment. It would be Sue Marshall, I will now unmute you.

JOHNSON: Sue, can you hear us?

MARSHALL: Yes, I can hear you. Can you hear me?

JOHNSON: Yes, I can. Can you please state your name and address for the record.

MARSHALL: Sure. My name is Sue Marshall. My address is 4316 N.W. 169th Street, Ridgefield, Washington, 98642. So thank you for the opportunity to provide testimony. I'm with Friends of Clark County, I'm here representing them too tonight. We submitted some written testimony earlier this week along with the Sierra Club and we would both like to be considered parties of record.

Just to provide a little bit of context here, one example of one water body, many of our members are actively engaged in restoration of the East Fork Lewis River. Both the State and County have invested a great deal in development of water quality cleanup plan for the East

Fork and Legacy Lands program, six of the ten approved land purchases this last round were in the East Fork.

This is all, just as I said, this is one example of the investment that the community has had and I hope that you will adopt the strongest possible Shoreline Management Program to compliment and honor these public investment. So just to hit a few points.

Mitigation, we're not sure if we're achieving the no net loss goal with mitigation and we're not sure that we have actually the metrics to tell if we're achieving it or not. There is a need to enforce some mitigation hierarchy more stringently via void minimize mitigate with a void being the very first consideration and mitigate being the last one.

Mitigation needs to be near, you know, on-site where the impact is occurring on a neighboring property or within the basement to truly mitigate for the impact of that water body. There's a need to monitor, follow up and enforce mandatory mitigation to assure that it is successful because right now the assumption is the goals that the mitigation plan state are achieved and there's no ground proofing. There also is a need for some baseline detail ecological metric so that we're able to compare over time what impacts there have been, right now we don't have that information.

Buffers, we think in many cases they should be wider and we should comply with the State best available science. We're concerned about climate change and the need to be adaptable with the inevitable sea rise. The landscape is changing. An analysis of geological hazard would be important, again to protect property so that they're not sliding off a cliff. And that mitigation that site potential for shape needs to be an important consideration to improve water quality.

I just might note that all of these things are GMA requirements that improve salmon habitat. So we encourage the County to take a proactive stance to identify and protect existing high-value habitat, not wait for a species to become on the brink of extinction, to apply net ecological gain rather than the no net loss as a better assurance to the public that resources are protected and to incorporate removal of fish passage barriers and restoration into Public Works projects starting with an inventory of those barriers in the county.

We understand that critical areas is up next and given the current inadequacies of the critical areas program it should compel a stronger implementation measure at this time with the Shoreline Master Program. So we encourage this proactive stance rather than hoping to get by, waiting for an appeal or a legal challenge all of which are costly, time consuming, creates uncertainty for property owners and do not serve our community well. So thank you very much for your service during this difficult time and consideration of our comments. Thank you.

SIDOROV: Okay. Thank you, Sue. You can now raise your hand down, lower your hand, sorry.

JOHNSON: Thank you for your comment. Larisa, are there any more public comments?

SIDOROV: I am seeing none as of right now. Sue, you can click star 3 and it will raise your hand, I mean lower your hand.

JOHNSON: Larisa, are you hearing me?

SIDOROV: Karl, can you hear me?

JOHNSON: Yeah. Yeah. Can you hear me now?

SIDOROV: Sorry about that. No, we have no more.

JOHNSON: Are there any more public comment?

SIDOROV: No, we do not have any more public comments as of right now.

Return to Planning Commission

JOHNSON: Okay. Thank you. Seeing none, we will close the public portion testimony of the hearing. Staff, is there anybody that would like to respond to the testimony of the public, please use your hand, little hand raiser? Okay. Seeing none, the Commission will now deliberate on making a recommendation to the Council.

SIDOROV: Ron's hand was raised.

JOHNSON: Yeah, we're deliberating now. Okay. Ron, go ahead.

BARCA: Okay. I had a question for staff. The question comes around the idea of what data are we using to verify whether we have mitigated net loss to be no net loss or data that could be used to look at the idea of ecological gain, how are we gathering that type of data?

KAY: Sure. Brent, do you want to chime in on this one?

DAVIS: Sure. Can everybody hear me? Okay.

KAY: Yes, go ahead.

DAVIS: So when we queue a shoreline permit whether it's a shoreline exemption or a substantial development permit, conditional use permit or variance, if there is mitigation required for wetlands or fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas, there is a monitoring period that is required with that mitigation, it can range from three to ten years with schedules that vary, but generally for two to three years we're looking, we're requiring some kind of monitoring activity every year as we move into longer time frames, we may skip some years as

we get further down the process and we are tracking those requirements through our LMS system, scheduling dates when those are due and reaching out to folks when they have not submitted their required monitoring reports.

In terms of the types of data for relatively small mitigations, particularly for single-family homes, we often accept data in terms of photographs indicating the performance of their plantings, and then we would only followup with a site inspection if the photographs did not document plant performance well enough that we could determine that they're meeting their performance standards for survivorship and growth.

For more complicated projects we actually require a professionally prepared monitoring report and each of those plans has specific performance standards that they have to meet, so the report has appropriate measurements to address those performance standards and they can range from plant survival rates, plant growth, generally measured by canopy cover and that sort of thing.

If there's wetland mitigation, there can be specific standards for hydrology in specific areas, it's really tailored to the specific plan to identify key metrics that will determine whether or not that plan is meeting its goals. And we also for larger plans hold financial assurances for that monitoring period either in the form of generally surety bond or a deposit account that has funds that are set aside by the applicant that are not released back to them until they are meeting a performance standard, so that's how we do the monitoring piece on that.

BARCA: Thank you. I appreciate that. So I guess then to kind of build on that, do we have data that shows at a systemic basis how particular waterways are doing overall on whether they're degrading even without projects?

DAVIS: We do not. That is -- we have a, and Jenna can speak to this as well, we have a monitoring plan in the Shoreline Master Program that we are compiling data in terms of the permits issued, the amount of impact that was authorized, the amount of mitigation that was required and that sort of thing, but it is being done at a county level and not at a reach level, and most of that data is based on permits issued, it hasn't taken the next step to correlate that with the monitoring data that we're collecting for each of those projects.

I think we can get there in the future but, you know, we need to collect enough of that monitoring data for enough years to have a useful database to work with in order to link what, you know, what's been issued in the permit to what actually happened on the ground over time and then correlate that back to specific stream reaches.

BARCA: Thank you.

KAY: Yeah, I can add onto that just a little bit. So, with the 2012 update for the Shoreline Master Program there was a lot of extensive work to compile like all the existing data on stream

and lake health in the county and that was used to basically establish a 2012 baseline; however, with this periodic review it wasn't scoped by Department of Ecology to redo that work, so we didn't -- we haven't done like any review of like pulling all data to check eight years later, right, how are we, what is stream health doing, I mean it would still be even if we had the net, it would still be very high level type of information, so because I think, so that's one thing to mention.

And then I also think in terms of looking at the data we have been collecting since 2012, that's like, that's, Brent mentioned about like permit data, like what has been permitted in terms of amount of impervious surface added, amount of mitigation required, things like that, we're collecting that now but one of our challenges that we don't really know what our, like our baseline, so we have baseline for like general stream and lake health, but the things we can measure like impervious surface and amount of mitigation required or amount of impact to wetland or habitat areas, we don't really know where we started in 2012 at that level of detail.

So we have a challenge of what we are able to track and the data we have and I think the commenter was getting at this in that we have some challenges on being able to measure as well as we would like to be able to.

BARCA: Thanks.

JOHNSON: Okay. Okay. Any other comments for staff, fellas? Okay. Seeing none, the Commission will now deliberate and make a recommendation to Council. I will call each Planning Commission member one at a time to make your comments if you have any. Ron Barca.

BARCA: I saw that Bryant had his hand up, I don't know whether that was inadvertent or whether there was more that he had before we go to deliberation. Bryant, can you indicate?

ENGE: Yes, Ron, thank you. I just wanted to piggyback on the question that you asked that and their response and it sounds like data is being collected. My question to staff is how is that information being communicated to the public from, you know, is it recording, is it on the web, how is that information being disseminated?

KAY: As of right now we are not publishing any reports on it. So we started tracking like we have a spreadsheet at the County and like the mitigation data that Brent is collecting right now, again like it's all available by public records request but there is no official reporting requirements and it seems like some additional researchers would be needed if we were to shift in that direction, so it is not easily accessible without someone specifically asking for it.

ENGE: Okay. Thank you.

JOHNSON: I'm putting him on mute. Are there any more questions of staff?

MORASCH: Yeah. Yeah. Karl, I have one.

JOHNSON: I see you, Steve. Good to see you.

MORASCH: Yeah. Yeah. I apologize if this was covered in staff's presentation and I missed it, but my question is, has the DEAB reviewed these changes, and if so, did the DEAB have any comments on them?

KAY: Yes. So we, I believe we met with DEAB three times since the start of the project. They did have some questions and concerns regarding some of the proposed amendments regarding wetland.

One suggestion they made has already been incorporated into the proposal that you're seeing and then there were two items and, Brent, you might have to help me out here, they had some concerns regarding the proposed, the proposal that was specifying stormwater facilities have to be located in the outer 25 percent of a wetland buffer. The current Critical Areas Ordinance for wetlands has the language that they need to be located in the outer edge and so they have some concerns with the specificity about the outer 25 percent.

And I'm trying to remember what their other concern was. It is in your comments, it is captured in the comment materials. Oh, their other concern was about the urban plat exception not applying in shoreline management areas. So, Brent, you can probably expand on their concerns a bit more.

DAVIS: Yeah. The two that, well, actually there were three, there was those two and then they were concerned about the elimination of the wetland buffer reductions for incorporating LID in their stormwater plan and those three proposals when we presented to them were proposed to be in the Critical Areas Ordinance as opposed to just the Shoreline Master Program and in response to their concerns we made those revisions and only to the Shoreline Master Program at this time and they will be even further consideration under our CAO update when we get to that.

MORASCH: Okay. What was DEABs response to that, were they okay with that or did they still think that those provisions shouldn't be changed even in the shoreline management update?

DAVIS: I would say, I mean they're concerned but they understood that, you know, that these changes were necessary to the Shoreline Master Program to be consistent with the Shoreline Management Act.

We have more discretion under the Critical Areas Ordinance with regard to these matters and so I think, you know, they're not, they're concerned about those changes in the shoreline management area, although I just based on experience that we've had thus far with this master

program, those issues do not come up very frequently in the shoreline management area because generally projects are trying to avoid that area as much as possible, you know, particularly for like residential development in particular.

And so I think they were while they're concerned, they're understanding that, you know, that these are changes that we really can't avoid in a shoreline management area and they'll have more to say about it when we look at it in CAO.

MORASCH: Okay. Thanks.

JOHNSON: Okay. Any more questions for staff? All right. Seeing none, the Commission will now deliberate and make a recommendation to Council. I will call each Planning Commissioners' name one more time to make your comments. Ron Barca.

BARCA: Thank you, Karl. As we have seen over the years with the shoreline management basically it's a 900-pound gorilla that Ecology gives us and we don't have a lot of wiggle room. As much as I would like for us to be given the end state that we have to achieve and then allow us to try and craft proposals that we think locally are most palatable for us, a lot of times we get very specific rulings similar to that 25 percent on the outer perimeter kind of dictates, and we've also known in the past that there's not a lot that we can do in that regard that this is something that keeps us in compliance or it doesn't.

The one thing I guess I would like to say for the future going forward for staff, we're starting to see more environmental agitation towards the idea of net gain and I think a portion of that is there's no way for us to really determine whether we are holding our own or losing ground and the quality of the different waterways and reaches that we're trying to protect and it seems like we would be doing ourselves a big favor by being able to have established some baselines and show how the projects going forward are not detrimental and that existing development is not deteriorating the waterways that we're in discussion on.

So I would ask staff to look at the potential of putting it in their work plan, presenting that to County Council specifically for the idea of the good faith effort to show the public on the efforts that are already being done and that we believe that they're showing some value in the efforts that are being made. That's my comments at this time.

JOHNSON: Thank you, Ron. Bryant with a T.

ENGE: I just want to echo what Ron just said. I believe that, you know, we would be, we'd be doing ourselves a good service by showing a good faith effort in terms of presenting information in terms of how we are currently maintaining and trying to improve the program. That's all.

JOHNSON: Okay. Thank you. Brian Halbert.

HALBERT: Yeah, thanks. You know, I thought the presentation was very well done and I hope I don't have to read through 24 exhibits again, it's been a long time. I was -- I thought that they were also very careful with their responses and their considerations of all the responders, it seemed like they really put some time into research and to me their entire body of work just reflects to that education that they have to this process.

I understand what Ron and Bryant are saying in that we don't really have a great baseline to measure that by except that the staff is really working to comply with many competing interests in this process. So that's all my comments.

JOHNSON: Thank you. Steve Morasch.

MORASCH: Thanks, Karl. Well, I guess I'll echo what has already been said and I won't add to it too much. I mean, staff's done a lot of work on this so... I, you know, I don't really have any comments beyond that, just thank staff for all their work and that's about all the comments I have at this point.

JOHNSON: Thank you, Steve. I want to echo both of these, you guys were very well prepared, lots of information, so I want to congratulate both of the things that we had on the agenda today for hard work and it looks like you put some good effort into it, so thank you. With that said, I will accept a motion if somebody wants to somehow.

ENGE: Well, I'll make a **MOTION** to approve the staff recommendation as presented in the today's staff proposal.

BARCA: Second it.

HALBERT: I'll second that motion.

JOHNSON: Sonja, will you take a roll call, please.

ROLL CALL VOTE

BARCA: AYE

ENGE: AYE

HALBERT: AYE

MORASCH: AYE

JOHNSON: AYE

WISER: 5/0.

JOHNSON: So, Sonja, that's a 5/0 vote, the motion passes.

OLD BUSINESS

JOHNSON: Is there any old business? We use the raised hand function if you have any old business. Seeing none.

NEW BUSINESS

JOHNSON: New business, this was just given to me right before, the election of officers for the Planning Commission hearing, it's put off from September to October. For, as of right now, we don't have anything for September, is that correct, Sonja?

WISER: Yes, it is.

JOHNSON: Okay. And then again is there any new business that needs to be raised? Okay. Good job, that wasn't too bad, gentlemen, I appreciate it. Ladies, appreciate it. With that said, we'll adjourn.

COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION

JOHNSON: Oh, is there any, before I adjourn, are there any more comments from the Planning Commission, anyone?

BARCA: I have a question concerning that Orchards neighborhood letter that came out to us, is that something that we're supposed to be seeing in the future or is that grievances over something that was done long in the past?

ORJIAKO: Can you hear me Planning Commission members?

JOHNSON: Yes.

ORJIAKO: First of all, let me thank the Planning Commission for, you know, this our first virtual meeting, it's hard but I appreciate your indulgence and we will get better as we move forward, we are very hopeful that maybe we'll move into a phase where we will resume our in person meeting.

Commissioner Barca, to your question, we have forwarded that inquiry to or complaint, if you will, to Community Development and we will be following up to make sure that there is a response, that also was forwarded to the Council. So it's (inaudible) and we will deal with it as such, it's not something that my shop will handle, but the appropriate staff have been notified.

I hope that answers your question, community staff will be following up and I will be reaching out to the Community Development Director to make sure that there is a response.

BARCA: Thank you.

ORJIAKO: You're welcome, sir.

ADJOURNMENT

JOHNSON: Thank you, Oliver. Okay. Are there any more comments from the Planning Commission? All right. Gentlemen, with that said, this meeting is 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>

Television 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, Program Assistant, Clark County Community Planning*