

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**

**6:30 P.M. – SPECIAL MEETING
FOLLOWED BY PUBLIC HEARING**

**THURSDAY, OCTOBER 15, 2020
6:30 p.m.**

CALL TO ORDER

JOHNSON: Why don't you go ahead and take the meeting, Ron, if that's okay with you.

BARCA: Okay. We have a quorum. Let's go ahead and call this meeting to order. This is an online public meeting for Thursday, October 15th, 2020. I am Ron Barca, the vice chair of the Clark County Planning Commission.

BARCA: Before we begin, I would like to ask the Planning Commission to amend tonight's agenda. The special meeting has been added to amend CCC 40.260.115, clarifying the definition of substance use disorder treatment facility as it pertains to the restriction restricting of the location of marijuana facilities.

Another amendment to tonight's agenda is CPZ2020-00009, Hidden Glen, the item is being pulled at the applicant's request and will be rolled over to 2021.

GENERAL & NEW BUSINESS

A. Approval of Agenda for October 15, 2020

BARCA: Do any members of the Planning Commission have questions before we amend tonight's agenda? If not, I will have Sonja take roll call. Please say yes if your name is called and you are in favor of amending tonight's agenda.

ROLL CALL

SWINDELL: ABSENT
ENGE: YES
MORASCH: ABSENT

HALBERT: YES
TORRES: ABSENT
JOHNSON: YES
BARCA: YES

BARCA: All right. Thank you. Tonight's agenda has now been amended. 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.

B. Open Statement & Planning Commission Rules of Procedure

BARCA: The role of the Planning Commission is to 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 perspective and information.

In legislative matters the role of the Planning Commission is advisory. The County Council will hold separate hearings, consider our recommendations and make a final determination. The procedures is as follows:

The Planning Commission will conduct a public hearing tonight, take testimony regarding the matters being considered. All public comments received by mail, e-mail before the beginning of the hearing will be entered into the record.

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

When we get to the public comment, we will provide more detailed information. Please keep 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 to 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 testimony from the applicant and the public. The Commission will then deliberate and make recommendations 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 on your video camera throughout tonight'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 for the people testifying tonight whether you agree with their comments or not.

Would anyone on the Planning Commission like to disclose any conflicts of interest on tonight's agenda? Okay. Hearing none, let's start with the roll call of the Planning Commission members who are present, please say I'm here after Sonja calls your name. Sonja, please take roll call.

ROLL CALL

ENGE: I'm here.
BARCA: Sorry, there was a lot of background noise, I missed that. I am here.
HALBERT: I'm here.
MORASCH: ABSENT
SWINDELL: ABSENT
TORRES: ABSENT
JOHNSON: I'm here.

GENERAL & NEW BUSINESS

B. Approval of Minutes for August 20, 2020

BARCA: Okay. So, the first order of business for general business, approval of the minutes for August 20th. Can I have a motion to approve the minutes for August 20th as written.

JOHNSON: **Motion** for to approve the minutes for August 20th.

HALBERT: I'll **second** that. Bryan Halbert, I'll second that motion.

BARCA: Okay. There's been a motion and seconded. Roll call, please.

ROLL CALL

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

WISER: 4 yeses.

C. Communications from the Public

BARCA: Okay. I'm back. This is the point in time in the hearing in which we take comments from the public. We're asking for these comments to be not related to any of tonight's agenda items. If anybody from the public wishes to speak on items other than what is presented as the agenda, this is the opportunity for the Planning Commission to hear those comments. And in front of you on the screen is how one raises their hand to participate.

KAMP: Ron, I'm going to go ahead and just give them verbal instructions for those that also are calling in.

BARCA: All right. I'm going to mute.

KAMP: Okay. So, for attendees using their computer or WebEx application, if you would like to speak for this general public comment period, please utilize the raised hand icon. You can do this by clicking the participant button or icon, the location of which depends on the device you are using.

We have two graphics up here that show where it would look like on a computer or a tablet, so once you find the participant button, your hand icon should show, please click on that if you would like to speak and that will let us know that you have raised your hand and would like to provide public comment. When you are acknowledged, you will be unmuted.

For attendees using the telephone tonight, you need to press star 3 on your phone's number panel to raise your hand. When you do this, 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, please press star 3, that lowers your hand and you will hear a message that lets you know you have done so.

Okay. We do have one so far, so I'm going to identify this caller as or this member of the public by Andrew. I'm going to unmute you.

PETERSON: Hello.

KAMP: Hello. We can hear you.

PETERSON: Okay. This is all just really strange to me, I'm just trying to get in on the fact of the bike lanes being possibly put in on 159th.

KAMP: I believe that that --

BARCA: And we will cover that as part of the agenda this evening.

PETERSON: Okay. That's all I'm kind of here to make sure my word gets put in there and my worries.

BARCA: Okay. So now you know how to chime in when it's public comment time, that was good practice, and when we get to the portion of talking about the arterial atlas, you'll be able to add your comments. Anybody else?

KAMP: No one else has raised their hand. And, Andrew, if you could go ahead and click on your hand again to lower it so that we know you have finished your comments.

PETERSON: Okay. Thank you.

KAMP: Thank you.

BARCA: Okay. I'm going to move to the next part of the agenda. Allow me to pull that screen up.

KAMP: Give me one second. Okay.

PLANNING COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING – 6:30 p.m.

- A. A proposal to amend CCC 40.260.115 to clarify the definition of a Substance Use Disorder (SUD) Treatment Facility, as it pertains to restricting the location of marijuana facilities.
Staff Contacts: Lindsey.Shafar@clark.wa.gov or (564) 397- 5675
Susan.Ellinger@clark.wa.gov or (564) 397- 5122

BARCA: All right. So, we are moving into the proposed amendments and it looks like first up is IV.A, a proposal to Amend CCC 40.260.115 and let's go with the staff report.

SHAFAR: Good evening. For the record my name is Lindsey Shafar, it's L-i-n-d-s-e-y and the last name is S-h-a-f-a-r, I'm the Senior Policy Analyst to the County Council, so I see your recommendations but I haven't had the pleasure of appearing before you so good evening.

What's before you, the County Council is looking at an amendment to Clark County Code 40.260.115 regarding marijuana facilities. I know you have seen this issue previously and this is what I hopefully is the last of what has been a longer saga of what I think staff anticipated.

What happened is in 2019 the County Council lifted the moratorium on marijuana facilities. Subsequent to that there was a biannual code amendment process and unfortunately during that time there was a scrivener's error because staff in drafting the biannual code amendment which related to marijuana signs, there was some dimension, sign dimensions that needed to change, and during that process they utilized the draft from the prior ordinance that was prior to the Council's adoption of the 2019 ordinance that lifted the moratorium, so in adopting the biannual

code amendments unfortunately that resulted in a scrivener's error as it related to marijuana.

Fast forward to May 6th of this year in bringing back the ordinance that would have addressed the scrivener's error, the Council decided to impose just a temporary interim ordinance so that they could look at the issue of a substance use disorder (SUD) treatment facility and whether or not to regulate the distance at which an SUD treatment facility could be located in proximity to a marijuana establishment.

So, in the process of the Council's conversation they have decided to continue to prohibit marijuana establishments from locating within 500 feet of an SUD treatment facility and additionally the proposed amendment would clarify the definition of an SUD treatment facility. There was some discrepancy regarding what constituted an SUD treatment facility and (inaudible) if it's supported tonight would make it similar that such a facility is defined by its licensure by the State of Washington.

The Department of Commerce has been notified of these proposed changes and the County Council hearing is scheduled for next Tuesday, October 20th. So, staff is recommending approval to both correct the scrivener's error and to follow the County Council's desire regarding the substance abuse treatment facilities. I'm happy to answer any questions.

BARCA: Do we know if there are any conflicts between existing substance use disorder treatment facilities and existing marijuana facilities?

SHAFAR: So, with the revision in the language, no, there are no conflicts. There was some question because there are facilities that in other locations that entity provides SUD treatment, but that's a location in proximity to the marijuana establishment, that location of this approved doesn't provide SUD treatment facility, so this clarification helps some of that, so, no.

I think the primary issue will be if and when the Liquor Cannabis Board opens up for additional licenses, right now they're not giving any licenses and we have no indications that will change any time soon, but of course that's a matter for State law and they could do it at any time, but right now, no, they're not issuing new licenses that we are expecting.

BARCA: Okay. So nobody is in an immediate jeopardy based on us making this change, and then whoever comes forward first to be permitted would have precedent within the confines of if they are in a good space the substance use disorder treatment facility could not locate within 500 feet of an existing marijuana facility and an existing marijuana facility -- or sorry -- and a future marijuana facility could not locate within 500 feet of an existing substance use disorder treatment facility?

SHAFAR: Partially correct. So a marijuana establishment as new licenses are granted, a new marijuana establishment could not locate within 500 feet of an existing SUD treatment facility; however, if a marijuana establishment is sited, located and operational and then an SUD

treatment facility decides to locate within 500 feet, that does not force the marijuana establishment to have to close.

BARCA: But we would allow the substance use disorder treatment facility to locate within it, within that zone?

SHAFAR: Correct. Yes. Assuming that all other zoning was met, you know, that wouldn't be the limiting threshold, that's correct.

BARCA: Strange. Okay.

SHAFAR: And it's happened across the state, so, yes, I agree it is a bit strange.

BARCA: All right. I'm going to mute. Is there any other questions from Commission? Seeing none, do we have public comment?

Public Comment

KAMP: Okay. Let's see if we have public comment. I'm going to go ahead and let's go through the directions one more time for those that might have just joined us.

For attendees using your computer or Internet, please find the raised hand icon to let us know that you would like to make a public comment. If you don't see the raised hand icon, please find the participant button or icon depending on what type of device you are using, click on that, and you'll find the hand icon, click on the hand icon to indicate that you would like to speak. We will unmute you when we acknowledge you for your public comment period of time.

For those that are joining by phone, please press star 3 on your phone's number panel to raise your hand. You'll hear a message that lets you know that you've raised your hand, and when you are acknowledged we will unmute you and you will be able to speak. And please both Internet users and phone users once you're done, if you could lower your hand by either clicking the raised hand icon or dialing star, pressing star 3 again. No raised hands as of now.

Return to Planning Commission

BARCA: Okay. So, let's go to deliberation and if we have questions of staff, we'll come back, if somebody pipes in in the next couple of minutes, I think we can pull them in to the conversation. So, Planning Commission discuss.

HALBERT: Yeah, Bryan here. I do have a question for Lindsey, how many marijuana facilities are currently in the county since it's been opened?

SHAFAR: That's a number I unfortunately don't have off the top of my head. It's less than 15,

it's not very many, and of course that number is inclusive, it's not just the retailers but there's also the producers and processors as well.

HALBERT: So, any new producers, processors and retailers would need to make sure they're outside that 500-foot radius of an SUD, and is that information available or at least discernable, I guess?

SHAFAR: Yeah. So, the way that it works I mean the information is relatively easily discernable. I know it's public information in terms of where all of the SUD treatment facilities, for obvious reasons we want to get that information out to folks so that if they're looking for SUD treatment that they have that information readily available, but in terms of the function what happens is that a licensed application would be made to the Liquor Cannabis Board and then the Liquor Cannabis Board will send notice to Clark County that an application has been made and then the County has the opportunity to do that (inaudible) and say this location, proposed location is within 500 feet of an SUD treatment facility and therefore doesn't meet County Code and at this point then the Liquor Cannabis Board would have that information and determine whether or not to issue the license.

HALBERT: Yeah, thank you, Lindsey. No other questions.

BARCA: Any commentary from Bryant or Karl before we go to roll call?

ENGE: Thank you. This is Bryant Enge. The recommendation I think is straightforward and so at this time I have no further comments.

JOHNSON: I have no comments, Ron.

BARCA: All right. Then under these circumstances, just double-checking, nobody raised their hand from the public?

KAMP: No raised hands.

BARCA: Okay. Then if I can get a motion, we will see what happens next.

HALBERT: Bryan Halbert here, I'll make a **motion**. So, the motion's moved.

JOHNSON: I will **second** that motion. This is Karl Johnson.

BARCA: Okay. It's the motion has been moved to accept staff's recommendation and it's been seconded. Let's go ahead and have roll call.

ROLL CALL VOTE

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

WISER: 4 to 0.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS:

- A. Review proposed **2021-2026 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**. The TIP identifies public works capital projects including new construction, reconstruction, bridges, bicycle and pedestrian, safety, hot mix preservation improvements, signalization construction to maintain and enhance Clark County's transportation system in unincorporated Clark County.
Staff Contact: Susan Wilson, Manager at Susan.Wilson@clark.wa.gov or (564)397-4330

BARCA: All right. Very good. Now let's move on to the public hearing items which is the Transportation Improvement Program. Who's got the ball on this one?

WILSON: I do. Susan Wilson and Chris Carle. Chris Carle is the Transportation Engineer and -- or excuse me -- a Capital Program Engineer and I am the Manager of the Programming Section for the Clark County Public Works Transportation Division and manage the Transportation Improvement Program and oversee grants and contract compliance. Next slide please.

Tonight, our agenda is pretty simplistic. We would like to talk about why we're here and the Capital Facilities Plan and Transportation Improvement Program project, next step and what we are requesting from the Planning Commission. Next slide, please.

So, the Transportation Improvement Program State mandated program, it's adopted by Council before the annual budget is adopted. The TIP is an implementation of the transportation or the Capital Facilities Plan. So, we have our Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program projects that are consistent with our 20-Year Capital Facilities Plan.

So, any time we make an update to our Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program we must take Planning Commission action through before it's adopted by our County Council so we're following the Title 36.70A and the RCWs. Next slide. Next slide.

KAMP: Sorry, Susan. There you go.

WILSON: That's okay. I'm going to go ahead and turn it over to Chris Carle who's going to talk about the Capital Facilities Plan and the six-year program.

CARLE: Thank you, Susan. Chris Carle, Clark County Public Works. This here is a map of both

of our Capital Facilities Plan projects as well as our Transportation Improvement Program projects. The Capital Facilities Plan or the CFP operates under a 20-year ban, from that we take our projects, we evaluate them and bring them into our active Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program.

What you have there in purple are our Capital Facilities Plan projects with our TIP projects below. In the legend, the red ones and the blue ones, and you can see where the purple is overlaid with projects that were pulled from the CFP itself.

What's not on this map is also on the CFP the ongoing programs for example are sidewalk, ADA, bridge, capital preservation and safety projects, but from that they're also pulled and evaluated under our separate system that's more appealing to those types of programs. Next slide.

This is a basic time frame of what we do year-round practically starting in January. Unfortunately, with the pandemic a lot of our in-person was canceled so we're doing more of digital, virtual meeting such as this as well as giving an opportunity to expand our social media whether it be Twitter, Instagram, Facebook and what have you.

So, where we're at now we had our Council session earlier in August, preparing the TIP throughout the year. In October, early October 1st we had a work session here with Planning Commission as well as with the Development Engineering Advisory Board, DEAB, and our next step after this, after you give us your blessing we will have a November 3rd public hearing to adopt the Transportation Improvement Program and the ACP, which is the first year of our TIP and ongoing now we're going to have the notice going out to advertisement, to advertise for that November 3rd Council hearing and then that leads into the budget adoption in December.

And we're going to use some open houses that are coming up whether they be virtual or in-person for 10th Avenue, 68th Street sidewalk as well as 99th Street, some of our bigger projects to have that opportunity to do so. Next slide. And I'll turn it back over to Susan. Thank you.

WILSON: So, what we're seeking from the Planning Commission is support of the 2021-2026 Transportation Improvement Program for consistency with the 20-Year Capital Facilities Plan. Do you guys have any questions or comments?

BARCA: Planning Commission.

ENGE: Susan, just a quick question. The gas tax initiative, does that have any impact on your TIP program?

WILSON: Yeah, unfortunately it has, it does have an impact. We typically receive so much money in fuel tax, I can't remember the number offhand, but we are anticipating a 20 percent less, less fuel tax for our program.

In addition to that, our sidewalk program has been slightly impacted. We rely on money from the Transportation Improvement Board, they did not do a call for Complete Streets and they did not do a call for their sidewalk program, so that's how we've been impacted, so hopefully it will -- it will turn around in the next couple of years.

ENGE: So, a question then. So, it sounds like, Susan, you guys are taking a kind of a cautionary approach even though that I think it was the court decided that it was unconstitutional?

WILSON: That's really -- it's what we receive for our -- for our tax base. Chris Cook might have some other comments on that.

CARLE: Well, I think it's two-fold. I think there's the active approach of saying as well as the initiative on 976 which also had, that Clark had a portion to it.

WILSON: And we don't have a transportation benefit district currently right now that supports our program and so it's the Complete Streets that received some of that money which we don't have an opportunity to apply for that money this year, that's the only way that it has impacted our program.

ENGE: Thanks for the clarification.

BARCA: Anybody else from Planning Commission?

HALBERT: Yeah, can I jump in, Bryan Halbert here. It seems since our workshop there has been a couple of vocal oppositions to one of the road projects, 137th and 132nd Avenue expansion and how do you address that and/or what do you say to the folks in those corridors, are they looking at road expansion projects right away or is it many years down the road?

WILSON: Those are actually many years down the road. Currently we -- we do have those in our priority array once they're on the 20-Year Capital Facilities Plan but currently our focus right now, like we talked about last time is the 179th Street area. If we want to go back to that map on that Chris had presented, Page 5.

CARLE: Two slides up.

WILSON: Yeah. Unfortunately we don't have enough money to support our entire program, so the projects in red and blue are the projects that are currently funded in our program, not fully funded, some have partial funding, so all the red projects are fully funded or reasonably funded in our six-year program, our blue projects are partially funded, so currently those projects are in our priority array, they're evaluated, they're prioritized, but unfortunately they did not make the funding array this year, this go around.

HALBERT: Susan, is that magenta projects that did not make the funding?

WILSON: Well, you can see that it's, they're consistent, but if you look at the red and the blue projects --

HALBERT: Sure.

WILSON: -- it shows all the funded projects --

HALBERT: Got it.

WILSON: -- fully funded or partially funded. The purple projects are the 20-Year Capital Facility Plan projects, but you can see the overlap there of our Transportation Improvement Program.

HALBERT: All right. I got it. Thank you. And it seems like someone who has a concern about a particular road extension has time to continue to have input on that.

WILSON: Absolutely.

HALBERT: Thanks, Susan.

BARCA: For the people listening in on this discussion about all of the projects that are listed but yet not funded, can I get Chris or Susan to discuss how do the projects even qualify to be on the 20-year plan, please.

WILSON: How do they qualify to be on the 20-year plan?

BARCA: Yeah. Why are they there?

WILSON: That's a -- that's really a Matt Hermen question. I understand that there is a macro-level model that's -- that's done throughout unincorporated Clark County, so we address the capacity issues. And then once those are on the 20-year plan, they go to the six-year program and then my group seeks funding for those projects as we evaluate based upon safety, mobility and economic development.

KLUG: If I may, this is Rob Klug, I'm the Transportation Division Manager for Public Works. There's a process to go through the comprehensive plan updates when we look at the anticipated changes to the land use that are adopted in the comprehensive plan looking at what the actual traffic needs are to be able to offset the congestion that occurs, that is estimated to occur based upon the changes in land use, and the projects that are shown there in magenta were part of the 2015 comprehensive plan update to address the congestion associated with the land use changes in the comp plan.

So, every time we go through a change in the comp plan, we will likely have some changes in the new projects on the CFP. And I'll be happy to answer in any detail you want to, we can go all the way down to the weeds or stay up at the higher level, so I don't know if I've answered your question or if you'd like more information.

BARCA: Thank you, Rob. Yeah. To try and help elaborate what Bryan's concern was with public wondering about the choices that are being made. I think ultimately what we're getting at here is the 20-Year Comprehensive Plan looks at much increased density in the regions of those particular roads and therefore the roads need to be upgraded to handle the increase in density that will come as we continue to grow with the 20-year plan.

So, thank you, Rob, for helping clarify and, Bryan, I think this kind of helps set the stage for when people have the question about why my road is getting this much work done. Well, it isn't funded, but we anticipate with the increase in residential density that the requirements will be there.

KLUG: So there's one other layer I didn't say and that layer is when the comprehensive plan is moving forward also the arterial atlas is designated and the arterial atlas would then say what roads could be something that we would put on the CFP to improve the capacity of the roads and safety of the roads associated with the existing proposed land use. So, there's quite a process that goes into the identification of a road that could be improved.

BARCA: All right. Thank you.

HALBERT: Thank you. I appreciate your explanation.

Public Comment

BARCA: Okay. So that being said, specifically with this being for the transportation improvement planning, do we have comments from the public concerning that? And can I make sure that all of the participants are muted unless they are speaking themselves, please.

KAMP: All right. We -- it looks like we have a couple coming up. Again, I just want to go over the instructions so that everyone that may have joined since our last public comment period know how to raise their hand.

If you're using your computer or WebEx application, please utilize the raised hand icon. You can do this by clicking the participant button or icon depending on the device you're using and find the hand icon and click on that to raise, that's only going to acknowledge those attendees during the public comment period who have raised their hand by selecting the hand icon. When you're acknowledged you will be unmuted.

For those using a telephone option, you need to press star 3 on your phone's number panel to

raise your hand. You will hear a message that says you have raised your hand and the host will call on you to speak. When you are acknowledged you will be unmuted, and you will hear a message that lets you know that.

When you have finished your comment, please press star 3 to lower your hand as well as for those using the computer, press the hand icon to lower your hand after your comment.

And please those that are testifying and would like to be a party of record to make sure you say your name and spell it for us please and furnish an accurate post office mailing address or e-mail address and that is if you are wanting to be a party of record. Okay. We will start, whoops, sorry, with Andrew, I'm going to go ahead and unmute you.

PETERSON: All right. Can you hear me?

KAMP: Yes.

PETERSON: All right. So, I'm just kind of confused right now. I can't -- I'm doing this all on my smart phone and I'm just wondering if what we're talking right now is pertaining to kind of the issue of these bike lanes on 159th.

KAMP: Andrew, could you give us your name and please spell it.

PETERSON: Andrew, A-n-d-r-e-w, Peterson, P-e-t-e-r-s-o-n.

KAMP: Andrew, I believe you are waiting for the Arterial Atlas hearing; is that correct?

PETERSON: I -- I think so. I mean, I'm just waiting to get a word in on the bike lanes for 159th.

KAMP: Okay. I don't think we're at that one yet.

PETERSON: So, I'm waiting arterial, what was that called?

KAMP: The Arterial Atlas Amendments.

PETERSON: Okay. I'm just kind of confused here. Maybe someone will let me know when that comes up. You know, I'm confused with this all.

KAMP: That's fine. We'll do that for you.

PETERSON: Okay. Thank you.

KAMP: Yep. And, Andrew, if you could lower your hand, please.

PETERSON: You got it.

KAMP: Thank you. Okay. Our next, we have a call-in, oh, nope, they went away. So, if anyone would like to make a comment on this public hearing, if you're using your phone star 3, if you are using your computer or mobile device find that hand icon. Okay. I'm not seeing any other raised hands.

BARCA: Okay. I imagine most of the public comments that we received during the course of the last two weeks have been around bike lanes and pedestrian access, so I imagine that's where we'll cover a lot of the ground with people. So, I am ready to turn it back over to Planning Commission, deliberation on the subject. Is there talk?

Return to Planning Commission

ENGE: Sorry about that. Bryant Enge. The Transportation Improvement Program is consistent with the 20-year plan so it seems to be straightforward. Some of the questions that was raised by Bryan Halbert I thought were very good questions in terms of how the Capital Facilities Plan and the Transportation Improvement Program developed, so I'm okay with moving forward.

JOHNSON: Karl Johnson. I'm inclined to say the same thing, we've been over this a few times and so, but, yeah, I'm inclined to say to accept staff's recommendation.

HALBERT: Yeah, Bryan Halbert here, and I too would echo Bryant and Karl, I'd be ready to support the proposal.

BARCA: All right. Well, let's get a motion on the table.

JOHNSON: Make a **motion** to accept staff's recommendation.

ENGE: I'll **second** that motion.

BARCA: It's been motioned and seconded. Can I get a roll call, please.

ROLL CALL VOTE

ENGE: AYE

HALBERT: AYE

BARCA: AYE

JOHNSON: AYE

BARCA: Okay. We approve it going forward 4 to nothing, and let's get back into the agenda. Okay. We have I think pedestrian access first; is that true?

KAMP: Yes.

HERMEN: That's correct.

BARCA: And is it going to be Matt?

HERMEN: It's going to be me.

BARCA: All right. Matt.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS, continued

B. **CPZ2020-00013 Pedestrian Accessways:** Amending Clark County development code to require pedestrian infrastructure when development is near major roads and allowing reduced setbacks and lot coverage standards when those pedestrian accessways are required in the single-family zoning districts.

Staff Contact: Matt Hermen, matt.hermen@clark.wa.gov or (564) 397-4343

HERMEN: All right. Good evening, Planning Commission. My name is Matt Hermen, I'm a Transportation Planner with Clark County Public Works. Today is the public hearing regarding CPZ2020-00013, Pedestrian Code Amendment.

This is a proposed change to Clark County Title Code 40. Code amendment is intended to improve connections between neighborhoods and services that are along collector and arterial streets such as bus stops as well as commercial services. Clark County Code defines accessways as public facilities shared by pedestrians and bicycles.

The proposed code amendment recommends changes to the Pedestrian Circulation Code which is 40.350.015 as well as the single-family zoning district code which is 40.220.010. Next slide please.

In the following slides I will cover these topics, take questions from the Planning Commission and then hopefully entertain a motion. Next slide.

Currently Clark County Code Section 40.350.015 Subsection E states, quote, The review authority may require an off-street accessway be constructed to provide direct routes for pedestrians and bicyclists not otherwise provided by the street system to mitigate the impact of development, unquote.

This requirement is often enforced when transit routes are adjacent to proposed developments, but the requirement remains at the discretion of the review authority without providing certain criteria for applying the code. In most circumstances the neighborhood is developed before

transit is present and commercial services are available.

As you know the direct access from residential developments to collector and arterial streets is not allowed; therefore, the pedestrian has to travel out of direction in order to access transit or commercial services. The proposed code amendment attempts to resolve the out of direction travel for the pedestrian.

The proposed code requires the pedestrian accessways to be provided when certain criteria is met. Most certain criteria include these three things: One, frontage access or abutting a collector or arterial on a classified roadway; two, a pedestrian circulation is further than one-quarter mile from the collector or arterial; and finally, three, pedestrian has to travel out of direction to access the collector or arterial. All three of these conditions have to be met in order to require the pedestrian accessway be placed when the development occurs. Next slide.

The proposed code also stresses that ramps compatible with ADA which is Americans with Disabilities Act are encouraged; however, stairs can be provided only when the site has physical topographic constraints and ramps cannot be constructed. Next slide.

The proposed -- Clark County also recognizes that the new requirement will have impacts on proposed developments; therefore, we are proposing incentives in single-family zoning districts that might reduce these impacts. The incentives include reduced interior side yard setbacks and coverage standards. Interior side yard setbacks for lots that abut the accessway will be reduced by 50 percent and the coverage standards will be increased by 10 percent.

We sought DEAB's recommendation on September 3rd. Their recommendations are shown in red and included in the staff recommendation for this hearing. The recommendation by DEAB helps to clarify the accessway whether it's publicly owned or privately owned in an easement. Next slide.

This slide illustrates those reductions in the interior side yard setback and coverage standards in real numbers. Next slide.

The proposed code implements the Commission on Aging recommendation when transportation was their focus in 2018. These recommendations from the Commission on Aging were directed to the Clark County Council. On July 22nd, 2020 -- 2020, County directed staff to process the code amendment seeking your recommendation, DEAB's recommendation as well as the bike and pedestrian advisory recommendation. Next slide.

The following three slides attempt to show you the impact on providing accessways and its effect on transit. Here you see two distinct neighborhoods with two development styles. On the left is the Hough neighborhood in Vancouver near downtown, on the right is the Hazel Dell neighborhood near Gaiser Middle School. Next slide.

Typically transit agencies measure their service area by a quarter-mile catchment area. This is the industry standard for forecasting ridership. Here the quarter-mile catchment area is shown in blue. Again, bus stops are shown in pink dots, pretty hard to see on the slide but they are there.

The yellow line is going to the edge of the catchment area to an existing bus stop. Next slide. However, this quarter-mile catchment area shown in blue is not within a quarter-mile walking distance to the nearest bus stop. A pedestrian has to typically follow the street network to access that bus stop. The bus stops on these slides are hard to see again but they are shown as a pink dot. The pedestrian catchment area is much smaller than the quarter-mile catchment area.

As you can see in these two neighborhoods, the pedestrian catchment area depends on the connectivity of the streets and the road network. As I advance to the next slide please pay attention to the suburban neighborhood on the right. Next slide.

The suburban neighborhood was developed with an accessway that connects N.E. 27th Court to N.E. 99th Street. This accessway significantly increases the pedestrian catchment area to transit as shown in the hatched pink area. Next slide.

The map shows N.E. 99th Street east of SR-503 otherwise known as N.E. 117th Avenue. This neighborhood was developed prior to transit becoming available. As you can see there are lots near the intersection of N.E. 99th Street and N.E. 130th Avenue that can see the bus stop from their rear windows but have to travel further than one-quarter mile to get to that same bus stop. Next slide. The proposed code -- whoop -- the proposed code attempts to remedy that issue.

Staff is recommending that the Planning Commission forward a recommendation to the Clark County Council for approval of the draft code. We have received 16 public comments and they are posted on the Planning Commission's website and we believe the Planning Commission members have read them and will consider them when you deliberate. I'd be happy to answer any questions from the Planning Commission.

BARCA: All right. Planning Commission.

ENGE: Matt, very good, I appreciate your presentation and the consistency of improving the walkability and the connection, but I do have a few questions or just comments.

One is when I was looking at the public comments it appears there's some concerns about safety and the accessways and so I know there's some guidance, Matt, in terms of being able to look from one end of the accessway to the other end of the accessway, but my question would be or my comments would be, what about in the evenings and nights, are there any recommendations in terms of lighting in that area or any other I guess the other idea I would have or comments I would have for you in terms of are there ways to develop these paths in a way that they are used

appropriately versus inappropriately?

HERMEN: Sure. So, I can, I believe you have two questions, the first one regards illumination. Currently there is no street illumination in unincorporated Clark County. We are not proposing to change that.

These accessways will be similar to sidewalks as they currently are, sidewalks are not illuminated along the street, streets are not illuminated. As far as the design of these accessways, when they are in the public right-of-way it's the County's responsibility to maintain those and make sure they're clean free.

In most recent developments of these accessways they are designed so that they are not long narrow ways that are dark and not seen and we're hoping that that continues during requirement of these and future development.

ENGE: Thank you, Matt.

BARCA: Other questions, comments for staff?

HALBERT: Yeah, Bryan Halbert here. Just really a couple of comments. I've lived in those neighborhoods where there haven't been a direction or out of or where we have an out of direction and where you can see the destination just on the other side of a home or through a lot but you can't access them, it's very frustrating, so I really appreciate the forethought into pedestrian access and really bicycle access too at the same time.

And then my second comment was I also appreciate that you sought out and you used the DEAB recommendations, that Board and very thorough in their application of looking at properties and developments and, yeah, their recommendations were spot on, so thanks for addressing it with them.

HERMEN: Absolutely.

BARCA: Okay. If there's no other Planning Commission comments or questions for staff at this time, we're going to move to the public participation portion and we will be dealing specifically with this pedestrian access item here, and then following that we will get to the Arterial Atlas. So, are there questions?

Public Comment

KAMP: Okay. Just one more time or a few more times as we go tonight. If you are joining us by computer or Internet, the mobile device, please find the raised hand icon to raise your hand.

If you can't find it, please locate the participant button or it might be an icon, once you click on that you will see the hand icon, so that if you click on the hand icon that will let us know that you would like to speak. When you are acknowledged you will be unmuted and when you have finished your comment, please click on the raised hand icon again to lower your hand.

For attendees using the telephone, please press star 3 on your phone's number panel 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 acknowledged you will be unmuted, and you will hear a message that lets you know that. And, again, when you have finished your comment, press star 3 to lower your hand.

And, again, if you would like to be a party of record, please make sure you spell your first and last name and give us a mailing address or e-mail address. Okay. Anyone have any questions or would like to comment, please raise your hand now. No raised hand so far.

BARCA: Okay. Seeing none, we will go ahead and bring deliberation back to the Planning Commission. I guess I would start off just by saying I do also appreciate the concept of incorporation of the DEAB recommendations and the Commission on the Aging actually having those come from those two diverse opinions on some matters and bringing together something that looks like we could get behind it all together, so I would like to hear if there's any more deliberations, otherwise I'll take a motion on this matter.

Return to Planning Commission

HALBERT: Ron, I would, I'd like to make the **motion** that CPZ2020-00013 be approved as presented.

JOHNSON: I'll second the motion.

ENGE: I'll **second** that.

BARCA: Okay. With that motion to approve and a second, and I'm ready to go to roll call.

ROLL CALL VOOTE

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

BARCA: And so, we move the motion along 4 to 0.

HERMEN: Thank you, Planning Commission.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS, continued

A. **CPZ2020-00012 Arterial Atlas proposed amendments:** Amending Clark County Comprehensive Growth Management Plan Arterial Atlas Map to reclassify certain streets to accommodate bicycle infrastructure and realign planned roads.

Staff Contact: Gary Albrecht, gary.albrecht@clark.wa.gov (564) 397-4318

BARCA: All right. So, let's move on to the next one. Okay. Next, we're looking at CPZ2020-00012, Arterial Atlas Proposed Amendments and who from staff is going to kick this off for this?

KAMP: Okay. I'm giving the presenter over to Gary because he's going to run his presentation with his maps. Just give him a couple of minutes to get his screen up.

ALBRECHT: Hello, Planning Commission. Gary Albrecht, Clark County Public Works with Transportation Planning. I'm here to discuss CPZ2020-00012, Arterial Atlas Amendments.

We received eight public comments and they were posted on the Planning Commission website and we believe the Planning Commission members have read them and will consider them when you deliberate. You've also received 17 public comments and Public Works Facebook comments that were submitted before the hearing.

The Arterial Atlas is a supporting document to the Comprehensive Plan. The Arterial Atlas is a long-range system that sets the course for future growth in our community promoting strong links between transportation and land use. The atlas identifies arterials and collectors and specifies the design of these facilities in general terms and includes proposed roads.

And here's the agenda we'll discuss this evening. These proposed amendments reclassify certain streets to accommodate bicycle infrastructure and modifying alignments of planned roads to improve mobility and safety.

This table shows 7 proposed amendments to reclassify road segments seen as described in the table, but Number 5 does not need to be reclassified. It was recently discovered that Clark County GIS made a mapping error during last year's reclassification segment that pertain to N.E. 152nd Avenue between 137th Street and N.E. 144. So, from N.E. 119th Street to about N.E. 137th Street is a M-2cb so it does not need to be reclassified.

So, this table shows an additional 4 reclassification amendments and 3 modification amendments. Modifications allow shifting existing proposed roads to line up with parcel lines. There's a total of 13 amendments, 10 reclassifications and 3 modifications.

Clark County Public Works recommends reclassifying several streets to provide bicycle

infrastructure where parking is underutilized based on existing conditions. The existing conditions include direct residential access to parking on local streets adjacent to collectors, existing parks and amenities and existing bicycle routes are near proposed map changes.

These amendments are consistent with the 2010 Clark County Bicycle Pedestrian Master Plan. Bicycle planning is not new to Clark County. Two previous bicycle plans have been completed in Clark County; the 1972 plan and the 1996 Clark County Bicycle Commute Plan. The first plan was a very basic plan addressing the modern trend of bicycling which started in the early '70s. The purpose of the 1996 Bicycle Commute Plan was to develop a strategy to encourage more people to use bicycling as a way to ride to work. Pedestrians were added to the 2010 Clark County Bicycle Pedestrian Master Plan.

As a component of public involvement, we have created a GIS Story Map to provide information to learn about the proposed changes, so I'm going to click on this link and walk you through bicycle story map. The existing bike lanes are shown in blue; you can see that in the legend. There are approximately 65 miles of bike lanes in Clark County jurisdiction.

During the October 1st Planning Commission work session bike licensing was mentioned. Bike license fees are discussed in the 2010 Clark County Bicycle Pedestrian Master Plan. Council has not approved a bike licensing fee for Clark County and has not directed staff to work on bike licensing fees.

The Planning Commission also wanted to see more information about N.W. 21st Avenue, but N.W. 21st Avenue is, we'll go back to the red line that you see in front of the screen, we adopted Clark County Bicycle Pedestrian Master Plan includes proposed bike lanes on this road segment.

So, I just want to reiterate that the plan envisions an interconnected transportation system where people can bicycle or walk safely and conveniently to all destinations within reasonable walking or bicycling distance. School children will have safe routes to walk and cycle to school. People can walk or ride to and from their transit stops and have a comfortable and convenient place to wait for transfer. Bicyclists and pedestrians can enjoy Clark County's natural beauty. Appropriate transportation choices are available to all.

And then the other one the Planning Commission wanted to discuss was 152nd and 78th Street, this intersection here, it connects to Ward Road, so and Ward Road is built as a principal arterial, four lanes with center lane turn and bike lanes. The roadway cross-section width would be reduced from 38 feet to 34 feet.

The cross-section width does not apply when it comes to intersections as it is dictated by traffic operational needs. The bike lane in this case would be located to the left of right-turn lane. The intersection configuration in this case is based on the Clark County Code standard traffic plan T13.0. Back up.

So, this tab here, the Aging in Place tab, shows that, shows the percent of residents 65 years of age or greater that live in Clark County and available C-Tran bus routes. The darker shade of red depicts areas that have larger populations of people over 65 years of age.

The Volumes tab that I've highlighted, this map shows the daily traffic measure in terms of volumes. The thicker lines indicate larger traffic volumes. The proposed changes occur on lower volume roads. Converting underutilized travel lanes to include bike lanes can eliminate potential conflicts within the roadway and improve traffic operations. And that's it for the Story Map and I'm going to go back to the PowerPoint presentation.

BARCA: That's the existing bike lanes where we can see the heavily traveled routes as well, is that a layer that you can layer over it?

ALBRECHT: I can toggle back and forth if you want me to zoom in to a specific area.

BARCA: I guess I'm looking more along the line of up around 134th to out toward Fruit Valley and just seeing the heavily traveled areas.

ALBRECHT: Okay.

BARCA: And there's a lot of existing bike lane already and I'm just I'm trying to picture that in my head with the heavy traffic areas.

ALBRECHT: So, you can see that Salmon Creek is the, and where the thicker line is and I'm going to click on the bike routes path and where the bike lane is at.

BARCA: So, there's existing bike lanes on many of those heavily traveled areas now.

ALBRECHT: Yes.

BARCA: Okay. Thank you.

ALBRECHT: You're welcome. Public involvement. So, we've had Washington State Department of Commerce 60-day notification. We've had three advisory committees support the recommended changes. Commission on Aging, Clark County Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee and the Development and Engineering Advisory Board.

About 1700 postcards were mailed out last, I want to say last week, but actually it was two weeks ago they were mailed out. We've had Facebook posts on Clark County Public Works started on October 5th and had the Planning Commission work session on October 1st and have the hearing this evening.

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission forward a recommendation of approval to the

Clark County Council to amend the Comprehensive Growth Management Plan Arterial Atlas. I'm available to answer any questions.

BARCA: So before we go to public comment, I think it's worth for the public and information, clarifying that how or what is the recommendation when the arterial atlas is changed and the idea of choosing to put bike lanes on it, I think you elaborated that fairly well of why the criteria was there, but why does it change at all, can you clarify that some for the public, please.

ALBRECHT: Well, so it would need to change the current classification, the C-2, and is -- and the configuration it has does not allow for bike lanes. So, the other two classifications, the C-2b and the M-2cb allow bike lanes to occur and the minor arterial is the bigger of the two and that would allow more traffic to occur at the time when development happens. So, this is a 20-year plan, so this is a long ways down the road where any of this would happen. Does that answer your question?

BARCA: Yeah. Perhaps somewhat, what I'm really wanting to get at is what I don't understand is a lot of these roads are designated to grow to take additional capacity and that's part of what happens with the changes to the arterial atlas, the choice of putting bike lanes on them is part of our planning process to establish and complete bike friendly transit, are those fair statements?

ALBRECHT: They are. So that, yeah, the Bicycle Pedestrian Master Plan has the proposed bike lanes and those proposed bike lanes won't get built unless they're designated in the arterial atlas to have bike lanes built on them, so we're -- this effort is syncing the two so the Clark County Bicycle Pedestrian Plan has already been approved, it lines up with the arterial atlas.

You know, what, I reached out to the Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Committee and what they've noticed is that the bike lanes aren't getting built, the proposed bike lanes aren't getting built, and it goes back to the classifications of the road, so if they're not classified to have bike lanes, then they won't get built. And as far as an equity component goes for transportation, bike lanes provide equity, you know, for all users and all abilities.

KLUG: So, Gary, do you mind if I add a little more flavor?

ALBRECHT: Please.

KLUG: So, Commission, I'm Rob Klug once again with the I'm the Transportation Division Manager. Bike lanes provide a lot of benefit to the public even for people that don't ride their bicycles.

What it does is it provides a narrowed lane as opposed to instead of having a 16 or an 18-foot wide lane that looks like you can go very quickly down there, it provides a narrowed lane because of the eight-inch bicycle lane narrows -- excuse me -- the eight-inch wide line that designates the bicycle lane narrows the apparent travel lane from 16 to 18 feet down to 11 feet, so it can help

to slow traffic down on the collector which is a good thing for the neighborhoods.

It also provides an improved buffer for the pedestrians walking along the sidewalk because the cars are not as close to them due to the separation of the painted bike lane.

Additionally, you have because of the bike lane every driveway that fronts on to the street and every side street and private road that fronts on the street have essentially an extra five to six feet of extra sight distance where the traffic is further away from them as they come out of the side street looking for gaps in the traffic, so it improves the visibility of drivers coming off of, on to the street or crossing the street by having a little more separation between where the traffic is versus where they're coming out on the side street.

And there's a lot of other benefits like that where we see locations that don't have bike lanes in them, we see a lot of scrub marks where tires are rubbing up against the curb and that could be a problem because people are driving close to the curb and they lose control because of that, just moving them away from, away from the curb helps to better improve the safety on the corridor for a lot of different reasons. And I'll be happy to take any questions.

BARCA: Planning Commission, any additional questions, comments?

ENGE: Gary, thank you for the presentation. A question for you, well, a couple of questions. What is the lanes that are, that have been identified in this particular presentation are, will that complete with the 2010 bike master plan or are there still some additional bike lanes that were in that plan and that will need to be, will there be some in the future that will need to be adjusted that were identified in the 2010 plan?

ALBRECHT: Well, there are still proposed bike lanes in the master plan that are not syncing up with the arterial atlas, so, yes, in the future we'd make additional changes to the atlas to get them in line.

ENGE: Then my second question because there are some bike lanes that were outside of the bike master plan, the criteria again that you use to identify additional bike lanes or to be on the bike master plan?

ALBRECHT: Let's see here, so... Which -- well, so --

BARCA: Bryant, please mute.

ALBRECHT: A few of the roads it just depends on which section of the county you're talking about. So the SR-503 area, some of those roads did not have specific bike lanes, if I remember correctly, I would have to go back and look at the map, but their classifications lined up with the existing SR-503 circulation plan that was approved by the Council in 2005 and they were already classified as a minor two-lane arterial.

So last year during the rural industrial land bank was there so the Growth Management Act we were challenged by having the land out there, you know, in the rural industrial land bank, so we went back and changed the classification to back to the way the plan was before, we adjusted them, but in that review we noticed that we still haven't adopted SR-503 circulation plan which WSDOT, Washington State Department Of Transportation, approved of noticed facilities that were in that plan, so we're syncing up those that SR-503 circulation plan with arterial atlas, so that's why, that's part of the criteria there.

And then on 152nd, Clark County Public Works the capital project that they're working on it's changing the classification to improve the roads, that was another criteria that we've used.

ENGE: Okay. Thank you. So, there are some others, other planning processes that are going on that include in terms of assessment of the treatment of bike lanes?

ALBRECHT: Yes.

BARCA: Any other Commissioners? Okay. Seeing no additional discussion with staff at this time, we're going to open it up to the public and, Andrew, you've been waiting patiently I imagine, let's see who else is going to be on the line with Andrew, let's go through the process.

Public Comment

KAMP: Okay. Thank you. So just again for those that may have just be joining us and didn't hear the instructions before. If you would like to make public comment, please utilize the raised hand icon if you're using your computer or an Internet connection device.

If you can't find the raised hand icon, click and find your participant button or icon, once you click on that, the raised hand icon should appear. So, you would click on the hand, that will let us know that you have a public comment and we will call on each person in turn. When you are done with your public comment, please lower your hand.

For those that are joining by telephone, you need to press star 3 on your phone's number panel to raise your hand. You'll hear a message that lets you know that you have raised your hand and when it is your turn, you will be unmuted, and you will hear a message that tells you so. Again, when you have finished your comment, you would press star 3 to lower your hand.

Please note that if you would like to be a party of record and for all of our commenters, please if you could spell your first and last name, and if you're wanting to be a party of record, please provide an accurate post office mailing address or e-mail address. Okay. I'm going to go ahead and start from the top. Andrew, I'm going to go ahead and unmute you.

PETERSON: Hello. My name is Andrew Peterson, A-n-d-r-e-w, P-e-t-e-r-s-o-n. I need to give

like an e-mail or something?

KAMP: Yes, if you want to be a party of record for this hearing.

PETERSON: Yeah, it's all lower case, andrewppeterson@msn.com is an e-mail for me. Is it okay to talk about 159th now?

KAMP: Yes, go ahead.

PETERSON: 159th Street is, you know, I've lived here for 15 years and when I first moved out here I used to have a view of Mount St. Helens, I used to have field above my house before a water tower, another water tower came, and I can understand the addition, we needed something like that, these bike lanes I just, I really don't feel are necessary.

I am a biker and I've biked this area for 15 years, this hill is so extreme like you don't shoot this hill unless you're an extreme biker and I mean I've only seen, I know I'm just repeating myself as testimony went through, I've only seen three people go up this hill.

In the long run the bike lane that will be going up this hill will block over probably seven homeowners including myself from utilizing parking on this road which even today with having to put my dog down I had to utilize the front of my house for parking for people partaking in helping me with this and any guests, you know, to pay their respects.

If anything happens to cause us not to be able to utilize the parking in front of our houses, I mean there's a lot of us that are going to be affected, I won't be able to do meetings at my house and people, there's a number of people that have already voiced their concerns, like I won't be able to come to your house if I can't park on your road.

So, this bike lane that will be especially going up the road that will barely be used will not, you know, I mean all it will do is screw up things for a number of us that live directly on the road. Going down it's extremely dangerous, it is a very steep hill. I live in this area like I said for 15 years, whenever I ride my bike, I go up 157th or down, it's a lot more safer, it's Mount Vista, quiet, nice neighborhood road. 159th has always been kind of on the edge, it used to be all cow across the way and open field or forest.

Now everything's developed, I know we're really cooking, but I'm really kind of scratching my head on the factor of the matter of, you know, when you get to the bottom of 159th now the bike lane stops, so I mean the bike lanes can't even go down 21st as-is or you'll be stopping people that need the parking right there as well and then through the neighborhood to get to Union Road it's pretty dangerous and narrow because bike lanes cannot exist. So, I just think it's kind of stupid to even think about 159th bike lanes, it's just dumb. That's pretty much it.

KAMP: Okay. Thank you, Andrew.

BARCA: Okay. Before Andrew disappears off the phone, does the Planning Commission have any questions for Andrew? Okay. Seeing none. All right. Andrew, thank you for hanging in there, appreciate it and I believe we've heard what you were hoping for us to hear. Thank you.

PETERSON: Yeah. It's to a point where I just want to voice one more thing. I mean these changes have me worked up to the point where, you know, I mean and my owning a home out here, I mean things change on this road that in the long run it's being overused as it is and a risk because of traffic, speeding, this road has become a freeway, risky, unlighted, the signage is not -- isn't right for being wary of even going over my hill.

I got clipped a few months back by a car, took out my taillight on my truck, if it would have hit me as fast as they were going I would have been hurt, in the hospital and I've seen two other accidents pretty severe on this road.

This road is, in the current way it's going right now, it's dangerous and someone's going to lose their life especially down the way where the road winds through and through this narrow neighborhood and everything else. And on 21st, there were, the bike lanes will not be able to exist because of current people needing the parking on the road like we at the top of the hill need the parking on the road. It's just ridiculous. Anyone who lives in this area will use 157th for transportation on bicycles.

The main road that needs attention right now is 179th and I think everything's been fine in front of Legacy and 29th almost. 29th could use a little more attention here and there for a little more space for some of the bike lanes, but 159th we don't need them, it's an unsafe road as-is and we got to figure out, we got C-TRAN ripping through here, we got people using this road and it's basically a freeway speeding and the accidents are going to happen more and I'm just waiting for, I'm ready to start like preparing for like I got to have a pack maybe in my closet next to my front door for emergencies, I'm ready to do that because I'm worried as heck with how things are and the speeding on this road and just, yeah, bike lanes not necessary.

BARCA: Okay. Thank you, Andrew. Questions for Gary at this point. Gary, I'm assuming that this is one of the outstanding legs of the bicycle transportation plan, so the idea of putting something on here has gone, what, a decade or so in the planning process?

ALBRECHT: Yeah, that's correct. Yes.

BARCA: And is there a review of the appropriate avenues and streets as times have changed from that ten-year plan?

ALBRECHT: The plan has not been updated. We're talking about having it updated, it has not happened. And, you know, for the record so 159th connects down to 20th, so that those streets

are classified to have bike lanes, they're not built to standard, but they're classified so it can function and they would have a place to go.

BARCA: Okay. And I guess to Rob's point earlier is the County looks at it as a traffic calming application, but I think the idea of us having a review and update in the near future with congestion and the way things have changed is probably appropriate. All right. Who do we got next?

KAMP: Okay. Next on the list here is Leslie Washko. Leslie, I'm going to unmute you now.

WASHKO: Hi there. Can you hear me?

KAMP: Yes, we can.

WASHKO: Good. My name is Leslie Washko, L-e-s-l-i-e, W-a-s-h-k-o. I live at 14200 N.E. 132nd Avenue in Brush Prairie. My e-mail address is lawashk23@gmail.com.

So, I'm here to present our opposition to this proposed reclassification of 132nd Avenue including the bike paths and sidewalks. To choose this proposed reclassification of 132nd Avenue to this designated M-2cb minor arterial roadway it will disrupt the quality of life for all the residents on the street.

As we understand it this classification would include bike lanes that we've been talking about and sidewalks and it would increase the width of the current roadway that we measured out to be 20 feet across to about 72 feet when considering the addition of the bike paths and the sidewalks.

So, I'm not a mathematician but it would appear to me that this proposition means that the residents on either side of 132nd Avenue stand to lose potentially 25 feet of our property frontage. Now, as we drove down the street the other day we were looking to see what the situation was with each of the houses and many of the homes on the street are quite close to the roadway as it is, to take another 16 to 25 feet would put larger, noisier road right up at people's front door and that's just wrong.

So, also considering the area along both sides of 132nd Avenue is zoned AG-20. According to the Clark County zoning classification Section 40.210.010.A this district is to encourage the conservation of land which have the growing capacity, productivity, soil composition and surrounding land to have long-term commercial significance for agriculture and associated resource production.

Also, the general growth planning act has encouraged the or discouraged urban sprawl and encouraged the preservation of farmlands and forest lands. So, there are agricultural activities taking place in the area. There includes some small family farms on our street, there's two commercial farms, Botany Bay Farm and the Larwick Tree Farm as well as the Lagler Dairy and

the GIS map that we looked at recently incorrectly identified some of these properties, these farm lands, as unused or vacant rather than recognizing them as farm lands or grazing land and the proposed amendments appear to neglect these agricultural endeavors.

There are also several designated wetland and wildlife habitat areas in the vicinity. If you look at the habitat maps that are on the website, those will be adversely affected by any new or expanded roadways. For example, one large species area and a buffer adjacent species area could be seen on the habitat map along with the smaller recognized riparian habitat area.

So in looking at the proposed bike path on 132nd Avenue, they appear to go nowhere right now with the exception of connecting to the proposed new road that would cut across farm lands and wildlife habitat from State Highway 503 and this would also add to the increased traffic of what is now a relatively quiet roadway.

The establishment of bike paths on 119th Street where there are hundreds of residents would be a much better idea and better use of the road funds that our taxes contribute to. The existing plan which is still controversial, not the one that's being amended, is preferred, many residents prefer that option even though it's still controversial.

And it's unclear how these estimated benefits from the proposed reclassification of the street outweigh the negative impact to the environment and to the residents on 132nd Avenue. And we understand that part of the planning process is solicit citizens and taxpayers' input, we hope we're being heard, we call for transparency on all the planning that goes on and additional communication. Thank you for your time.

BARCA: Thank you. Any questions for Leslie? Okay. Well, we can't get much more transparent than this. I think we're all here right now trying to kind of sort it out. So I guess once again, Gary, coming back, I get to you in a second, Bryan, just hold on, looking at what Leslie is talking about in the context of habitat and AG-20, we're designating a collector out there, are we envisioning additional growth or is this just our method of getting a planning for the bike lane itself?

ALBRECHT: It's just a planning bike -- it's just a transportation exercise, so it has nothing to do with changing the zone. So what Leslie was talking about was -- so when I originally started this, this project, I was looking at all of 132nd from 119th up to 144th and, you know, digging through these comments looking at it and going back through GIS and seeing the ordinance that was done up for the reclassification, so the road is already classified as an M-2cb.

So, when it goes to develop, we don't have to reclassify it. So, it's already set so it's -- and she has a point because it's already agricultural designated land and in order for any kind of development to occur the County would have to go through a de-designation process. So, and you know it as well as I do that it's an uphill battle with the court system to try to de-designate agricultural land.

So, it's just a -- it's purely a planning exercise to change the road classification. So, when the land use does eventually change, it will be set and ready to go, it's a 20-year plan, it's a long ways out.

BARCA: All right. Thank you. Any other comments from Planning Commission? Bryan.

HALBERT: Yeah, Gary, I think maybe you answered my question and for Leslie too, actually the reclassification was struck from this proposal if I'm not mistaken.

ALBRECHT: Well, a portion of it is. So, we're going to still look at changing from 137th to 144th and moving the alignment that goes across that parcel from 137th to 144th and then I'm going to up 132nd from 137th to 144th, so that's still on the table.

HALBERT: Okay. Thanks, Gary.

ALBRECHT: You're welcome.

BARCA: All right. Next comment from the public, please.

KAMP: Okay. Next public commenter is Sean McCormick. I'm going to go ahead and unmute you now.

MCCORMICK: Good evening everybody. My name is Sean McCormick, it's spelled S-e-a-n, M-c-C-o-r-m-i-c-k, and my e-mail is seanjmccormick@gmail.com.

I'm actually really delighted to hear that there's a plan on N.W. 21st Avenue to have a bike lane put in. My family lives on 21st Avenue and we know a number of families that do live on 21st Avenue. My children utilize their bikes to get to school and we know a number of other families that walk or bike in the neighborhood.

The road is riddled with cars that speed above the 35 miles or mile per hour speed limit and I have concerns around the combination of adding a bike lane and the increased risk of a 35 mile per hour speed limit versus a 30 mile per hour speed limit and I would recommend that that be addressed in the consideration for the addition of a bike lane on N.W. 21st Avenue.

Even today there was a vehicle at 99th Street and 21st Avenue that was turning on from 99th Street into N.W. 21st that got into an accident and injured a child. Last year a student from a local elementary school at Lakeshore was injured and hospitalized due to a car that was turning the corner and cars routinely will travel northbound on N.W. 21st and way above the speed limit and it's highly unsafe and I have grave concerns about the safety of the neighborhood and my family with the addition of a bike lane and not without reducing the speed limit.

And so I think that it's a great addition because it is a residential neighborhood and there's a lot of houses that have been added to the neighborhood and homes and families and I think that it would be welcomed, but I think consideration for the speed limit and safety precautions in addition to that would be really important for us in this process. So, I just ask that that be considered, and I appreciate your work on this, Gary, and thank you for sharing this information tonight. Thank you.

BARCA: Questions? All right. So, Gary, we have a member of the public asking about the idea of the ability to actually get a speed limit reduced beyond what the standard is, how does transportation look at those items?

ALBRECHT: Individually, so I mean it's something that Public Works would have to take forward to the Council and the Council would approve that and look at that specific criteria, and I'm not sure what exactly the process is for doing that. Rob, are you still around?

KLUG: I am.

ALBRECHT: Can you help with this?

KLUG: So, we have a very specific process that we follow that is an engineering process to determine what the appropriate speed would be for the road and there's kind of several issues that we need to be cognizant of.

One is what is the posted speed for the road, another one is what are people driving, and in the event that people are driving in excess of the speed limit it really is appropriate for the Sheriff's Department to be involved in the discussion to see how they can provide targeted enforcement to deal with people that are not obeying the posted speed.

So I can talk to the Sheriff's Department about seeing if they can provide some targeted enforcement in there and I'd have to take a look and see what our recent speed studies and information on the corridor are to see if it would be a location that we would consider changing the speed limit for.

BARCA: Okay. So, there's some information for Mr. McCormick, he can look at the idea of maybe getting involved with you or the Sheriff's Department that way, but we did take note of the fact that the concern is existing speed let alone the design speed. Okay. Who do we have next on the public?

KAMP: Okay. I just want to also remind those of you that have already made a comment if you could lower your hand just so that we know who's still left to speak. Our next is a caller so it's call and User 19 as we see, so I'm going to go ahead and unmute you and you'll get that message that tells you you have been unmuted, so please remember to tell us your name and spell it for us and if you want to be a party of record to give us a mailing address or e-mail.

PILIPONIS: Hello. Can you hear me?

KAMP: We can hear you.

PILIPONIS: Okay. My name is Shawn, S-h-a-w-n, last name is Piliponis, P as in papa, i-l-i-p as in papa, o-n-i-s, my e-mail is my last name so piliponis@msn.com, and I just had a couple of questions regarding this plan is, one, is there access to the map of the proposed changes located on the Clark County website, and if so, what would the link be to get there?

BARCA: Gary, I think that's you.

ALBRECHT: Hi, Shawn, there is a link available. So, this PowerPoint presentation has a link to it, I'm going to go up a page, right here.

BARCA: He's on the phone.

ALBRECHT: Oh, that's right. I'm so sorry, Shawn, so you know what --

PILIPONIS: I am watching it on TV as well, sorry.

ALBRECHT: Oh, good. Okay. So, do you see the PowerPoint presentation?

PILIPONIS: Yes, I do.

ALBRECHT: Okay. So, there's a link there, so if you click on, so if go to that URL and type it in that will show the GIS Story Map with all the proposed changes there.

PILIPONIS: Okay. Thank you.

ALBRECHT: You're welcome.

PILIPONIS: And that would have been helpful, sorry, ahead of time. Mainly my concern is I'm off of the 152nd area of this proposal. Currently the east side of 152nd does have a bike path, the west side of 152nd does not, and currently the amount of traffic that is moving in between Ward Road or that would be Padden Parkway to 199 or 99th itself, there's only one stop sign in between 199 and Padden Parkway and what that does is it's already created quite a bit of congestion, there's no outlet to the cars that currently live within that area too that fit the area unless you're brave just because of the amount of trees and foliage that has been added there already.

So, within these improvements that you guys have been talking about, what is the likelihood that the expansions of that is going to be mainly to the west side of 152nd versus to the east side?

ALBRECHT: Well, so ideally, you know, it's you'd look at a segment and the center line it would go equal on each side of the center line. So wherever the center line is going up the road, so if more width was needed on the right side, then it would come from the right side or if it was from the left side it's equal on it would go from the left side. So, this there's actually less asphalt involved with a collector, with the bicycle lane, the C-2b, there's less asphalt there than the collector, so it's better for the environment from that point of view.

PILIPONIS: No, I understand the environmental aspect of that. Really it's just what it comes down to is currently the it's pretty much a straight shot from Padden Parkway all the way down to 99th whether it's the daytime or the nighttime you have semi-trucks that are often speeding through this neighborhood because of the amount of stop signs you have off of 117th, pretty much they circumvent that system to then come down 152nd where there's less traffic, stop signs, traffic lights, things of that nature. Is the plan to add stop signs or anything else above just bicycle paths?

ALBRECHT: There no plans right now for that. It just depends on where you're at. So, you know, so we have a comp plan project going from 99th up to, Rob, do you know the exact location, I can't remember off of the top of my head?

KLUG: Sorry, it took me moment, I was writing an e-mail to the person who does the speed studies to have them take a look at N.W. 21st Avenue. Sorry.

ALBRECHT: That's okay.

KLUG: We're talking about 152nd Avenue from 99th Street to Padden?

ALBRECHT: That's the segment that we're doing the capital project on?

KLUG: Right, that's my understanding, and that would involve widening the road out to meet the standards that have the proper pavement width with the lanes that we would have in the arterial atlas designation plus sidewalks and where appropriate pedestrian crossing locations, but the function of that road is an arterial and it was intended to take traffic from point A to point B and so we don't look at putting in stop signs for the purpose of inhibiting traffic on an arterial.

What happens when we start doing that is we start actually creating more traffic going through the neighborhoods on local access roads which is where we don't want a lot of extra traffic in front of people's homes, in front of their homes as opposed to on the arterials, that's the function of the arterial.

PILIPONIS: Right. I understand that; however, this particular section of 152nd, that's potentially people's house fronts, my backyard is backed right up onto 152nd, so essentially the artery that has been created has just allowed people to continuously speed up and down this

road making it unsafe for anybody who's traveling by bike, making it almost impossible for people to get out of the neighborhood safely just because of the amount of speed from semi-trucks, school buses, regular vehicles, it's challenging, we're essentially trapped within this neighborhood just due to our only outlets being Padden, Ward Road and 152nd.

So the congestion within the neighborhoods not able to get in and those who do travel down 152nd or Ward Road, Padden Parkway to get into the neighborhood back up additional traffic, so I don't know if it's possible to include any traffic revisions or what, however you want to label it, some additional stop signs or reduced speed or even a roundabout right there at 152nd and Padden Parkway to reduce the opportunity for semi-trucks which we just seen as a wreck here earlier last month between a semi-truck and a four-door vehicle.

KLUG: Well, Padden Parkway in that location is actually a State Department of Transportation road, it's not a County intersect- -- or County road, so the DOT, State Department of Transportation determines what the intersection configuration is going to be there.

I know that we -- I can appreciate what you're saying about the traffic on the arterial is causing potential delays for entering and exiting your neighborhood. We'll take a look at it. I've been with the County now for over 18 and a half years and this is the first, literally the first time, and I've been in transportation that entire time, this is the first time I've heard a concern about being able to get in or out of a neighborhood off of 152nd Avenue in the 18 and a half years I've been with the County taking these types of call, so we'll look at it.

PILIPONIS: Right. And I do appreciate that. We do have new development down toward in between 99th and 119 that has created the additional traffic on top of the already existing semi-trucks that bypass 117 and the other main roads which is part of that issue, but I do appreciate it.

BARCA: Okay.

PILIPONIS: That was all I had.

BARCA: Thank you, Shawn, for that input. If there's no questions from Planning Commission, we're going to move to the next public participant.

KAMP: Okay. The next public commenter with a raised hand is William Gardner. William, I'm going to unmute you now.

GARDNER: Hi. Can you hear me?

KAMP: Yes, we can.

GARDNER: Hi. My name is William, W-i-l-l-i-a-m, Gardner is G-a-r-d-n-e-r, e-mail address is

wgardner44@yahoo.com.

So I've been living off of 21st Avenue for probably about 18 coming up 20 years and my question that I have is will the road be widened by adding more pavement and will you be removing trees and possibly power poles to make room for more road?

ALBRECHT: No, the road wouldn't be, it wouldn't be widened, so it would actually be narrower than what it was planned to be, so where it's at right now, and I'm not sure about the trees, it just depends on the location.

GARDNER: Okay. And then I second, I'm neighbors to the individual who spoke earlier about the speeds, there are some records that are occurring on 21st when it comes to speeds. You'll hear them as they leave the light off of 99th and work their way north and, you know, I'd say the average on this road is probably about 40 and I'd say some records are probably have to be 60s, the Doppler effect definitely comes into effect when you are talking about some of the speeds on the road, you hear them before you see them type of thing, but, yeah.

So, I would appreciate if the Sheriff could do some patrolling out here, they could probably make quite a bit of money for the city if they were to patrol out here on a regular basis.

KLUG: So, this is Rob, I just want to add a comment. I ask the Sheriff for a lot of people to go out, a lot of times for them to have people go out and do target enforcement, and my voice only goes so far, so I'm always going to recommend that, I will forward your information or I will forward your concern, but if you have a concern about speeding that you may also choose to talk to the Sheriff's Department directly and provide information because it may be that you as a single person calling them for the first time may get a better response than me always bugging them, so for what it's worth.

GARDNER: Okay. I agree on reducing the speed limit too, I feel like the road is already narrow and you taking more of the lane to give for a bike lane would make -- I would -- it would be interesting to see if there would be more accidents or not, if people are going to continue to (inaudible) on a narrow road. Will there ever be a change to add sidewalks to 21st?

ALBRECHT: You know, if like when it's built to standard it includes sidewalks, even the current configuration when it's built it will have sidewalks, when development occurs the sidewalks will come in.

GARDNER: So, the power poles are really, really close to the side of the road, so my question is will you be removing those power poles like putting power underground type a thing or building around them?

KLUG: So, Gary, do you want me to take that?

ALBRECHT: Yes, please.

KLUG: Once, again, Rob Klug, I'm the Transportation Division Manager. So, we do not have at this time a plan to provide a capital county project to improve 21st Avenue.

This is a process so that we can make sure that as development occurs we're getting the proper amount of right-of-way dedicated and frontage improvements to be able to facilitate this type of growth and it's going to occur in patchwork until such time as the County comes along and they do a full capital project to fill in the gaps, and when that occurs, then we'll put in a continuous sidewalk and quite likely we will work with CPU, we always work with CPU to address the utility poles that are on the road.

Now it's CPU's choice as to whether they're going to go underground or stay above ground and quite frankly when I've talked to CPU, Clark Public Utilities, CPU, they've told me that underground utilities are cost prohibitive and they try to do it only when absolutely necessary.

GARDNER: But one question is what happens across the street is two tall pine trees that are probably about 120 years old that are easily five stories, seven stories tall, I mean they're just gigantic, will those never be touched type of thing or is that something that would be possibly enough to be taken down?

KLUG: I can't promise anything. I can tell you that when the design goes through we look at things like that to say what can we do that we can reduce the affects as much as possible, but we are very cognizant of the fact that those trees, all trees have a root system on them and if you start cutting into the root system to be able to build a road or a sidewalk, you can kill the tree over time, so we would make a very good decision with an arborist and trying to find the best way to keep as many of those assets for the neighborhood as possible.

GARDNER: Okay. Thank you.

BARCA: Thank you very much, Rob. Can we go to the next public participant, please.

KAMP: Yes. The next person calling in is caller User 18, I'm going to unmute you, so please make sure you spell your name for us and if you would like to be a party of record your e-mail address or mailing address and please if you could speak as clear and slow as possible, we have a transcriber so we want to make sure we capture everything you say.

ROWAN: Hi. Can you hear me?

KAMP: Yes, we can.

ROWAN: Okay. Thank you. My name is Kattera Rowan, that's K-a-t-e-r-r-a, R-o-w-a-n, e-mail address is my first name katerraj4@gmail.com. And thank you for taking my call.

I am a resident on 21st Avenue. We've lived here probably six years, going on six years, so, you know, relatively new compared to the last folks that spoke, but again we are highly concerned about the speed limits and thank you for the recommendation to contact the Sheriff. I do know that two of them live, you know, just in the neighboring streets off of 21st, so we will contact them.

I think it should be at 25 the way it is, it's scary, it's like a freeway, it's like people try to see how fast as they can go from 99th to 119th, so the addition of bicycles on that road in itself is in my personal opinion asking to get somebody killed. That being said, I don't know what to do about that.

I have a question also about the length of time that this proposal would take watching the work down 119th if you're widening that road, I mean it's taken years to do that one how long it would take and then how much land would be taken from each individual homeowner because there's already a right-of-way, correct, I think it's four to five feet coming in from the road but how much further would be taken off of that?

ALBRECHT: Well, so this, the County does not have any plans to build any of these proposed amendments, there's no funds at 21st Avenue, there are no funds in the 20-Year Capital Facility Plan, there's nothing in the Six-Year Transportation Improvement Plan, so whenever development does occur, you know, it's, you know, it typically it would take about three years design, to design and build a project, that's typically what I've seen in the past, from design to being built is about three years and depending on where the right-of-way is, you know, like I said earlier, it may be taken, it may not be taken, I don't, you know, it's unknown at this time because all we're doing is just changing a line on the map, there would be less asphalt involved going to the C-2b classification compared to the collector classification.

ROWAN: Okay. But that would still include the addition of sidewalks so it would come into people's property; is that correct?

ALBRECHT: For both of them, yes.

ROWAN: Okay. And then the power lines and trees would be subject to those suggestions.

ALBRECHT: Yes.

ROWAN: Okay. Thank you, I appreciate your time.

ALBRECHT: You're welcome.

BARCA: Okay. Before we get to the next public comment, let's just make sure that some of the people have clarification, we seem to get this early on and we didn't really I think adequately

address it.

The arterial atlas is updating the routes and the lines on the map, these are not funded projects at this moment in time, these are the suggestions at which time the congestion and density requires that the work gets done through build-out that these will be the standards that the roadways will be brought up to.

So just as a clarification on this regard, it may be on your road frontage, but this is not saying that the project is funded as any design criteria setup for it other than the road standard itself.

And I think, Gary, maybe an update to this for the public when they come in to the County website and look at it is to also give them the cross-section view so they can see what the proposal looks like with the bike paths and the sidewalks.

ALBRECHT: I can do that. So, the story map has that setup so what it would look like with the bike lanes and the sidewalks, so if they go to the story map, you'll see how the road looks when it's built.

BARCA: Yeah, but we just told them to go to this link on this one PowerPoint, so I'm thinking if we can do a little bit of one-stop shop with this we might be able to get a lot of questions answered a little bit more clearly. I'm ready for the next public participant.

KAMP: It looks like we have one of the previous commenters still has their raised hand, so if you have completed your comment, we'd like you to click on the raised hand again. Other than that, I don't see any more, but I want to kind of go through it one more time to make sure everyone's had an opportunity.

So, again, if you would like to make a comment, please utilize the raised hand icon if you're using your computer or a web device. And if you are calling in by phone, you would dial star 3 on your phone panel.

It looks like we have another commenter so I'm going to go ahead and unmute Christopher. Christopher, make sure you spell your name for us and if you want to be a party of record, please let us know an e-mail address or mailing address.

BERAOMCAS: Thank you. Can you hear me?

KAMP: Yes. Could you speak up a little bit.

BERAOMCAS: Absolutely. How about now?

KAMP: That's better. Thank you.

BERAOMCAS: Great. Thank you. My name is Christopher Beraomcas, that's C-h-r-i-s-t-o-p-h-e-r, last name B-e-r-a-o-m-c-a-s.

I'm calling to comment specifically on the revisions to N.E. 132nd Avenue. I've written a public comment, so I won't repeat what is in that. But I wanted to ask for clarification on a couple of points.

The first was related to Amendment 6 and 14. I'm wondering, Gary, if you could give some clarification or background on why Amendment 14 moved the originally planned road connecting to from 132nd to 137th and replaces it with the expansion taking place along 132nd up to 144th.

The reason why I'm curious about this change is it looks like the road that is modified in Amendment 14 was planned for some time, I think at least 15 years it's been on a plan, and it connects with 137th which goes north and it appears as if it is intended to facilitate northbound traffic, arterial traffic not moving northbound on 503, so it looks like it's designed to help folks that are between 503 and the Hockinson area traveling northbound.

It seems to me like that changed and Amendment 14 to have it go T into 144th is a less efficient traffic pattern and would require people traveling north on 137th to make a right turn and then a left turn rather than the road, you know, continuing straight across the intersection, so I'm curious about the reasoning behind that.

And the other question I had was related to the land use. Could you clarify whether you believe the changes on 132nd will be delayed until there is a land use or a zoning change in the surrounding land or would you anticipate that the changes would take place prior to land use changes and I think, yeah, I think that summarizes my question. Thank you.

ALBRECHT: Sure, Christopher. So, you know, I apologize for the confusion for the table with 132nd Avenue. So, what we're only looking at is reclassifying the segment on 132nd that goes from about 137th over to 144th.

So right now, that proposed road that's been on the books for many years bisects that parcel. So it's likely to, it's easier for development to occur when the lines line up on the parcels, so that was the rationale for changing it over to line up to go straight up 132nd up to 144th instead of going across and cutting that parcel in half, so that would make that parcel pretty much unusable by having that road all the way through that.

And then a lot of that land is agricultural land, and in order for the road to develop at an urban level, the classification would need to be changed.

BERAOMCAS: Okay. The last follow-up question, thank you for that, is could you give details on where we could find the most up-to-date information about the land use classification changes or proposed changes in this area if we're not on the GIS map.

ALBRECHT: Sure. It's the Clark County Comprehensive Growth Management Plan has all of the current management, it's the 20-year plan, the next time it will be updated I believe is 2025 is when the next update will occur.

BERAOMCAS: Got it. That's the Comprehensive Growth Management Plan?

ALBRECHT: Yep, it's a 20-year plan. So, it looks, I mean it's all based on population forecasts and densities. So, like I said earlier when it comes to agricultural land that land would need to go through a de-designation process to remove it to change it to something else other than agricultural land.

BERAOMCAS: Great. That answers my questions. Thank you.

ALBRECHT: You're welcome.

BARCA: Any new public participants?

KAMP: We do. We have a couple of more so far. The first one is a call-in user, so I'm going to go ahead and unmute you now, please don't forget to let us know your name and spell it for us and if you want to be a party of record, your address or e-mail address.

Hello, caller, can you hear us? Okay. I don't hear anybody. Why don't we, I'll mute this person and maybe we can try again after the next caller. Okay.

Next is another caller, I'm going to unmute you so you should hear the message that says you're unmuted, please let us know your name and address if you want to be a party of record.

FOLKERTS: Hello. My name is Gary Folkerts. P.O. Box 104, Brush Prairie, Washington, 98606.

KAMP: Gary, can you --

FOLKERTS: I'm glad I finally got through, I hit the --

KAMP: Gary, could you spell your name for us.

FOLKERTS: G-a-r-y, F-o-l-k-e-r-t-s.

KAMP: Thank you.

FOLKERTS: I hit star 3 originally but apparently it didn't work so after waiting all through this I had to do it again, so anyway glad I've gotten through now, and I appreciate it. I'm interested in the 87th Avenue part.

I called in and talked to Gary day before yesterday and talked to him a little bit about it. My main concern I live on a farm, a family farm on 87th Avenue, we have quite a long frontage, and my father had planted trees all along, probably about five feet outside the right-of-way about 40 years ago, there's quite a few giant sequoia trees, cedar trees, cedars of lemon, and there's an oak tree that's been there forever.

So my main concern in talking to Gary, you know, it sounds like theoretically they would be looking at widening the right-of-way which would put all those trees in jeopardy it sounds like, basically the right-of-way would be about where the trees are.

So, I think there's 16 giant sequoias that are probably three to five-foot DBH now, another 20 years or so they'll probably be six feet plus. That oak tree, I don't know how many years old it is, it's probably close to four-foot DBH and it goes down about 100-foot diameter drip line and it goes clear across 87th Avenue now. Anyway, that's my main concern is those trees being wiped out in the name of progress basically.

And I do appreciate the other planning that you're looking at trying to make things more safe, this road. Like the other callers, this road is extremely dangerous, people routinely race through there up to 100 miles an hour or so. Two or three times a year it seems like they end up in a ditch or through a power pole or through a fence, so it is hazardous now and, you know, having a bike lane and stuff would be great, but it is zoned ag.

And like Gary had mentioned nothing will change until that changes, but I would like to get it in the record that if it was to go through, you know, that it's really looked at trying to find some alternative to wiping out all those trees on the left side.

And then secondly I pointed out to Gary your current plan shows a proposed route less than a quarter mile to the east, it's 92nd, proposed 92nd Avenue, so to me it doesn't seem necessary to have bike lanes, you know, that's a 100-foot right-of-way that you've already been taken by the County for the first about third of it going south about a quarter mile from 134th Street and it's part of the Wildwood Subdivision that was done in 1988.

So, we have that right-a-way or you've had that right-of-way for a long time and the rest of it like I said it wouldn't be developed until things change. Right now I think most of it's ag on that route also, but that routes been on the map for a long time and like I said less than a quarter of a mile to the east, I don't really see a need for bike lanes on both of those which I assume a 100-foot right-of-way would have bike lanes.

And then so that kind of affects Number 9 on your list too, if you really didn't need 87th then you wouldn't need from 87th to 92nd that portion of 134th. So therefore, you know, I do basically, I do oppose this reclassification based on just on the fact that I don't think it's needed because of what you already have on the map and because of my concern for the trees. Any questions for

me?

BARCA: Okay. No questions? Thank you, Gary.

FOLKERTS: Okay. Thank you.

KAMP: Okay. I'm going to go ahead and try the previous caller again and see if we can get the audio. Caller User, I'm going to unmute you now and you should get a message that says you've been unmuted and then go ahead and, go ahead and let us know your name and spell it for us, and if you want to be a party of record your mailing address or e-mail address and please speak as clearly and slowly as you can. Thanks.

FOLKERTS: Alfred Folkerts. 6315 N.E. 47th Street, Vancouver, Washington.

KAMP: Could you say your name one more time and spell it for us.

FOLKERTS: Alfred Folkerts, A-l-f-r-e-d, F-o-l-k-e-r-t-s.

KAMP: Thank you very much. Go ahead.

FOLKERTS: Yes. I'm Alfred Folkerts, 6315 N.E. 47th Street. I am in regards to the same area that Gary just spoke of earlier, 87th Avenue between 119th Street and 134th Street, the right-of-way expansion, and as you gathered due to a row of sequoias and azaleas that would fall on the right-of-way and I believe probably would be removed, they're three feet in diameter, and I suggest that a 12-foot offset of the three-eighths of a mile on the west side of 87th Avenue and a reference might be that the offset that was done with the Thorntons' Christmas Tree farm on 119th Street would be placed a similar type situation.

Also, if a sidewalk not next to the curb so also move it next to the curb in that area from roughly 126th Street to 134th Street on 87th Avenue. These are unusual trees and still would give the trees to the sidewalk and save those beautiful big trees. So, I think that with those options that they could be saved and at the same time be very useful to the right-of-way as well. So, are there any questions? Hello?

BARCA: I think we understand your position, Alfred, and since there is no actual design at this time only a proposal for a standard (inaudible) discussion about potential road offset or other items could occur at a later time as Rob Klug mentioned that all of these things would be taken into account, but it's agricultural land, this is just a planning process at this point in time so your suggestion and your proposal for offset has been noted. Thank you.

FOLKERTS: And that's my point is that I understand it's not presently there, but if this would be a 20-year design proposal that's being set up I would like to see that setup made rather than 20 years from now when it's could be done and have to be readjusted. Okay.

BARCA: Okay. All right. Thank you very much. Is that the --

KAMP: Okay. We have, we still have --

BARCA: -- do we have more comment?

KAMP: Yeah. We've gone through everyone; we have a previous commenter that has raised their hand again. I don't know, I think your procedures are just once but I wanted to let you know.

BARCA: Yeah, I think anything additional that they'd like to put in they can put in in the form of written commentary.

KAMP: Okay. With that, I'll just do one more time. Any other comments please raise your hand using the raised hand icon or star 3 for those that are calling in. Okay. And for those who have already made a comment, please lower you hand, and if you're on the phone please dial star 3, that will let us know you're lowering your hand.

HALBERT: How many are lowered?

KAMP: Star 3. Okay. I don't think we have any new commenters.

Return to Planning Commission

BARCA: Okay. And so everybody else has been muted. I bring it back to the Planning Commission for discussion and deliberation, please speak up.

JOHNSON: This is Karl. Gary, good job. I just, you know, with all the confusion of what people think is going to happen, the clarification was well made, Ron, regarding, you know, we're not building bike lanes tomorrow, and so I think that was an important thing to interject in the middle of it, so I'm inclined to support staff's recommendation.

HALBERT: Yeah, Bryan Halbert here. You know, Gary, I found a lot of opposition in the Facebook pages to the proposed amendments and it really does mean like most of the commenters really aren't certain how this is being funded, when it is being built and could you speak to the process of paying for and installing bike lanes, many commenters were very opposed to bikes because they don't pay taxes on and, yes, they still get to share the road, do you have a comment on that?

ALBRECHT: Well, so like I said at the Planning Commission work session, so that's a common misconception. So if a person's riding a bike and lives in a house they're paying property taxes and those property taxes help pay for the roads and whether they're owning it or renting it, that house is paying property taxes, that's one source of revenue scheme for the roads to get built

from people thinking that bikes don't pay their fair share.

So, you know, and the other one was the bike licenses. So, in the master plan, they have a comment that there's been research out that bike licenses discourage people to having them pay for these improvements. I've seen some of those Facebook comments as well. I mean, I don't -- I'm just going to stop talking to them on it.

KLUG: Gary, do you want me to kind of fill in a little bit about the funding structure that goes into paying for our roads?

ALBRECHT: I could. Well, you know, it goes from the Comprehensive Growth Management Plan, it starts there and then it would filter down into the Six-Year Transportation Improvement Plan.

KLUG: No. No, I'm sorry, Gary, I was talking about the funding.

ALBRECHT: Oh, okay. Yeah, please do.

KLUG: So, once again, Rob Klug again, the Transportation Division Manager. I'm responsible for traffic engineering, traffic signals, the grant program that you heard from Susan and the TIP that you heard from Susan before, that's part of the umbrella that I manage and also transportation planning, so I have a pretty good understanding, a deep involvement in all of this.

There are a whole bunch of different funding sources that go together to make the funding that we use to build new roads and also to maintain those roads and the gas tax is a portion of the money that we get that goes into that pot of money that has a lot of different what we call colors of money.

There's the road fund which is primarily developed by the gas tax and mostly from your property taxes and real estate excise tax too which is a fee that's paid, put out (inaudible) that goes into fund primarily parks and road construction. There's traffic impact fees that are assessed against new developments that are used in some of the seed money that we use to build additional capacity and safety improvement projects.

There's a lot of other fees, a lot of other pots of money that we get from for sales tax, a little bit of license tax, et cetera, so it is true that when you drive your car you do pay more taxes I guess because you're buying gas also, but the person who's riding their bicycle or walking for that consideration because if you don't want to provide for bicycles why do you want to provide for pedestrians walking on sidewalks because obviously pedestrians don't pay taxes, right, I'm being facetious here, you can't see my expression on my face, I apologize.

All of that goes into a mix and then we take some of the money and put it into the ongoing programs to be able to maintain the existing roadways, pay for the maintenance and other work

like that and it also goes into other where we leverage the money through grants to get 2 to \$3, sometimes more for every dollar that we put in to get grants to come in and build more that are based upon federal taxes that come off of gas tax and other taxes.

So I've heard the argument over the years, I've also heard the argument that some people will say that renters don't pay any tax at all and somehow the property manager who owns, the landlord is coming up with all the taxes and he's not charging through to his rent, it's not a correct view on how the taxing structure works. So, I'm happy to take any questions.

BARCA: That cover it Bryan.

HALBERT: Yeah. Yeah, thank you, Rob, appreciate you covering that again. I think that anyone listening it helps for us all to be reminded that it isn't just a gas tax, that we all are contributing towards these bike lanes and the potential for pedestrians and bikers to be safer on our roads is a huge piece, so thanks for that.

KLUG: You're welcome.

HALBERT: Thanks, Gary, for your presentation, appreciate all the work you put into this and I think about supporting this process.

ENGE: This is Bryant Enge. Gary, just, and others and Ron and Rob, just a question, there seems to be some confusion in terms of this being a planning exercise and not involving projects, is it in the future to do this exercise, there is a project that is in the near future that one can connect it to, that's just my comment or my question I would ask?

ALBRECHT: I'm confused. What are you asking?

ENGE: Well, there was a lot of confusion, Gary, about this just being a planning exercise versus this being a project, and so the question I have is that is it better or, and more efficient to raise these issues or have a discussion around these changes in the roads when it's connected directly to a project?

ALBRECHT: You know, it's a 20-year plan we're looking at, so we're changing the road classifications so when development does occur, it can get built to that standard. So, it's just really complicated and it's not necessarily a good planning idea to do the same thing at the same time.

So it's like what we've done with 179th, we've had a plan in place for the cross-section of how it looks and now we're actually getting to the point where we're dealing with WSDOT having a design criteria to have it built and funded, so we've got that in place. So, it's better to have a line on the map in place than to do two things at once.

KLUG: So, this is Rob. I like to think of it as a long-term vision, we have to have the vision to understand how we're going to put the pieces together to build the puzzle to actually provide the services ultimately the residents need.

A good example is Padden Parkway. The County started doing the planning for Padden Parkway and trying to reserve the right-of-way and set it aside 30 years before it was finished and it took 30 years from the inception until it was actually, the last portion was finished about 15, 16 years ago.

So having that long-term vision helps us to be able to project for the future needs of the system of the people in the community and what we're doing right now if we're laying the ground work for that visioning by making sure that the road network is going to support the variety of sources that we expect to be on the road and then that allows us to put the pieces together as the bursts of development occurs and as occur to make sure that we are as development occurs we're reserving the right-of-way, we are reserving the ability to make sure that we can build that road to the needs of the community.

ENGE: So, Rob, it's me. So, you say you're reserving the right-of-way, the right-of-way is, already belongs to Clark County at the time so we're not taking any right-of-way away. I guess the question I have is in the instance where we had a caller concern about the designation of the agriculture underlying that particular land and so what we're going to have to do in order to do changes to the right-of-way in this scenario is actually change or redesignate that particular land use in order to do the, to do these road improvements if we move forward with this bike lane and so that's kind of the connection I was trying to bring up, because otherwise what we're saying here that we're making this planning exercise and then we're moving forward already with the idea that we're going to re-change the land use designation for that particular land.

KLUG: So I'm going to speak a little out of turn here because I'm not an expert in the right-of-way, I'm not a surveyor, I'm a traffic engineer, but with the right-of-way there's a wide variety of ways that right-of-way has been designated, there's fee simple, there is easements, there's a whole variety of things and so we have roads out there that have the basic state law right-of-way that was 20 or 30-foot half-width improvements based upon what the state law was at the time when the area was subdivided originally or subsequent subdivisions.

So on, for example on 21st Avenue we, N.W., and on many of our roads we have a sawtooth of right-of-way where some of it is 20 or 30-foot wide and that's the core road and then a development occurs and we have a widening out for along the frontage or the back of that development.

And so, by designating this road we are setting the standard that says as development occurs this is what will be dedicated or, and/or built to be able to facilitate this road. And so that process goes from whatever method was in place to developing the standard fee simple right-of-way that we use and when you're talking about the areas out in north of Orchards, south of Battle Ground,

that's quite a ways down the road, but we're setting aside to say this is what the road structures what we're intending to be as development continues to occur sometime in the future. Does that answer your question?

ENGE: That answers the question. Again, like I said I'm just a little concerned that I want to be clear that the this effort doesn't make a predetermination of a change in land use for that land and so that's where some of the confusion comes from and so that's a concern I have in terms of what I heard from a couple of the callers.

KLUG: Okay. And Gary can correct me if I'm wrong, please do, changing of land use is a comprehensive plan amendment that is its own process --

ALBRECHT: Yes. Yep.

KLUG: -- this is not that process.

ALBRECHT: Right.

ENGE: That's the part I understand and I'm in agreement. I'm just saying is I think there's some confusion with respect to some of the callers when they called in so that's what I thought I heard.

KLUG: And what I'm hearing in the conversation from the residents and what I've read through the comments I've seen our process is very complex if you're involved in it, if you're not involved in the process I could see where it becomes very, very convoluted and hard to understand.

So I do appreciate this type of involvement such as with the Planning Commission because it gives us a chance to have the discussion and hopefully people will know to say, okay, this is different than what I thought it was and I'm more comfortable with the situation and maybe what I was concerned about is not as big a deal as I originally considered.

ENGE: Thank you, Rob, appreciate it.

KLUG: Yep.

BARCA: Okay. Then I think to Bryant's point similar to me trying to make some clarification in the middle maybe we can front load some of these clarifications for the public to help them have a better understanding about what our specific goal is at the moment and why we believe it's progressive for us to be doing the work that we're doing right now.

So that being said, we've had a fairly lengthy discussion, we've had quite a bit of input from the public, if there's no additional deliberation, I'd like to get a motion. If there is deliberation, this is our opportunity for Planning Commission to ask or give us their comments one or the other.

JOHNSON: If there is not comments, I make a **motion** to accept staff's recommendation.

ENGE: **I second** it.

BARCA: Okay. It's been motioned, it's been seconded. Let's go ahead and do roll call.

HALBERT: Ron.

BARCA: Oh, hang on.

HALBERT: I think it should be accepted as amended because it was amended during the process.

BARCA: Oh, yes, you're right, Bryan. We have Number 5 was not going to be modified to a reclassification even though that's the way text goes at this moment.

ALBRECHT: Correct.

BARCA: Good catch.

HALBERT: Could the amendment be revised?

BARCA: Yeah, we do friendly amendment.

JOHNSON: Yeah, friendly amendment.

BARCA: To Karl.

JOHNSON: Yes, friendly amendment as revised. Does that make sense?

BARCA: Everybody clear on that? Gary, shake your head yes or no.

ALBRECHT: I'm clear. Thank you.

BARCA: All right. So, we're looking for approval as revised. Okay. Now let's do roll call.

ROLL CALL VOTE

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

BARCA: And that moves the approval forward 4 to 0. Gentlemen on the Planning Commission, it's 9:30, we've been at this more or less for three hours, I need five minutes minimum for myself before we join the public again, does anybody need longer than five minutes?

JOHNSON: No, that will be fine for me.

BARCA: Okay. Then we will start up again at 9:35 and I can call the meeting back to order.

(Pause in proceedings.)

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS, continued

D. 2020 Annual Reviews and Dockets amending the 20-Year Growth Management Comprehensive Plan Text and Map, Zone Map, and Clark County Code (Title 40):

1. **CPZ2020-00001** Reach – A proposal to amend the comprehensive plan and zoning designation from Commercial (NC) to Urban Medium Density Residential (R-22) on six parcels, which are cumulatively 4.21 acres (104530004, 104530040, 104600000, 104530016, 104530041, and 104530002).

Staff Contact: Sharon.Lumbantobing@clark.wa.gov or (564) 397-4909

BARCA: All right. Let's proceed. We have CPZ2020-00001, Reach.

LUMBANTOBING: Good evening, Planning Commissioners. This is Sharon Lumbantobing, I'm a Land Use Planner with Clark County Community Planning. So, this is CPZ2020-00001, Reach Community Development, Inc.

This is a proposal to amend the comp plan and zoning map designation from commercial with neighborhood commercial zoning to urban medium density residential with R-22 zoning on three parcels which are owned by Reach Community Development and they're cumulatively three acres.

If this amendment is approved by Council, there are three other adjacent parcels with two different owners that would be left behind in the neighborhood commercial designation and they

requested to be included in this comp plan and zone change request. The total cumulative acres of this request are 4.21 acres. The subject parcel -- Jacqui, can you move to the next slide, sorry. Next slide even. Next slide.

So, they're located along N.E. Covington Road just south of N.E. 76th Street. The subject parcels, so Reach CDI is a nonprofit that owns Covington Commons Limited Partnership. One of the three subject parcels owned by Reach has eight existing residential buildings with 40 affordable housing apartments, the other two subject parcels are vacant.

The proposed comp plan zoning from NC to R-22 would enable Reach to develop 15 to 20 additional affordable housing units on the two vacant parcels. In addition, having the same comprehensive plan and zoning designation on all the Reach properties would assist Reach with completing their resyndication process by placing all three developments into one tax credit. Resyndication is a tax allocation program where tax credits can be used to upgrade older properties or construct new ones.

The Council requested Reach to submit a Covenant Agreement that runs with the land stating that if this comp plan and zoning change was approved, the three subject parcels owned by Reach will be dedicated to preserving or developing long-term affordable housing to individuals with incomes at or below 60 percent of the area median incomes in Clark County for 30 years. And this map shows the three parcels that are not in the covenant, they are privately owned, they are not low-income housing developers.

Immediately to the north of the subject parcels about 1200 feet at the intersection of N.E. Covington Road and N.E. 76th Street there are eight parcels zoned community commercial and four parcels zoned neighborhood commercial that serve the commercial needs of the community.

The six subject parcels have been zoned neighborhood commercial since 1994 and have not developed as commercial. Due to their small parcel sizes and location, the subject parcels are not as well suited to commercial development as the commercial properties at the intersection of N.E. Covington Road and N.E. 76th Street.

Staff finds this request meets the criteria for the comp plan and zoning map changes and is forwarding a recommendation of approval to the Planning Commission. That's all I have.

BARCA: Questions for staff? Okay. Seeing none, do we have anybody from the public calling in on this?

LUMBANTOBING: Well, the applicant is here, I don't know if they have, they'd like to present, Jacqui.

KAMP: Do you want to remind me who that is again?

LUMBANTOBING: It could be Eric Pattison or Brian Bieler, they're both there.

KAMP: Eric Pattison. And who was the other one?

LUMBANTOBING: Brian Bieler.

KAMP: Okay.

PATTISON: Yeah. So, Erik and Brian are both here from Reach to take questions. I don't know if there's anything necessary to add. We are intending to expand the affordable housing on the adjacent parcels as financing permit.

BARCA: Okay. For clarification sake in looking at the map, the three parcels not in the covenant, are those owned by Reach as well?

LUMBANTOBING: No, they are owned by a private owner. It's actually two parcels, the third parcel is a very narrow utility easement.

BARCA: Okay. The key says three parcels, so we roll with it.

LUMBANTOBING: It does have three, it has three tax identification numbers.

BARCA: All right. But they are not part of the covenant?

LUMBANTOBING: Correct.

BARCA: Okay. So, it's the two smaller parcels above on Covington headed towards 76th that will get the covenant and add the additional affordable housing units?

LUMBANTOBING: Correct. The property, the Reach property to the south of the two vacant parcels will also be in the covenant.

BARCA: All right. Anybody else have questions?

ENGE: No questions but just some clarification or maybe Brian or Erik want to speak to this in terms of Reach if this in fact will allow them to access additional resources so they can make improvements to these existing affordable housing like they have been.

PATTISON: It sounds like Brian maybe went into an echo chamber, but the adjacent parcels we are in discussion with at least one of the seller or one of the owners to potentially purchase the lot, but the -- by changing the zoning designation it allows us to add additional units as well as the hope is that the income (inaudible) of our adjacently owned lots into a large tax deal, but

even outside of that it will be land that is held by Reach for the long-term with the goal of adding affordable housing units to the lot.

BARCA: Okay. As much as we appreciate Mr. Bieler wanting to have testimony, it seems difficult right now with the technical problems we're having. Does that answer your question, Bryant, satisfactorily?

ENGE: I think so, Ron. Well, I didn't have any questions, I just wanted Erik and/or Brian to speak to that this consolidation will assist them not only with building additional units but also allow them to access resources, funds, so they can make improvements to the existing affordable housing that's already there.

BIELER: This is Brian, I will add that that's correct, I apologize for the feedback issue.

HALBERT: Bryan speaking. I think we did hear Brian confirm Bryant's question or comments there confirming that this will facilitate more affordable housing in Clark County. I have no further questions and be ready to support this proposal.

BARCA: All right. Let's check and make sure there's nobody else out from the public that wants to give any kind of commentary or questions. Where do we stand?

Public Comment

KAMP: Let me go ahead and give the instructions just a couple more times here. If you are joining by computer or a WebEx application internet and if you'd like to speak, please utilize the raised hand icon. If you can't find the raised hand icon, please go ahead and find your participant button, that will then if you click on it that will show you the raised hand icon, click on it and that will let us know that you would like to speak and then we will acknowledge you. For those calling in by phone, please dial star 3 on your phone's number panel, that will let us know you are raising your hand. If anyone would like to make comment, please raise your hand now. Again, raised hand icon on your computer or mobile device or star 3 if you're calling in.

Okay. We do have one caller; I'm going to go ahead and unmute you now. Please say your name and spell it for us, and if you want to be a party of record, please give us a mailing address or an e-mail address and please speak as clear as you can and as slow too so we can grab all that you have to say in the transcript. Thank you.

ORJIAKO: This is the Planning Director, Oliver Orjiako. Typically I don't make comments on a proposal; however, this is one where the applicant has proposed a covenant running with the property which to me typically 20 years, 30 years, that's a long time, but for that commitment that is one of the things that I would like the Planning Commission to consider.

Other than that, I typically don't comment on application before the Planning Commission, but

they made that offer which I think is significant to have a covenant and making this if it were to be approved by the Planning Commission and Council up to 30-years commitment. That's the only comment I have. Thank you, Planning Commission members.

BARCA: Thank you, Oliver. Is that the only call-in that we have?

KAMP: That is all I see now. Anyone else? Not seeing any.

Return to Planning Commission

BARCA: Okay. Then let's bring it back to Planning Commission. Any deliberation? If not, then I will take a motion.

ENGE: I **move** to accept the staff recommendation on the amendment to the comprehensive plan to change the designation from commercial to urban medium density residential.

JOHNSON: This is Karl, I'll **second** the motion.

BARCA: Okay. We've had a motion, it's been seconded and let's go to roll call, please.

ROLL CALL VOTE

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

BARCA: All right. It's been motioned and approved 4 to 0. Can we go to our next comprehensive plan change, please.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS, continued

D. 2020 Annual Reviews and Dockets amending the 20-Year Growth Management Comprehensive Plan Text and Map, Zone Map, and Clark County Code (Title 40):

- 2. CPZ2020-00010 25th Promenade North** – A proposal to amend the comprehensive plan and zoning from Commercial (Community Commercial) to Urban High Density Residential (R -30) on one parcel (20020000). The parcel is currently split zoned with R-30 and CC zoning and is 3.45 acres

Staff Contact: Sharon.Lumbantobing@clark.wa.gov or (564) 397-4909

LUMBANTOBING: This applicant is requesting to amend the comprehensive plan designation and zoning map designation from commercial with community commercial zoning to urban high density residential with R-30 zoning on one parcel that's 3.45 acres.

The site is currently split zoned with community commercial designation on the western four-fifths of the property with the balance currently zoned R-30. The subject parcel is located in the Vancouver urban growth area along the east side of State Route 503 between N.E. 119th south to N.E. 115th Street and is part of a 57-acre continuous commercial corridor.

The western four-fifths of the parcel has been zoned commercial since '94, it has remained undeveloped. The eastern one-fifth of the parcel was brought into the UGA in 2004 at which time it was rezoned R-30 with an urban holding overlay, that was lifted in 2008. Jacqui, next slide. Next slide, keep going. Next slide. Yep. Community commercial zoning allows for --

KAMP: That one?

LUMBANTOBING: Yep, that one, the commercial one, perfect. Community commercial zoning allows for a wide range of uses including residential uses permitted above the ground floor. This slide shows all the potential uses beyond retail.

Community commercial was identified during the 2016 comp plan update as the most appropriate zoning for this location due to the site's proximity to SR-503, its location near a retail center with heavy traffic flow and proximity to concentrated residential development.

The current zoning is more consistent with the comprehensive plan policies and commercial zoning allowed for both housing and long-term employment in the area through a wide range of allowed commercial uses whereas the conversion of commercial land to R-30 could result in a permanent loss of employment land and associated jobs in the future. The R-30 designation would also break up the commercial corridor and leave two parcels zoned community commercial just to the south of the subject parcels. Next slide.

Gary is the transportation planner and he's going to address the access issue to this site off SR-503.

ALBRECHT: Thank you, Sharon. So, we actually invited WSDOT to attend this hearing, but they were unable to make it. So SR-503 is classified as a Class III highway, so in order to get into the development where the red X is, a right-turn deceleration lane is required, so there's according to WSDOT there's a lack of right-of-way to safely construct a right-turn deceleration lane, so the site access is not allowed.

What they've done is they've granted emergency access to N.E. 116th Street, that's where the, it's basically where the red X is, so that's, they've got ballers there so only emergency vehicles are able to access that, and if you want to get into the site you've got to go down 119th over to

122nd and then back in, and that's how you would access the site.

LUMBANTOBING: Next slide, Jacqui. Thank you, Gary. So, staff is recommending denial of this request and that's all I have.

BARCA: Questions of staff? Okay. Not hearing any questions of staff at this moment, we can come back to deliberation. Is the applicant here or anybody from the public wishing to comment?

LUMBANTOBING: Yes, Mike Odren is here.

ODREN: Hi. Can everybody hear me?

KAMP: Yes.

ODREN: Wonderful. Good evening and thank you for the opportunity to present a short PowerPoint presentation and testimony regarding this proposed comprehensive plan and zoning map amendment. My name is Mike Odren, M-i-k-e, O-d-r-e-n, I'm a landscape architect and land use planner with Olson Engineering, 222 East Evergreen Boulevard, Vancouver and my e-mail is part of the record. Moving on to the next slide, please. You can see, that's just a quick summary of the proposal. Please move to the next slide.

You can see the location of the subject parcel and the parcel's proximity to existing roadways and adjacent development. The adjacent development primarily consists of multi-family housing to the east and southeast with some single-family residential uses to the south and north and I believe there might be a commercial use in one of those single-family residences to the north.

While not shown on the current aerial photo, the western most portion of the parcel 200100000 to the south which is the site of the Promenade Apartments has been recently developed as a mini-storage facility primarily serving the residents of those apartments. Next slide, please.

The next slide shows the existing comprehensive plan designation and zoning of the subject parcel and surrounding property. As you can clearly see the split zoned nature of the subject parcel. Any commercial development of subject parcel would not only have to deal with the access restrictions imposed by WDOT as evidenced by the letter WDOT has provided as contained in the application material, but would also have to address the R-30 zone sliver of property along the eastern portion of the site. Move on to the next, please.

Moving on to the next set of slides, these are Google street views of the subject parcel along SR-503. You can slowly scroll through these. You can clearly see the existing bus stop along the parcel frontage as well as the existing driveway drop off N.E. 116th Street; however, as mentioned there is insufficient distance in right-of-way available to the south along the east side of SR-503 to provide a right-turn deceleration lane onto 116th Street and as such WDOT has

indicated that vehicular ingress and egress will not be allowed. So, without access, it's our position that commercial use just simply won't work. If you go to the next slide, please.

This one, this slide shows the travel distance from N.E. 116th Street which I'm sure was probably assumed by Clark County Long Range Planning staff that would eventually provide vehicular access to the subject parcel. Prior to the development of the Promenade Apartments when this access restriction came to light, in order to access the subject parcel (inaudible) to travel would of course take one along north along 503 to 119th Street to 122nd Avenue and south along 122nd Avenue to 116th Street and west along 116th Street to the subject parcel we saw a similar exhibit that staff showed, but this results in a distance of approximately 3,755 feet or approximately seven-tenths of a mile.

Now before continuing with the PowerPoint, I'd like to address a couple of items from the staff report as well as highlighting some items from the application narrative. It is clear taken on the surface of and based solely on the goals and policies on the comp plan that commercial (inaudible) of the subject parcel makes sense; however, what is missing is the realization that very limited and out of way travel to access this site does not make this site viable for commercial development.

While staff has indicated that there are housing opportunities available in the commercial zoning district, most rely on an underlying commercial use. Commercial uses would still require direct vehicular access to make it attractive for commercial development. Additionally, according to the market analysis provided in the application, the current movement has the need for commercial brick and mortar stores trending down as e-commerce continues to increase with vacancies rising in even existing commercial development and now with the onset of COVID this downward trend makes (inaudible).

And one last item of note, the 2015 amended Clark County buildable lands report indicated that the County's overall residential goal is eight units per acre; however, according to the report there's currently a density of 5.7 units per acre. Development of multi-family housing on the subject parcel would move the County closer to its goal of eight units per acre.

Additionally, and according to the same report, the County has a goal of providing no more than 75 percent of any single product type of residential uses. And currently the County has approximately 79 percent single-family and a 21 percent multi-family residential split. Development of the subject parcel of multi-family residential would further this goal in bringing the County 75 percent goal closer to fruition. Next slide, please.

Now in summary, while the current comprehensive plan designation of commercial and the zoning of commercial, community commercial may have been in place on the subject parcel since '94 and it was identified during the 2016 periodic review of the comprehensive plan as the most appropriate zoning for the subject parcel, the parcel still remains undeveloped.

One reason is that the County may not have taken into consideration the access restrictions necessary to support commercial development, in fact, this may be the underlying reason why the parcel as well as other commercially zoned parcels adjacent to it may have remained undeveloped.

The proposed comprehensive plan and zoning map amendment would allow development of the subject parcel that would be compatible with other adjacent and surrounding land uses. It would also add much needed affordable and multi-family housing which would move the County closer to its goal of eight dwelling units per acre.

It will also contribute to the economy through (inaudible) and the construction industry. While there are some residential uses allowed in community commercial zones, almost all rely on some kind of underlying commercial use which requires efficient and direct vehicular access.

So, based on the reasons above as well as those indicated in the applicant submittal material, a comprehensive plan designation of urban high density residential and a zoning designation of R-30 are appropriate for this site. I'm available now for any questions if staff or the Commission may have.

BARCA: Any questions for the applicant? Okay.

HALBERT: I'm sorry, I'm slow to get to my button here, Ron. Bryan Halbert here and, Mike, thanks for sticking around for this, it's a long night.

ODREN: Yes, indeed.

HALBERT: You know, if it was to stay community commercial and you said there's a seven-tenth of a mile trip to get to this site from 117th, what happens on a traffic study if it is commercial using that residential road? I know there's probably not a traffic study done, but I haven't seen that, that would be putting more trips onto a residential road, do you have an opinion on that, Mike?

ODREN: Yeah. We did have a traffic study prepared for this and a -- it indicated, I'm looking at it right now, it is part of the application material, let's just take a look here real quick, let's see, the trip generation for, okay, so the traffic study in the application indicates that if it were to remain zoned as-is and with the one-fifth, four-fifths split between the two zoning designations that there would be approximately, and this would include some pass-by trips that the new site trips would be about 1,288 average daily trips for a, say a shopping center type use which would be considered a multi-tenant mixed sort of commercial use development plus some housing as opposed to full build-out which would give us, you know, 103 apartments to maximize the density of 754 average daily trips, so there's a significant difference between the almost 1300 average daily trips with the current zoning versus the 754 average daily trips with the low-rise housing which would be a, you know, three-story apartment complex.

HALBERT: Mike, did the -- would the traffic study address some of the other commercial uses I, you know, was looking at the list here churches, warehouses, storage, all much lower trip counts and really perfect for like many commercial sites, has that been discussed at all?

ODREN: No, there was not an exhaustive traffic study completed that looked at all of the possible commercial uses on the subject parcel. Generally, a shopping center use would be typical of would encapsulate a number of retail, office, restaurant uses, other uses of course would be potentially a lower trip generator; however, the lack of access would not make this necessarily attractive for any of those other.

And keep in mind that if this were to be rezoned to R-30 a lot of those other uses are still available to be, you know, like such as assisted living facilities, churches I believe would be allowed uses within that zone. I'm quickly pulling that up right now on my computer to be able to speak more intelligently to that.

HALBERT: Mike, I don't believe that churches are far outright permitted without a conditional use permit.

ODREN: Oh, right. You're right. My apologies, yes, there would be a conditional use permit required in that regard.

HALBERT: I'm wondering why it wouldn't be easier for the remainder of the parcel zoned R-30 to be brought over to the commercial designation than the other way around?

ODREN: I would assume it probably would be; however, we still have the issue of the access from a general commercial standpoint that is still limiting in that area. Also keep in mind that while this particular parcel has yet to be developed and remains undeveloped, the large commercial center for this area which is Bowyer Marketplace just to the northwest it too has remained fully undeveloped, it still has probably, as our firm was involved with it, it still has at least three pad sites that it was originally approved for I believe ten years ago still available for development.

So when you're looking, and that includes that all of the other commercially done parcels that are along there that have yet to develop or redevelop and Bowyer is shovel ready, it has been entitled, it has all of the necessary utilities available to it, it has a binding site plan approval so that it is able to be, each individual lot is able to be created so that it can be, each lot could be sold or leased and so that the opportunities for commercial development with very good access from SR-503 and 119th Street are present and yet have still not built out.

HALBERT: Mike, I think you make very good points and I don't disagree with you that retail has been very challenged and we're not sure how it's going to come back so, but this site really isn't setup for retail, it would have to really be looking at some of the other uses that are on the CC designation. Okay. I'm good for now. Thanks though, Mike.

ODREN: You're welcome.

BARCA: Other questions for the applicant? Okay. Hearing none, I'm going to move to the idea of whether or not we have any call-ins?

Public Comment

KAMP: Okay. I think this is our last public comment period, so this is the last time I'm going to say this tonight. For those that are joining us from computer or WebEx application if you would like to speak, please utilize the raised hand icon, you can do this by clicking the participant button or icon. Staff will only acknowledge those attendees that have raised their hand. When you are acknowledged, you will be unmuted.

For attendees using the telephone option, you need to press star 3 on your phone's number panel to raise your hand, you will hear a message that says you have raised your hand. When you are acknowledged, you will be unmuted, and you will hear a message that lets you know that. When you have finished your comment, press star 3 to lower your hand. You will hear a message that tells you you have lowered your hand as well.

Okay. So far, we have at least one person wanting to make comment, it is a call-in. I'm going to go ahead and unmute you now. Please tell us your name, and if you want to be a party of record, please give us your mailing address or e-mail address and also please spell your name for us. Thank you.

ORJIAKO: Thank you, Jacqui. This is Oliver Orjiako, the Planning Director. I will just wait and respond to any questions that the Planning Commission may have of staff, so I'm just available to support staff and answer the questions that the PC may have and I will sign up and wait.

KAMP: Any other -- thank you, Oliver -- any other comments from members that have joined us? Remember to hit that raised hand icon if you're using your computer or mobile device and star 3 if you have called in with your phone. Okay. I'm not seeing any raised hands.

Return to Planning Commission

BARCA: Okay. Then let's go ahead and close the public comment period for this and move into deliberation. I guess I'll start since I've got the mic at the moment.

I think staff is pretty clear on the idea that even with the limited transportation route community commercial does offer some opportunities, assisted living, warehouse, church, there's potentially some types of office driven business space with small customer interaction that these traffic issues would not impact.

I think as I saw the applicant's presentation there's also the case to be made that says commercial is changing, there is an opportunity to utilize this land in an area that already has high amounts of traffic and is it desirable for residential even though the property across with the WinCo in it I think he called it the Bowyer space, it used to be a golf course, the Par 3 Golf Course was there, and it isn't fully built out and should the commercial space be given over, there's some positive aspects to it.

If we want to create jobs and the potential of utilization of commercial land as commercial was designated, you actually have to have an inventory of land available. I think the unfortunate aspect as I see this right now is, we have this split zoning which is really something that we needed to resolve some time ago and we let it go on.

So, I am interested to hear what the other Planning Commissioners think. I've given both sides of the coin and I'd like to see where the other people fall.

HALBERT: Okay. Bryan here and I'll speak up. You know, part of me, and I can see both sides of the coin on this one too just like you, Ron. Part of me is are we zoning change to chase the current trends and the trend is that commercial isn't viable, multi-family is and we could better utilize this land today with multi-family, but it being taken out of the commercial inventory of the, you know, the applicant's presentation showing that even when there is commercial inventory in that area there may not be enough (inaudible), he didn't say this, there may not be enough rooftops in the area to support the commercial services that are, that could be available on land ready for development, but I'm also concerned that if this land is rezoned to residential, there's several other smaller pieces adjacent to this that would be orphaned that should probably still have the same access challenges as this property does, that corner that was carved out probably some long time ago, not the corner of the intersection, but the corner of the subject property also wouldn't have a right-in de-acceleration lane because it's already a bus stop at that spot and it seems like multi-family and a bus stop and walking distance to the commercial services that are there would be desirable. So, I'm sorry, I'm going on both sides here and really torn that about rezoning this land.

I think staff is right that we should, that we'll lose commercial land out of our inventory and the applicant's right that commercial land just isn't moving today, and this land could be better utilized right now.

BARCA: Other members of the Planning Commission, your thoughts, please.

ENGE: Well, Bryant Enge here. Ron, and, Bryan, you know, I'm twisted or torn just like the two of you. I appreciate the applicant's presentation, but we have a lack of inventory in terms of commercial space. Staff is looking at existing policy and also trying to plan for the future, so I'm just a little reluctant at this time to approve the change and support the staff recommendation.

BARCA: Karl, are you with us brother?

KAMP: Karl, I've unmuted you.

BARCA: I show Karl as being unmuted but I'm not picking up any audio from him.

KAMP: He seems to be connected but I mean I'm not sure if he's having audio issues.

BARCA: Okay. We need to come up with something that we feel is a reasonable recommendation. We can zone the whole thing commercial. We could zone the whole thing residential. We could not make a recommendation and pass it up the line. Staff obviously wants to hold the line commercial, but it seems like that little sliver of residential needs to be dealt with as well.

So, I know, Oliver, you're listening. I think it is something that needs to be taken into consideration, the idea of the split zoning. So anything from the Planning Commission to move this forward or --

KAMP: Ron, I think Oliver wanted to comment on --

BARCA: Oh, all right. I'll mute.

KAMP: Oliver.

ORJIAKO: Yes, Planning Commission members, I hear you. We are going to be looking at, I mean the next review of the County Comprehensive Plan actually it's not due until June 30th, 2025. As we look at the periodic review, these type of issues is one that we will be very cognizant of.

It is never the desire of the Council or the Planning Commission or even staff to split, have a split zoning of a property. This one is unique because it appears that the area that have developed residentially isn't really significant that will have any impact on the future development of the property, but we will try our best to make sure that as we review the plan going forward we minimize areas where there are split zoning and make sure to the best that we can, that the zoning follows the appropriate lot line.

So that's my input here. I was hoping that you will have a question. This one is a very unique one. You all have raised some concern and I share the presentation from the representative of the applicant; however, when you're taking a worst-case scenario you really don't know what's going to happen.

Worst-case scenario is maybe a Safeway, maybe a Fred Meyer, when you look at CC, on the other hand, you could have a branch bank, you could have similar uses that are in terms of traffic impact

maybe very minimal, I'm not going to convince you one way or the other, but it is important to look long term, yes, it's true that today changes are occurring in terms of our commercial needs, many of our businesses are going online, we don't know yet what the impact of the COVID-19 is going to have on land use, but you have to look at what are the future that we are trying to plan for. We have a huge tax (inaudible) to our folks to the south and we have to take that into consideration.

Clark County continues to grow, right now we are very close to about 500,000 and we are going to continue to grow. You guys had some issues and discussion about the arterial atlas amendment, you can only expand the urban growth boundary hence some of this area that are very flat and developable are gone, you don't get it back. If you expand to the rural area, you don't get this type of property developable in the rural area when you expand the urban growth boundary. I just want you to consider those issues as you look at some of this application that are coming before you, we have to be patient.

BARCA: Okay. Thank you, Oliver.

ORJIAKO: You're welcome.

BARCA: Okay. Gentlemen, as acting chair this evening I'm not going to put forward a motion. We will act on a motion that comes from the Commission itself. Staff is recommending denial, that's one option for us. We could approve or we could pass along without recommendation. Under all those circumstances I think it's what we're building here in the record our reasons why that is most important before it goes before the County Council. So, it's almost 10:30.

HALBERT: Say, Ron, what would a non-motion look like, would we say we're tabling this because it is unfortunately a no-win whichever way it goes if it was multi-family in between all of the community commercial out there it would be dividing up other community commercial and yet as you look to the south it's been developed as storage to support multi-family, this is a very difficult zoning to ponder.

BARCA: So, I think to answer the question is we would make a motion to pass this up to County Council without a recommendation. I think the complexity of it is going to still fall on the idea of patience, stick with the plan or declare the area in a position where it's never going to be consumed as community commercial and turn it into the residential.

You know, I think there's probably many commercial uses that could be put in place that would generate less trips through those neighborhoods than additional apartments, 754 daily trips is it seems like the threshold as far as if we're going to go residential, and once again as you pointed out, Bryan, once we do that then we stand another island of community commercial and be facing this again.

HALBERT: I believe we would and I know there are other occupancies or other types of uses

that do have far less trips, but highly viable on this piece of property, it's 3.45 acres, it's large enough to do something but it's not big enough to generate a Fred Meyer's or a Safeway or anything near that sort of a use especially with no access. I would propose a **motion** that we don't make a decision and pass this along to Council up the line.

BARCA: Okay.

ENGE: I **second** that motion.

BARCA: Okay. So, Bryant, go ahead and mute. Okay. So, as I understand it, we've had a motion and it's been seconded to pass this up to County Council without a recommendation of denial or approval. Does everybody agree with that? You can just shake your head yes. Okay. Has Karl been able to come back on the line?

KAMP: He's still in the participants panelist but I haven't heard him, so I'm not sure what's going on.

BARCA: All right. So, we're going to take the vote and Karl will be a no show at this point in time. All right. So, let's do roll call based on a motion to pass without recommendation of denial or approval, pass it up to County Council. Roll call, please.

ROLL CALL VOTE

ENGE: AYE

HALBERT: AYE

BARCA: I'm going to say **NO** and Karl is not present so that's just the way this one falls. And where do we stand on the rest of our agenda then?

LUMBANTOBING: Sorry. Can I clarify? Is this a vote of 2 to 1 to **not** make any recommendation of denial or approval?

BARCA: That is correct.

ORJIAKO: Jacqui. Jacqui.

KAMP: Yes. Yes, Oliver.

ORJIAKO: I would like Chris to step in. I would like -- this is -- I don't believe -- I would like because you have four PC members and I believe that's a quorum or not, so I would like Chris to weigh in and I would like -- and I would like Karl to participate either way.

COOK: Oliver, are you asking me whether it is proper for the Commissioners who are able to communicate at this point to vote without Karl?

ORJIAKO: Yes, that's my question.

COOK: I believe it is.

ORJIAKO: Okay. Thank you.

COOK: You're welcome.

BARCA: Okay. That doesn't necessarily make us look any better, it's just the way it is at the moment. All right.

OLD BUSINESS

None.

NEW BUSINESS

BARCA: So new business we have election of a chair and a vice chair and there's three people available out of a larger group. I know we've put this off many times but I don't think three out of seven should be voting for these particular positions, and I apologize to everybody that we're so lax on our bylaws, but I don't think that the three of us should all pick Karl and Steve or Rick and Steve tonight just as a thought process. So, Oliver, Sonja, I apologize but I don't think we can do it.

COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION

None.

ADJOURNMENT

BARCA: And hearing nothing else, how about a motion to adjourn.

HALBERT: So moved.

BARCA: Motion to adjourn, I'll second it. 10:36 p.m. Good night.

HALBERT: Good night. Thank you, Ron. Great job.

ADJOURNMENT

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*