



## Clark County Planning Commission

Karl Johnson, Chair  
Matt Swindell, Vice Chair  
Aldo Lampson Veranzo  
Bryant Enge  
Steve Morasch  
Bryan Halbert  
Eldon Wogen

---

### PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 2022

Virtual Public Hearing  
Community Planning  
1300 Franklin Street, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor  
Vancouver, Washington  
6:30 p.m.

#### I. **CALL TO ORDER**

##### A. **Planning Commission Rules of Procedure**

WISER: Karl, we're ready to start the hearing.

JOHNSON: Okay. Good evening, gentlemen, members of the public, and staff members. I would like to call this online public hearing to order for Thursday, February 17th, 2022.

My name is Karl Johnson and I'm the Chairman of the Clark County Planning Commission. Just a quick reminder here, I'm filming above La Center and you can see my camera going in and out. If it gets to a point where that's too distracting, our vice -- new vice chair, Matt Swindell, will break his teeth in at his first meeting. So, I think we'll be okay, but just in case.

The role of the Planning Commission is to review and analyze comprehensive plan amendments, and 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 to consider our recommendation and make a final determination.

The Planning Commission will conduct a public hearing tonight and take testimony regarding the matters being considered tonight. If any public comments were received before tonight's hearing, they have been sent to the PC members and entered into the public record.

Our staff will go first tonight and present information on the agenda items on the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission can then ask questions of staff. Next, we will invite the applicant to speak, if there is one. Then members of the public who wish to provide comment.

When we get to the public comment portion of our agenda, we will provide more detailed information at that time. You will have three minutes to speak and remarks should be directed to the Planning Commission only. Please do not repeat testimony that has already been provided. At the conclusion of the public testimony, we will provide more detailed information at that time. You will also have three minutes to speak and remarks should be directed to the Planning Commission only.

At the conclusion of the public testimony, the applicant may take up to three minutes to respond and the public portion of the hearing will then be closed. Staff may respond to the testimony from the applicant and the public. The Planning Commission will then deliberate and make recommendations to the County Council.

Before we begin tonight's hearing, virtual members of the Planning Commission and staff, please ensure that your microphones are turned off and muted unless you are speaking. Also, remember to turn on your video cameras throughout tonight's hearing. For virtual audience members, you are all muted. You will only be unmuted if you wish to speak during the public comment period.

If any PC members have questions, I will call on each of you individually and you can respond with your questions. I will do the same during the discussion time. When you make a motion, please state your name, and then make your motion. Also, when you second your motion, please state your name and then second that motion.

Conflicts of interest, and these questions are directed to the PC, is there anyone on the Planning Commission that would like to disclose any conflicts of interest before we begin tonight's hearing? Hearing none, we will begin with the roll call of Planning Commission members. Please say I'm here when Sonja calls your name. Sonja, can you please take roll.

## **II. ROLL CALL & INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS**

ENGE: I'm here  
HALBERT: I am here  
VERANZO: I am here  
MORASCH: Absent  
SWINDELL: I'm here  
WOGEN: I'm here  
JOHNSON: I am here

### **Staff Present:**

Oliver Orjiako, Community Planning Director; Jacqui Kamp, Planning Manager II; Christine Cook, Senior Deputy Prosecuting Attorney; Rob Klug, County Engineer; Matt Hermen, Transportation Planner III; Gary Albrecht, Planner III; Sonja Wiser, Program Assistant; and Larisa Sidorov, Office Assistant.

### III. GENERAL & NEW BUSINESS

#### B. Approval of Agenda for February 17, 2022

JOHNSON: We will now take approval for the agenda for February 17, 2022. Can I have a motion for the approval of the agenda for February 17, 2022.

SWINDELL: Karl, this is Matt Swindell. I **MOVE** to approve the agenda for February 17th, 2022.

VERANZO: This is Aldo Veranzo. I **MOVE** to **second** the motion.

JOHNSON: We have heard a motion and second. Sonja, can you please take roll call on the motion.

#### ROLL CALL VOTE

ENGE: AYE

HALBERT: AYE

VERANZO: AYE

SWINDELL: AYE

WOGEN: AYE

JOHNSON: AYE

JOHNSON: Sonja, that's what, 6/0?

WISER: That's 6 to 0.

JOHNSON: All right. Thank you. The motion passes.

#### C. Approval of Minutes for December 16, 2021

JOHNSON: We'll now take a motion on approval for the minutes for December 16th, 2021. Can I have a motion and a second for the approval of these minutes.

HALBERT: Karl, Bryan Halbert here, and I **MOVE** that we approve the minutes as presented for December 16th.

ENGE: This is Bryant Enge. I **second** that motion.

JOHNSON: We've heard a motion and a second. Sonja, can you please take roll call for the motion.

#### ROLL CALL VOTE

ENGE: AYE  
HALBERT: AYE  
VERANZO: AYE  
SWINDELL: AYE  
WOGEN: ABSTAIN  
JOHNSON: AYE

WISER: 5 yes with 1 abstention.

JOHNSON: Motion passes.

#### **D. Communications From the Public**

JOHNSON: We are now going to take communications from the public, and this is communications from those items that are not, I repeat not, on tonight's hearing agenda. Sonja, it is your turn to speak.

WISER: Good evening, members of the public. For attendees using their 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 icon, the location of which depends on the device you are using. Staff will only acknowledge those attendees during the public comment period who have raised their hand by selecting the hand icon. When you have finished your comments, you can lower your hand.

For attendees using the telephone, which is the audio only option, you need to press star 3 on your phone's number panel to raise your hand. Please provide your name before making public comment. When you have finished your comment, press star 3 to lower your hand.

Public comments are limited to three minutes per person in order to accommodate all speakers. Again, this portion of tonight's hearing is only for items not listed on tonight's agenda.

Larisa, are there any members of the public with their hands raised wishing to provide public comment?

SIDOROV: There are no one wishing to speak.

WISER: Okay. Karl, we can close the public comment portion of the hearing.

KAMP: Sonja, hold on. Sonja, this is Jacqui.

WISER: Yeah.

KAMP: I do see -- I see one hand raised. Nope, he lowered it.

WISER: Okay.

JOHNSON: Okay. We will now close the public comment and go to the hearing items. The hearing items for tonight, up first is CPZ2021-0013, 179th Street Access Management & Circulation Plan. Matt, are you ready?

#### **IV. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS**

##### **A. CPZ2021-00013 – 179<sup>th</sup> St. Access Management & Circulation Plan**

The 179<sup>th</sup> Street Access Management and Circulation Plan provides a cohesive circulation and access management plan for the study corridor to guide future infrastructure improvements including access locations, intersection control and facility cross-section elements. Adoption of the plan will include amendments to the Arterial Atlas and approval of implementation guidance

**Staff Contact: Matt Hermen, [Matt.Hermen@clark.wa.gov](mailto:Matt.Hermen@clark.wa.gov) or 564-397-4343**

HERMEN: I am. Thank you. Thank you, Planning Commission. My name is Matt Hermen, I'm a Transportation Planner with Clark County Public Works. And joining me on this presentation are the consultants that helped me with this plan -- helped Clark County with this plan, and that includes Amanda Deering, Reah Flisakowski and Chuck Green. Also joining me is Rob Klug, Clark County Engineer. Next slide.

So, the following topics are the ones that I will address during this presentation. Move on to questions and then comments from the public. Next slide, please.

So, the reason why 179th Street Access Management & Circulation Plan is proposed is to promote safety and mobility on the future arterial. Currently, 179th Street from N.W. 11th Avenue to N.E. 50th Avenue is within the Vancouver urban growth area and most stretches of this road is a two-lane rural road. The classification, however, is a principal arterial four-lane with a center-turn lane.

So, in addition to that, there's significant hills and valleys that are necessary to build this road out to its classification and it includes several cuts and fills of those hills and valleys. So, it's absolutely necessary to promote safety and mobility while balancing the infrastructure and utility needs of development in order to promote safety on that corridor. Next slide.

Within this plan, we are guided by a couple of goals and several policies. First and foremost is to optimize and preserve the investment in the transportation system. Over the next several years, the significant amount of investment on the corridor as it recently has been released from the urban holding overlay. The investment in the infrastructure is identified to both promote the

community, as well as the long-term investment in the corridor. Next slide.

We want to ensure mobility through that transportation system, that means making sure that access locations are well vetted, well thought out, and efficient transportation can occur with local circulation onto 179th Street. Next slide.

So, as I mentioned previously, this is the Planning Study Area. This is 179th Street corridor from N.W. 11th Avenue on your left and N.E. 50th Avenue on the right. The color-coded streets are identified as arterial classification roads. The different color-coded means: The blue or light blue means that it's a minor arterial; pink is a collector; and the neighborhood circulators are shown as an amber color.

You also see hatch marks on those several roads, those are planned roads. Those have been planned roads in the transportation system and in the arterial atlas since at least 2009. So, again, if you go out and look at the locations, you will probably not see a road. It has been planned but it has not been built. The arterial atlas is a long-range circulation plan so it sets forth future alignments for near the corridors. Next slide.

Within the project, we use several different websites and are interactive. If you can -- if you want to click on these, they will direct you to several important websites. There is a specific interactive project website that is at the top. Next slide.

So, this area, the Fairgrounds Neighborhood, has a long history. 2007 it was added to the Vancouver urban growth area. In 2009 the Mill Creek Subarea Plan was adopted. Along with that Mill Creek Subarea Plan, there was several Arterial Atlas Amendments, a Zoning Amendment, as well as a Comprehensive Plan Amendment. In 2015 the I-5/179th Street reconstruction received funding through the Connecting Washington package.

The Planning Commission asked specific questions about this project in the work session. And to inform you, the design phase is set to begin on the interchange reconstruction in the summer of 2023, constructions will occur in 2027, and then construction will end in 2029. Moving on.

In 2020, there was an urban holding removal which allowed urban level development to occur on this area -- this neighborhood. And then in 2020, a Pedestrian Accessway Code Amendment was adopted by Council. That amendment required pedestrian paths when they to connect to collectors and arterials, when they abut those, and the direct circulation is longer than (inaudible.) Next slide.

There are several different types of intersections throughout this corridor and you can see those on this chart. Starting on the -- from the west to the east, N.W. 11th Avenue, we have stop control. The first signal occurs at Delfel Road and 179th Street, and then signaled at the on and off-ramp. Another signal at 15th Avenue. We have all-way stop control throughout the current corridor. Next slide.

Here you're seeing a map and we're going from east to west on here. So, this map is showing 179th Street from 29th Avenue to 50th Avenue. You're seeing several different driveway locations. Those driveway locations are indicated either by boxes or by triangles. Those triangles note whether they have below or above grade, according to the future build-out of 179th Street. Next slide.

Here are the existing driveways from N.E. 29th Avenue to N.E. 15th Avenue. Again, we're moving from east to west here. Additionally, I didn't mention this on the previous slide, but the color-coded land use types are shown here. Yellow and different shades of yellow show residential land uses; commercial showing in red; mixed use showing in the beige tone or the charcoal color; and then, also, residential is shown in purple. Next slide.

And, again, here are the existing driveways on N.W. 179th Street from N.W. 11th Avenue on the left, to the interchange on the right. Next slide. Okay.

Moving on to the hills and valleys piece. In order to bring 179th Street to its principal arterial classification, several cuts of hills are necessary, and fills of valleys are necessary. The existing profile on these maps is shown as a dashed green line. And then the ultimate design speed, which is 50 miles per hour design speed, is shown as the red line.

So, you can see from left to right the cuts that is needed in the current hill and then the fill that's needed in the valley, and this cross-section here is from 15th Avenue to, approximately, 22nd Avenue. Each horizontal line is denoting five feet. Next slide.

Here from 25th Avenue to 37th Avenue, here's where we're seeing a significant amount of cuts and fills that are necessary. From left to right, there's an existing culvert that is below the optimal topography for the 50 mile per hour design speed. So, a significant fill will be necessary. And then, two cuts and most significant fill between 25th and 37th Place. Next slide.

And, again, here's the topology from the BPA power line to 50th Avenue. And you can see the grade elevation difference on this chart as well. I should note that these slides do not include the topology west of the interchange, that topology is fairly well on grade with the 50 mile per hour design speed. It does not have significant hills and valleys that exist on the east side of the I-5 interchange. Next slide.

So, in addition to bringing the corridor up to its classification and the hills and valleys that are necessary, we also have some significant environmental constraints. And these maps, again, we're going from east to west here. You're seeing the wetlands shown in teal color and then streams are shown as a blue line there. So, you can see here's -- between 29th Avenue and 50th Avenue, there's several wetlands and streams in this location. And this is consistent with the previous topology maps that I showed that show those cuts and fills. Next slide.

And here's the wetlands and streams from 29th Avenue to 15th Avenue. Next slide. Once again, the stream and wetlands from the interchange to N.W. 11th Avenue. Next slide.

We know from past history that most of our collisions occur at intersections. These intersection collisions are both more frequent at intersections and more severe at intersections and we know this from our past history and the collisions that occur there. So, when we are attempting to promote safety along the corridor, it's crucial that we address that intersection safety, and intersection location, in order to provide a safe environment for our residents and visitors. Next slide.

We have several different planned improvements along the corridor. This map here is showing the planned improvements in the next six years. So that includes I-5. I'm sorry. N.W. 179th Street from Delfel Road to 15th Avenue. This project includes a realignment of both Delfel Road, moved further to the west, and then a new extension of 15th Avenue from 179th Street to 10th Avenue.

Additionally, there's an intersection improvements program at 29th Avenue on 179th Street and at 50th Avenue on 179th Street. We're also wrapping up the Whipple Creek Bridge project and N.E. 10th Avenue from 149th to 154th is currently under construction. You're also seeing the hatch marks here, that's denoting what was the urban holding area. Next slide.

So here is a cross-section showing the -- or planned -- I'm sorry -- showing the N.E. 29th Avenue roundabout. This is planned right now. It's moving through design and, yes, it's moving forward with a roundabout design. Next slide. The long-term vision for the N.E. 50th Avenue is a roundabout. There is going to be interim improvements to the 50th Avenue, 179th Street intersection that includes turn lanes. But in the long range, N.E. 50th Avenue and N.E. 179th Street are planned as a future roundabout. Next slide.

So, as I move forward with the proposal in the next couple of slides, I want to show the street classifications here. Major roads are shown on this chart. They include both principal arterials, minor arterials, and collectors. We have three different types of collectors: Ones with center-turn lanes and bike lanes; ones without the center-turn lane and just bike lanes; and then, collectors without bike lanes that have parking in the bike lane place. And these vary from right-of-way width and pavement width, going from more intense to less intense.

Also, worth noting that these street classifications do not provide direct access to driveways. Driveways cannot access any roads directly. Instead, local roads are, as they're accessed connecting them from arterials and collectors to their homes. Next slide.

Here you're seeing the local roads. Local roads are in the forms of commercial and industrial roads, which serve those land uses, commercial and industrial, as well as neighborhood circulators and local access roads. These, all of these local roads do provide that direct driveway access. You can access driveways directly onto these roads. Most folks when they think of the road in front of their home it's a local access road, 46 feet with 28 feet pavement. A



neighborhood circulator generally connects those local roads to collectors. Next slide.

So here you're seeing the proposal from the west side, N.W. 11th Avenue to N.E. Delfel Road. You're seeing several different things going on with these maps. The highlighted segments of the road are shown both in yellow, blue, and orange. A yellow highlight means it's an addition onto the arterial atlas, additional planned road. And then you're also seeing the intersection pipes. Intersection pipes are shown as a red dot as a roundabout. A blue square is an internal -- is a shared access right-in, right-out.

And I want to make it clear and clarify that these are planned roads. They are built as development occurs by development. They are lines on the map now. If folks choose to never redevelop their property, they will remain as lines on the map. The arterial atlas is a guide for future transportation system. It is built as development occurs.

I will note there has been a change to this proposal. N.E. 2nd Avenue is -- Larisa, can you go to the next slide. So, there was a temporary use permit that was issued in 2021. We generally don't check temporary use permits with long-range transportation plans, but this temporary use permit is directly across from N.E. 2nd Avenue. And throughout -- through their temporary use permit, they did a delineation of critical areas and discovered that there's a wetland and stream that cannot be crossed, at our suggestion. So, the change of intersection type was changed from a roundabout to a right-in, right-out, and we eliminated the neighborhood circulators because of the critical area that would be impacted from the future road. Next slide.

Here is the proposal from the intersection to 29th Avenue. Again, you're seeing changes to the arterial atlas that are highlighted on the road segments. Realignment of the future 15th Avenue extension is shown based on the design, as well as a roundabout in the middle of that segment to access the commercial property to the south and the mixed use property to the north.

You'll also see in that future roundabout at, approximately, 12th Avenue on 179th Street this again accesses commercial property to the south and then the roundabout at 15th Avenue. The triangles, the orange and black triangles, are denoting interim access and then will be switched to emergency access only when property is served by the local roads. So that emergency access only is basically on the ground. It's a gate that has a lock that can be accessed by the first responders. Again, the shared access right-in, right-out, are shown as the blue square.

And then, we also wanted to make a change to this section on the future neighborhood circulator to the north and align it more on the property line to avoid impact to the wetlands. Again, you're seeing the future roundabout at N.E. 29th Avenue shown as a red circle. Next slide.

Here is the proposal from N.E. 29th Avenue to N.E. 50th Avenue. There is a future neighborhood circulator that runs east/west on the north of 179th Street. We want to connect that to 179th Street with a right-in, right-out access; so, a proposed addition of a neighborhood circulator is on this map. As well as a future roundabout at approximately 37th Avenue that would connect a

future collector to the collector classification of N.E. 174th Street on the south. This collector -- two collector connection is necessary in order to distribute trips and provide the neighborhood more direct access to 179th Street.

You can also see on our plans how we considered the wetlands and the basic peninsulas of land within those wetlands that have the local road circulation. We're also proposing realignment of the road to align more with Woodbrook PUD permit approval. And then the addition of several neighborhood circulators that have more direct access onto 179th Street through a future roundabout and then right-in, right-out access. And I will note that that purple hexagon is new that you're seeing, that is a full access in the interim, but will be converted to a right-in, right-out when the local road circulation is built out and N.E. 179th Street is improved to its full classification. You're also seeing a future roundabout at N.E. 50th Avenue. Next slide.

In addition to the street circulation, we also wanted to plan for pedestrians, as well as wildlife that we share the land with. You're seeing here pedestrian access onto 179th Street, both on the south side of 179th Street. This is N.W. 179th Street. And then very faintly, there's a purple -- or I'm sorry -- a pink dotted dash line that is a trail connection. Next slide.

Here you're seeing the wildlife corridors from the interchange to N.E. 29th Avenue, as well as the pedestrian connectivity from on the commercial property close to the interchange. Those wildlife refuges will serve as corridors that wildlife can cross so they avoid direct impact and direct crossing with 179th Street. So, if it's a culvert, it will be expanded to include animals that walk instead of swim. Next slide.

And here you're seeing the wildlife corridors that we're proposing from N.E. 29th Avenue to N.E. 50th Avenue. These wildlife corridors I should note are also intended to remind Clark County staff in our design to include these wildlife corridors in the ultimate design of 179th Street. Next slide.

So, the approval process, we've issued the final draft report in January of 2022. The SEPA process occurred that same month in January. We did -- we held a public open house on January 27th. There was a Planning Commission -- I'm sorry. Work session, I should say, on February 3rd and then the hearing tonight. Your recommendation will be forwarded to Clark County Council, who will have a public hearing on March 15th. Next slide.

With that, Clark County Public Works is recommending approval of the Arterial Atlas Amendments to implement the 179th Street Access Management Plan & Circulation Plan.

JOHNSON: Thank you. Thank you, Matt. Does the Planning Commission have any questions of staff? I will call each PC member one at a time to ask you. Just a second here, I have to switch here to my grid. Bryant Enge.

ENGE: No, not at this time.

JOHNSON: Thank you, Bryant. Bryan Halbert.

HALBERT: Yeah, Matt. Bryan Halbert here. Hey, a couple of comments by the public have been about the SEPA non-project status. Could you address that a little and explain to us why it's a non-project SEPA.

HERMEN: Sure. So, the implementation of this plan is amendments to the arterial atlas. Amendments to the arterial atlas are, for lack of a better word, lines on a map. We -- this planning project is not on the ground. We are not moving dirt. We are not touching any land. It is not a project. It is a non-project action. It is a policy action that is reviewed by Council.

HALBERT: Yeah. Thanks, Matt. And then, kind of a question. Some of the comments were about the environmental concerns on Mill Creek and, I think, Mill Creek was just a little east of 50th Avenue; is that correct? And is it possible to go back to Slide 22, which I think shows Mill Creek near the interchange near the roundabout.

HERMEN: Larisa, thank you.

SIDOROV: Which one was that?

HALBERT: 22. Slide 22. I think you're on 28 right now. The aerial view of Mill Creek and I know that -- whoops, go back, go back to 22. I know like you said these are lines on a map currently, but maybe -- was this an intersection that is in the planning stages right now?

HERMEN: This is. This is currently in the planning stages. Our design team is working on this. It's interim improvements and future roundabout design. This is also the border of the urban growth area, N.E. 50th Avenue separates urban on the west and rural on the east.

HALBERT: And then some of the concerns have been regarding the environmental aspects of Mill Creek and by this aerial is that -- could that be perceived as a bridge over Mill Creek?

HERMEN: Yeah. It will -- on the eastern end it will be, yeah. In what form, I'm going to have to defer to my engineer to know whether it's a culvert or a bridge, open air bridge. I don't know that.

HALBERT: And will there still be time to, you know, fully address the environmental concerns of Mill Creek and the ability for wildlife to, you know, not just get through there but thrive and --

HERMEN: Yeah. The environmental concerns are conditions of -- the roundabout design are not factored into this proposal. Those are addressed during the SEPA process and the environmental analysis of the intersection improvement, the actual construction.

HALBERT: Right. Okay. So, for each of these roundabouts, then a SEPA will be published and there will be more chances to make sure that where we're responsible with places like Mill Creek, and I know there was quite a few wildlife corridors that you showed, each one will be addressed separately and not left out of the planning process.

HERMEN: And that's an important thing to note. Not only will the capital projects be addressed by Clark County as it progresses in the design, but for the land development that's addressed by development in their SEPA process.

HALBERT: Great, Matt. Yeah. I think the team behind you that's put this together have done an amazing job of looking at a lot of constraints and I know there's been a lot of comments from the landowners in the area regarding access and in and out movement and it really seems, you know, taking it all very seriously and into consideration, but you and your team have done a great job.

HERMEN: Thank you.

JOHNSON: Okay. Aldo Lampson Veranzo.

VERANZO: No questions at this time. Thank you, Karl.

JOHNSON: Thank you, Aldo. Matt Swindell.

SWINDELL: Matt, just to kind of go along with what Bryan was asking. He stole all my good questions there, but great questions, Bryan. How many different agencies are looking at this project? I mean, we're not doing this in a vacuum. There's a lot of different agencies looking at this thing; right?

HERMEN: So, the Washington State Department of Transportation has jurisdiction over the interchange reconstruction project. That is critical. We have been coordinating on a, oh, boy, weekly basis with the DOT and we have a very good relationship to coordinate their project and their construction timeline with ours.

In addition, this planning process has a Technical Advisory Committee that included folks from WSDOT, as well as the City of Vancouver as it's inside the City of Vancouver urban growth area. Additionally, we reached out to our utility providers so Columbia District Wastewater Treatment, as well as the PUD because providing utilities is a part of the street reconstruction.

The input that we received from the utility providers was excellent in terms of how to locate utilities in a roundabout. It provided us with greater insight so that we can work with them in the ultimate design of 179th Street.

SWINDELL: Great. Thank you.

HERMEN: And I should mention, we've also coordinated with the Amphitheater and the Fairground for event traffic on this corridor.

SWINDELL: Thank you, Matt. Appreciate it.

JOHNSON: Eldon Wogen.

WOKEN: So, Bryan touched on a couple of my questions. So, a couple of the public mentioned about the Mill Creek fishery being impacted and I know this isn't a project yet, but does County staff believe that the fishery will improve?

HERMEN: I can't answer that, but I can ask. Rob Klug might have -- might be able to answer that in greater detail.

KLUG: Good evening, Planning Commission. This is Rob Klug. I'm the County Engineer. I don't have an exact answer for you because some of this is in the future, but anything that we're doing as we move through and improve locations, we bring the culverts and other features up to full standard. And so, where there are non-fish passable culverts, we are designing a road to accommodate a full fish passable culvert.

There are requirements for how large that culvert is and everyone we've been putting in, is very significantly larger than the existing one that was taken out. There are also locations where we make a decision to put a bridge in instead of a culvert for a variety of reasons.

And actually, if it's all right, I'd like to ask Chuck Green and the team from OTAK to talk in a little more detail because they've been working on the detailed design of 29th and 50th. So, Chuck, or somebody from your team, would you like to talk about that?

GREEN: Yes. A couple of things. One is both the 29th -- actually several of these intersections are currently in their planning and design phases. I think it was about three weeks ago, there was a public open house along the corridor for this plan, but also some of the intersection improvements that are currently being considered.

One thing that's pretty clear in both the 29th and 50th roundabouts is we want to, and actually under environmental regulations, we need to actually improve that passage because we can't plan or put in a blockage for fish passage or even potential fish passage. So, in all these cases, those crossings, and the one you see on screen here is one of the examples of that, will be improved and there, we'll make sure that there's not a blockage of any of the stream or riparian habitat as it goes across 179th.

WOKEN: Okay. Thank you. No more questions.

JOHNSON: Okay. Good job, Matt. Appreciate all the information. Appreciate also the information that you came back when me now and when we had our work session. So, there's no applicant with this proposal. We are now going to open the hearing for public testimony.

### **Public Testimony**

JOHNSON: I'll begin with a summary of the public participation process for the public to understand how to participate in tonight's hearing. To be a party of record, you must first submit written testimony before, during, or prior to the close of tonight's hearing, or provide oral testimony at the public hearing, or request in writing to be a party of record.

No person shall be a party of record who does not furnish their full name, e-mail address or Post Office mailing address. If written comments were received prior to February 17th, 2022, they were submitted to the PC members and posted on the Planning Commission website. We will now take oral public testimony as we did earlier this evening. Sonja, it is your turn to speak.

WISER: Thank you, Karl. Larisa, you've shown the instructions on the screen. Thank you. If anyone from the public would like to comment on this proposal, now is your opportunity.

You need to let us know that you would like to be called on, either by clicking the raised hand symbol at the bottom of the list of participants on your computer screen or pressing star 3 on your phone's number panel. Staff will unmute you if your hand is raised when it's your turn to speak. Public comment is limited to three minutes. You can raise your hand now.

Larisa, are there any members of the public wishing to speak?

SIDOROV: Yes, I see -- I see Jim Byrne. I will unmute you.

HOLLEY: Spell their last name, please.

SIDOROV: Jim Byrne.

WISER: Can you spell it for her.

SIDOROV: Jim, for some reason I can't unmute you.

JOHNSON: We can't hear. Cindy, can you hear at all?

HOLLEY: No.

JOHNSON: Okay. Can we ask whoever it is to speak up, please, whoever is speaking?

SIDOROV: Can you guys hear me now?

WISER: Jim Byrne, can you hear us? Cindy, his last name is B-y-r-n-e, but I don't think he can hear us.

KAMP: Larisa, this is Jacqui. You're having issues being able to unmute him?

SIDOROV: Yes.

KAMP: Did you try if you -- there we go.

WISER: Okay. I unmuted him. Jim, can you hear us? We can't hear you.

SIDOROV: He has a bad connection.

WISER: I think he has a bad connection. Jim Byrne.

BYRNE: Yes.

SIDOROV: Can you please speak up. He's muted again. We can go on to the next one and we'll come back to Jim. I have Dean. Dean, I will go ahead and unmute you now. Dean, can you hear us? Dean Hergesheimer.

HERGESHEIMER: Hello?

SIDOROV: Yes, we can hear you.

WISER: Yes.

HERGESHEIMER: You got me now?

JOHNSON: There you go. We can hear you, Jim. Go ahead.

HERGESHEIMER: This is Dean Hergesheimer.

JOHNSON: Go ahead.

HOLLEY: Can you spell your last name, please.

HERGESHEIMER: Yes. It's H-e-r-g-e-s-h-e-i-m-e-r. My address is in the record. I have written testimony. I can give that to you if you'd like it now.

WISER: Yes, she would.

HERGESHEIMER: Okay. 4404 N.E. 174th Street, Vancouver, in this area. Do you want my e-mail? It's dljhg@msn.com.

JOHNSON: Okay. Go ahead.

HERGESHEIMER: All right. I think my neighbors, three of them, have yielded their speaking time for my purpose. Is that understood at this point?

JOHNSON: Each speaker gets three minutes so, yeah, you'll get three minutes. Go ahead.

HERGESHEIMER: Then I have three neighbors who notified that they were yielding their time so I could speak longer.

JOHNSON: As the Chair, I'm going to limit, so go ahead and tell me what you're going to say, but we're not -- you're not -- we don't have it. And correct me if I'm wrong, Chris, if you're out there, we don't allow to lump up so you're saying you'd get nine minutes; is that it?

COOK: Yeah. This is Chris Cook, Senior Deputy Prosecuting Attorney, and the time is limited to three minutes. There's no aggregation of time.

JOHNSON: Thanks, Chris. So, you got three minutes. Go ahead.

HERGESHEIMER: Well, okay. I'll try to be quick. As I understand the mapping that's been laid out there, I'm concerned with 174th Street, the Mill Creek neighborhood in particular, since that's where I live. 174th Street is a designated collector as it's been for years. If I understand the map, the 39th Avenue connection between 174th and 179th formerly was a neighborhood circulator. The map now suggests it's going to be a collector.

Also, there's a proposed additional collector at what would be 45th Avenue. So, the plan that's being proposed has three collector roads designated. I understand that a collector road has a capacity to service 1,200 plus lots each. In my written testimony, I provided information where I did a what they call a vacant lands, buildable lands analysis. And I believe this Mill Creek neighborhood will only have about 680 lots in total when built out. I do not understand why we have road capacity for like 3,800 lots being planned here.

The other concern is one of those goes right down my east property line between me and two of my neighbors. As I understand, a collector does not allow direct driveway access and so the road doesn't serve the abutting property except by, maybe, a street intersection and then you wind up with double fronted lots.

Basically, I do not believe there is a need for that kind of road capacity to serve a small neighborhood. It's way overbuilt and that translates to high capital costs, traffic impact fees, all those costs, additional pavement, all those things will result by overbuilding the amount of roads



needed. Subsequent submittal, I submitted copies of this area and the comparable area south of here at 134th Street and 72nd Avenue where it has already been developed. There are no collector streets designated within the -- this is south of 139th.

The Philbrook Farms development and the Hidden Crest subdivision have been built in an R1-6 zone, which is more dense than what we have here in the Mill Creek area. So, I do not understand why that area can be developed without a collector, yet we're getting three collectors here in the Mill Creek area. That just doesn't compute. That's my short summary since I'm limited to three minutes. I don't know where I'm at in that regard, but I'm trying to be quick.

SWINDELL: Sonja, did we lose Karl?

JOHNSON: No, I'm right here.

SWINDELL: You're there? Okay. I just wanted to make sure. You went -- your screen went blank. Sorry. Sorry to interrupt.

HERGESHEIMER: To continue then, the result of the --

WISER: Your three minutes are up.

JOHNSON: Dean, thank you for your comment. Dean, I encourage you, to clarify some of your questions, to contact staff. I know it's difficult, generally speaking, to get a comment/question out. But I'd really encourage you to go on to the County website and contact them and they're very good at getting back to you. So, I apologize that we're not being able to answer specific questions and it is further exacerbated by the --

HERGESHEIMER: Yes, I appreciate that.

JOHNSON: So that's why I apologize. But don't -- but they're logical questions to us and I want to encourage you to contact staff to try to get those answers; so at least you know one way or the other.

HERGESHEIMER: Yeah, I have -- I have submitted written testimony. I have not heard anything back except once.

JOHNSON: Yeah. If that was received prior to, which I believe it was, we have a copy of that. We have -- all the Commissioners have a copy of that. Larisa, is there anybody else with their hand raised, their virtual hand raised?

SIDOROV: Yes, I see a few more people. I will go ahead and unmute Joe Zimmerman next. Joe, can you hear us?

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

SIDOROV: Yes.

ZIMMERMAN: Okay.

JOHNSON: Can you give your name and your address or your e-mail address so we can get it for the record.

ZIMMERMAN: Yes, I can.

HOLLEY: And spell your last name, please.

ZIMMERMAN: Sure. My name is Joe Zimmerman. Last name is Z-i-m-m-e-r-m-a-n. My address is 11703 N.E. 128th Place. And with that, may I begin, I guess?

JOHNSON: Yes. Go ahead. You have three minutes.

ZIMMERMAN: Okay. As I said, my name is Joe and I am a fifth gen- -- or excuse me, I'm going to speak today if you don't mind about the potential for loss of ag land and the larger problem of the development in this area.

So, like I said, my name is Joe and I'm a fifth generation Clark County farmer and a member of the Friends of Clark County. I'm concerned about the lifting of the urban holding overlay and proposed development in the area north of 179th Street as it pertains to the loss of prime agricultural land. Clark County has some of the best soil in all of western U.S. and it should be a shame to allow houses and strip malls to be built over this precious land, okay.

Although Clark County ranks as one of the lowest counties in Washington State for ag revenue per acre, I'm here to tell all of you that this ranking is not because that agriculture is unprofitable but rather because landowners do not see investment in agriculture is worthwhile.

The actions of this County Council and many previous councils have created an environment where Clark County landowners are not encouraged to consider agriculture as a worthwhile long-term investment considering the ease with which they convert. They can convert their land to houses, apartments, or commercial property.

Currently, Clark County averages only \$525 of ag revenue per acre, where our farm averages over 30 times that amount. I want to repeat that real quick. Our farm averages 30 times the ag revenue per acre of most of Clark County or the average of Clark County.

As the population of the county continues to grow, the need for food will increase. While it's easy to assume that all of the food needed for the county can be brought in from other areas, I

would like to ask what happens if or when there is a breakdown in the food supply chain. It's easy to assume that food will always be available from somewhere else until it is not. As I like to remind people, it is really easy to turn farmland into houses, but it's a whole lot harder to turn houses back into farmland.

Additionally, I'd like to ask the Planning Commission if this is the only open and available area for development or is this simply an area that developers wish to develop. Thank you.

JOHNSON: Thank you for your comments and the hold had already been removed. So tonight, we're just talking about --

ZIMMERMAN: I understand. Thank you.

JOHNSON: Yeah. Okay. All right. Thank you. Is there anybody else, Larisa?

SIDOROV: Yes, there is. Let's try it again. Jim Byrne is back on. Jim, I'm going to go ahead and unmute you.

JOHNSON: Okay.

SIDOROV: Can you hear us, Jim Byrne?

JOHNSON: Can't hear Jim too well, Larisa.

SIDOROV: Okay. Jim, are you having a hard time?

BYRNE: I'm on a cell phone.

SIDOROV: Jim, we can't hear you at all, basically. Can you try to speak up again?

JOHNSON: I can see his icon coming up but I cannot hear Jim at all. Does anybody -- Cindy, do you hear Jim?

HOLLEY: No. All's I heard is "I'm on a cell phone."

JOHNSON: Yeah, that's probably -- seems like we're -- that's probably the issue right there. Larisa, unless we have something change on Jim, I'd like to move along. Do we have anybody else right now that's in the queue?

SIDOROV: Yes, I do. I have the next person is Caller Number 5. I'll go ahead and unmute you. Can you hear us, Caller Number 5?

BYRNE: Hello.

SIDOROV: Yes, we can hear you.

JOHNSON: Yes. Can you state your name and make sure you spell your last name and give me either your e-mail address or your physical address for the record, please?

BYRNE: So, this is Jim Byrne. I just heard that my line was unmuted. Am I able to talk now?

JOHNSON: Yeah, you're good to go now, Jim. Go ahead. We can hear you.

BYRNE: So, my name is Byrne, spelled B-y-r-n-e. And I live at 28501 N.W. 7th Avenue in Ridgefield.

WISER: Go ahead.

BYRNE: Okay. Good evening. My name is Jim Byrne and I'm a board member of Friends of Clark County and we appreciate the opportunity to comment on the 179th Street management and circulation plan.

First, we believe the County should not have lifted the urban holdings overlay. The County is not ready at this time nor has it met concurrency requirements associated with this project. Concurrency with the development is defined by the Growth Management Act to mean that any needed improvements or strategies are in place at the time of development or that a financial commitment is in place to complete the improvements or strategy within six years and that's in RCW 36.70A.6(b).

The whole purpose of the urban holding area was to secure infrastructure upgrade to accommodate additional traffic. Concurrency specified denial of proposed developments if impacts on the local transportation system would result in loss of service. Clark County has even incorporated concurrency into its own County Code 40-350-120.

So, what are the costs of this project. On August 21st, 2019, County Council voted 4 to 1 in favor of a resolution that outlines how to pay for \$66.5 million in improvements; however, those are 2019 dollars are lowball estimates and the cost has risen dramatically since then. I'm quoting what started as a \$66 million project to lift urban holding for housing developments and a strip of retail has morphed into a \$163 million project that lifts all of urban holding but we're only talking about a third to fund it.

The E.D. Hovee & Company, a consultant to the County, conducted an environmental feasibility study for Clark County Public Works. Hovee recognized that 85 to 95 percent of parcels within buildable lands, at least in part, are constricted by critical land constraints. Clark County GIS data indicates that 964 acres, or nearly one-half of the holding area, overlay comprised critical areas are not expected to support future growth.

The County had a staff meeting in January and said that the Access Management & Circulation Plan has mapped environmental conditions that would require avoidance or impossible -- or infeasible to mitigate, if available. It's a substantial amount of critical areas and I just had one question.

The County maps indicate sometimes, 1, 2, 4 or as many as 12 roundabouts on 179th Street and I'm confused as to what the final total is. And we would ask you to rethink plans lifting the overlay based on the amount of critical lands present, the lack of concurrency, and the current lack of dollars. Thank you.

JOHNSON: Thank you for your comments, Jim. And I again, I would encourage you to get your questions specifically answered, to contact planning staff and they will get right back with you. Thank you.

BYRNE: Okay. Thank you.

JOHNSON: Yeah. Do we have any other hands up?

SIDOROV: We do. I have Mo McKenna. Mo, I'm going to go ahead and unmute you now.

HOLLEY: Larisa, I can barely hear you.

SIDOROV: Okay. Can you hear me now?

HOLLEY: Barely.

MCKENNA: Hi. Can everybody hear me?

JOHNSON: Yes. Thank you.

MCKENNA: My name is Mo McKenna. I'm at 513 N.W. 184th Street. Last name --

JOHNSON: Can you spell your last name, please.

MCKENNA: Yep. M-c, capital -K-e-n-n-a.

JOHNSON: Okay. Thank you. Go ahead.

COOK: Excuse me. This is, Chris. Is the time clock running on the speakers?

JOHNSON: No, I don't see them, Chris. I was going to ask that. Sonja, would you just let me know when three minutes is, please.

COOK: There you go.

MCKENNA: Let me know when you're ready for me.

SIDOROV: It's going now.

JOHNSON: Go ahead.

MCKENNA: All right. Thank you. So, like Joe, I have a lot of concerns about the loss of prime agricultural land. I have a lot of concerns about the sensitive wetlands that we have in this area. Tonight, I'm listening to just a cacophony of frogs that are breeding in our wetland. But I think more than anything, I'm so disappointed by this process.

The first notification the neighbors in our community had that this was happening was January 21st. We found out that Council, that folks from the County had been meeting since last August, which was really disappointing for landowners and neighbors. And when we went back and listened to those meetings, we were referred to as lines on a map. This land is precious to us and I ask all of you not to rush this process.

I ask you to sit there and think about if this was your land, if this was your dream, if you worked hard to build a life here, and to build something for your kids, and I ask you not to rush it. Instead, I ask you to wait, talk to landowners because believe us, we want our roads to be safe. We want there to be a vibrant local economy. We want there to be affordable housing and we believe that all of these things are possible if we work together. That's all.

JOHNSON: Thank you, Mo, appreciate your information. Do we have anyone, Larisa?

SIDOROV: We do. I have Jessica Levonas. Jessica Levonas, I will go ahead and unmute you now.

LEVONAS: Hi. Can you hear me?

JOHNSON: Yes, we can. Can you state your name, spelling your last name and give us your address, please.

LEVONAS: Yes. My name is Jessica Levonas, L-e-v-o-n-a-s, and I live at 17810 N.E. 47th Avenue.

SIDOROV: Okay. I'll start your time now.

LEVONAS: Awesome. Thank you. So, I'm representing the other five families that live on our private road of 47th Avenue. We've all been quite shocked by not only the construction that's going on right across the road from our land but we are also very concerned with this new plan for the right-in, right-out, that will be going out of our private drive.

This has not been communicated to us, at all, outside of this public hearing, which between bedtime and bath for my twin toddlers, I manage to squeeze in. I know a lot of us are working parents and trying to get in on this meeting has been a challenge. So, wanting to express, you know, better communication, better planning with families and with people who own the land that you're directly impacting by these changes, you know.

We want to be a part of this process just like the last caller said. This is our dream and this is something that we've worked hard to achieve and it's -- part of it is being taken away from us now because of this roundabout and because of this right-in and right-out. My neighbor is about to lose a ridiculous amount of trees because of these changes that are coming. My other neighbors are terrified that roads are going to be put through our private driveway in the name of subdividing and in the name of traffic safety.

So, our little private road 47th Avenue, you know, we've been showing up on all of the visuals you've been sharing and it's scary to see how much we will be impacted by these changes and I just really hope that we will be personally spoken with and checked in with and given as much advanced notice as possible for any changes or impacts.

We have one way in and one way out of our little private drive and we're now going to be looking at over 625 homes out of our picturesque window. So please think of us, please include us, and please give us a voice going forward so that we can be part of this process and make sure that it's a win/win for everyone. And that's it for me.

JOHNSON: Thank you very much for your comments. Larisa.

SIDOROV: Yes. I see a Teresa Hardy. I will go ahead and --

JOHNSON: Larisa, again, I'm having a hard time hearing you. Can you repeat that a little louder if you can?

SIDOROV: I see a Teresa Hardy. Teresa, I went ahead and unmuted you now.

HARDY: Oh, good evening. My name is Teresa Hardy, that's H-a-r-d-y, at 15820 S.E. 15th Street. In listening to the public comments tonight, I want to kind of wrap up what we've heard. We've heard that these lines -- that the arterial 179th is lines on a map, but moving forward, it will open the door to development and, yes, we realize in the City of Vancouver and in Clark County, we're looking at more density as with climate in our surrounding states continue to experience fires, heat waves, and other things.

This area begins to look like a mecca and if we don't have long-range planning, we open the door, like I said to developers and we're looking at when these developers let the public know, it's usually within only a 300 to a 500 feet. Oftentimes, people aren't aware of the SEPAs until

the SEPA determination time and the comment time is over. And if you look at the SEPAs, we're getting a lot of DNSs in the City and in the County.

And then, if you go in and look at the mitigation that's being done, the mitigation sometimes is questionable. And then, if you look at the hearing process, there is very little forewarning of the hearing. And so, the whole process, in and of itself, really deserves and needs some real look at how it's happening.

So, we need to look at what our farmland is, what our open space is, what we're saving for our future parks, not eliminating all of our trees. This is more than just lines on a map. Yes, transportation is extremely important as we look at the long-range plans, but it's more than that. And time needs to be taken and time also needs to be allotted to what direction we're allowing development and how we hold development accountable. And we need to listen to the public comments tonight. Thank you.

JOHNSON: Thank you for your comments. Larisa.

SIDOROV: Can you hear me, okay?

JOHNSON: Not really but go ahead. Do you have anybody else?

SIDOROV: I don't have anybody else, no.

JOHNSON: Okay. I heard that you don't have anyone else; is that correct?

SIDOROV: Yes.

### **Return to Planning Commission**

JOHNSON: Okay. Thank you. All right. So, hearing that there are no more public comments -- I'd like -- what's that? Sorry. The Planning Commission will now deliberate and make a recommendation to the County Council. If the Planning Commissioners have any comments, I will now call each PC member one at a time to state your comments. Bryant Enge.

ENGE: Thank you, Karl. So, it was my listening, and my takeaway, and my reading that the 179th corridor was opened up and planned in 2007 and 2009. We're looking at potential development as we move forward. And as part of good planning, we need to make sure that we have roads that ensure safety and mobility, not only for vehicles but also for pedestrians and for bikes.

In addition, what I've heard is that there's been extra efforts or efforts made in terms of making improvements to the environment. Expanding culverts, as an example. And I'm also confident with staff that as these projects come onboard for the planning regarding the plan, that they will



be working with the public to make sure that those projects meet and exceed SEPA and other requirements.

I've heard a lot of concerns about communication and I know a lot of times what we do is we make sure that we meet the legal status of communication. But given the size of this area and the potential impacts on the number of people, we may want to think about are there some other opportunities to make sure that we are communicating to stakeholders. So just my comments and I appreciate the opportunity, Karl. Thank you.

JOHNSON: Thank you, Bryant. Bryan Halbert, do you have any comments to the Planning Commission?

HALBERT: Thank you, Karl. And, Bryant, I agree wholeheartedly with your comments. Thanks for throwing that out and the local property owners, the stakeholders in this 179th corridor have a lot of right to be concerned.

And I'd like to, you know, maybe assure them that we'll continue to watch how this 179th Street develops and address those concerns along the way and I believe that staff has done a fantastic job of laying out this corridor. But it certainly needs a lot of fine-tuning and a lot of addressing to the local landowners in other ways, other than just legal notices. That's all my comments. Thank you, Karl.

JOHNSON: Thank you, Bryan. Aldo, do you have any comments for us?

VERANZO: Sure. I also am reminding myself as I listen to the stakeholders, landowners come forward with their concerns, that within our process we do have many checkpoints where there's -- where the public can come and interact with the right decision-making body to effect the change should there be, you know, reason and data and, you know, common sense.

It's not that we're not caring and just to Bryant's, the first voice you heard, this plan has, you know, this change has been planned for many years and we know that we must strike a balance between environment and meeting all of these other critical housing and economic needs that we face daily in Clark County.

So, to say, oh, stop, is not the right answer. But at the same time, we are sensitive to hearing the voices of those who are directly impacted by these changes. So, there are still more opportunities to bring forward your concerns to County Council to give you the opportunity to shape the direction that this goes. Thank you.

JOHNSON: Thank you, Aldo. Matt.

SWINDELL: Yeah. You know, I heard in the testimony just a lot of concern about communication. I know this has been talked about for years and years and years, but it just

makes me think that maybe there might be a hole in the way that we're communicating with the public on these type of things.

I understand their concern with all this and I would encourage everyone that is in the corridor to reach out to staff, you know, make sure that you're at all the meetings, open houses that they're going to have in the future. I think they're going to probably have a few more and ask all the questions. And like Aldo was saying, there's a lot of checkpoints along the way, so just encourage everyone to be involved and have their voice heard.

And just like tonight, I'm hearing them and I think there's a -- I think there might be a hole in some of our communication, not to say that staff hasn't done a fantastic job because I want to actually point out something I noticed as I was going through the 143 pages of documents.

On Page 20 of the attachments here, there's a letter from Andrew Cecka and I want to just read a couple of quick things out of this letter. I'm not sure if Planning Commission had a chance to read this but I want -- I want this on the public record that this was said.

It said, "Hi, Matt," so Matt, this is directed to you, "Thank you for your direct and honest answers in the email and thank you for hosting the Open House last night. I know that my wife and I came at you guys pretty hard (and not just us). And it's been our experience living in Portland for 10 years was a terrible situation as it applies to development. We assumed the worst, and, it seems, wrongly so."

It goes on to say, you know, they did a good job. And I think that tells me that staff is really listening to the community when they have the open houses. The community is interacting. They're answering their questions. They're e-mailing them back. They're doing what they can to ease that. I just wanted to make sure everybody knew that we have people out there that are very thankful for what our staff's doing and I think they're doing a really good job. So that's all my comments.

JOHNSON: I agree they're doing a great job, Matt. Eldon, any comments, questions?

WOKEN: No. I resonate with what the other members have said. It does appear that there's some extra communication that might be needed to the local stakeholders. I do sympathize with them. They are facing some challenges with growth in the area and it's got to be upsetting to them.

That being said, I think staff has done a real good job and I would encourage all the public to know that all staff wants to do a good job for them too, and I think there will be many steps coming up in the future where staff and the stakeholders can work together and get these things resolved. That's it.

JOHNSON: Thank you, Eldon. Matt, great job. You know, it's interesting because we always

start out with these big picture, you know. We've had a lot of them and it's amazing to me, still the disconnect. The disconnect will always be there. But I was thinking today, like our words were lines on a map versus this is my home.

The, you know, the whole idea of taking this thing small but while people are talking about their concerns about the urban holding lifted, that happened a long time ago. I just -- I want to encourage you. And again, this is not a critique, it's an encouragement to really be patient, to walk these stakeholders and homeowners through this because this -- this is just the beginning.

If we are just talking about this kind of anxiety just with this, you know, read the writing on the wall. And I remember a certain overlay, surface mining overlay years ago that we did, and it kind of started -- it reminded me of this. And then it -- then it just escalated to where it was this pretty rambunctious.

So, as we go, I think all of us need to do a better job of explaining it, questioning it, being patient with people when they come on. This is -- and this is a COVID comment. This is the worst way to be able to get someone's opinion from the community through a phone line that's, you know, fritzing out on them.

So, Matt, I don't want you to think you did any -- you did a great job, but I just think that we need to do better, better than we ever have on this one. And I think Christine might have pointed me towards this when we tried to just let this one pass through us when we first were talking about the overlay removal and I kind of stepped back and went, wait a minute, let's really look at it.

So, a lot of communication to the people that are hearing this or caring about it, we hear you. There's not a lot that's happening right now, but a line on the map doesn't take away the anxiety. It isn't a line on a map when you see a road that looks like it may pass through your property and you don't know if it is or isn't.

So, hold us accountable. Hold the Planning Commission accountable. We're the voice that sends this up to the County Councilors who make the ultimate decision, but I kind of like to think of ourselves as the big collector of this information out there and I'm not afraid to say no to staff. I'm not opposed to saying yes or no. I just want to get it right. This is going to happen but let's just do it the right way.

So, with that said, gentlemen, I'll take a **motion** and a second on this if you'd like to.

PUBLIC: No. How did you like that answer?

JOHNSON: What's that? I didn't hear that.

SWINDELL: Karl, this is Matt Swindell. I'd like to make a motion for CPZ2021-00013 --

PUBLIC: The Planning Commission is a joke.

JOHNSON: Somebody's, excuse me, somebody's got your mic. You're not mic'd. Somebody ought to mic pretty quick. Sorry, Matt. Go ahead.

SWINDELL: That's all right.

PUBLIC: That's the school board, worse, I think, but...

JOHNSON: Can we figure out what that is.

PUBLIC: Oh, I'm done.

JOHNSON: That seems like someone that's on the audio, Larisa. So, the audio is muted.

SIDOROV: Okay. I think -- I think I got it figured out.

JOHNSON: Thank you. Matt, I apologize. Go ahead again.

SWINDELL: Well, it's nice to hear the honest comments. CPZ2021-00013, 179th Street Access Management & Circulation Plan, I'd like to make a **MOTION** that -- sorry, I'm off a little bit.

JOHNSON: That's all right. I got you. I was thrown too. I was thrown by when I was called the school board. We have a motion. Do we have a second?

VERANZO: This is Aldo Lampson Veranzo. I **Second** that motion.

JOHNSON: Okay. We have a motion and a second. Sonja, could we get a roll call, please.

**ROLL CALL VOTE**

ENGE: AYE

HALBERT: AYE

VERANZO: AYE

SWINDELL: AYE

WOGEN: AYE

JOHNSON: AYE

JOHNSON: That looks like we have a 6/0; is that correct, Sonja?

WISER: 6 to 0, yes

JOHNSON: Thank you. The motion passes. Moving on, hopefully, to something a little less contentious. The second item on tonight's agenda is the Planning Commission Rules and Procedure Update. Staff presenting this is Jacqui Kamp. Jacqui, are you there?

**IV. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS, continued**

**B. Proposed Changes to Planning Commission Rules of Procedure**

The purpose of the changes is to update information and provide clarification on Planning Commission rules and procedures.

**Staff Contact:** Oliver Orjiako, [Oliver.Orjiako@clark.wa.gov](mailto:Oliver.Orjiako@clark.wa.gov) or 564-397-4112

KAMP: Yep, I'm here. Can everyone hear me?

JOHNSON: Yep.

KAMP: Great.

JOHNSON: Go ahead.

KAMP: Okay. Good evening. My name is Jacqui Kamp, K-a-m-p. I'm Program Manager for Clark County Community Planning. I'm here tonight to go over the revisions to the County's Planning Commissions Rules and Procedures. Larisa, could you actually open up the track change version. Thank you.

So, we reviewed the initial revisions at your work session on February 3rd. The major revisions, as we discussed on the 3rd, included new guidelines for the applicant presentation; some clarification on the rules and procedures for public testimony, both orally and written; specifically clarifying the three-minute rule; and that Planning Commission members will ask questions of the public commenter, if there are some after they provide their public comment, and any questions do not count against their three minutes.

We also included a new section on conflict of interest that we have not had to provide clarification and guidance for Planning Commission, for a Planning Commission member. And then, the last thing I wanted to just go over was we had some discussion at the work session and some suggestions from the Planning Commission members on making some changes to the new revision. So, I just wanted to highlight those.

So, the first one is -- Larisa, could you go to Page 2. We had a comment to be consistent, we made some changes reflecting going to "their," the pronoun "their," instead of "him/her," just to simplify that. So, we made sure we caught the other one that was in here under "APPLICANT PRESENTATION" so you'll see that highlighted yellow so that's in reflection of your work session discussion. Let's see.

And then if you could scroll down a little bit, Larisa, to the bottom of that page, yes. We added this additional sentence to the written testimony section regarding materials that are submitted during the hearing. We had a conversation about, you know, the how it can be hard for Planning Commission members, if they receive this huge body of work right at during the hearing.

So, this kind of provides some guidance and clarification to members of the public that, you know, it's not guaranteed that you're going to be able to absorb 300 pages if you receive it at the hearing. So really trying to encourage people to, you know, get that information to you all in advance of your hearing. But that we still will take it and it will be part of the record for the Planning Commission and forwarded to the County Council. So that was that revision.

And, Larisa, could you move on to the next page. So here you see the changes in yellow highlight for our new section on "CONFLICT OF INTEREST." So, we had a typo during the work session that we caught. It said, "familiar interest," so we changed that, updated that to "familial interest." And then, we had some discussion about on letter c there, VII.c and deleting "providing support for a party or position on the matter" as per the discussion from commission members and agreement with our legal counsel.

And then, I think that might be covering all of the kind of updates from the work session. I did want to read through it again as we did that through the work session. But I'm happy to answer any questions and we have Chris here, as well, and Oliver, if you want to discuss any more or have any questions for us.

JOHNSON: Thank you, Jacqui. Bryant, do you have any questions or comments?

ENGE: No questions, Karl.

JOHNSON: Thank you, sir. Bryan Halbert, do you have any questions or comments?

HALBERT: I have no questions or comments, Karl.

JOHNSON: Aldo Lampson, do you have any questions or comments?

VERANZO: No, sir.

JOHNSON: Matt?

SWINDELL: Nope, not at this time. Thanks.

JOHNSON: Eldon?

WOGEN: Nope. Thanks to staff for the clarity.

JOHNSON: Great. Hey, this may be -- Jacqui, I had one and maybe this should have come up at work session. But I was thinking tonight, when we give a three-minute time constraint, or limitation, or whatever, to someone from the community and they want to ask a question to staff, is there -- and, Chris, maybe you could chime in here, is there an approach to that that we want to take? Do we want to refer that question to be answered right then or do we want to refer that question to be answered to staff, if they call staff? Do you understand what I'm saying?

KAMP: Yeah, kind of that back-and-forth during the public comment.

JOHNSON: Yeah, that's what I was trying to avoid tonight and I don't -- I was -- I didn't know what. Especially when we're going remote, that could get messy.

KAMP: It looks like Chris -- I'm going to have Chris chime in. Go ahead.

ORJIAKO: Yes. This is Oliver. Karl, if I may, unless our legal counsel wants to take that. I believe that all questions during the public testimony should be directed to the Planning Commission members. And during -- in my opinion, during your deliberation, you can write it down and then ask that question of staff. But I think that when the public are testifying, they should be directing their questions to the Planning Commission. And our legal counsel can chime in.

COOK: Yeah. This is -- this is more a question of how to -- how to run a meeting in an organized fashion and fair fashion than a legal, you know, than anything that's in a statute someplace, but I absolutely agree with Oliver here. In order to allow everybody to have a, you know, equal input, this has to go through the Planning Commission, as opposed to all of a sudden, a great side conversation between a witness and the attorney or staff. That's not -- that's hard to keep track of in terms of time and --

JOHNSON: Yeah, that's exactly. We've had that happen --

COOK: Yes.

JOHNSON: -- brutally where I've gone, oh, no, and I don't -- but we've also had it happen where it's a little question here or there. I don't want to make it totally, totally rigid or we don't want to make it totally rigid, but I just wanted to make sure that I could say, hey, look, it's the Planning Commission, not this is the body that's making the decision, not, in this case, staff. Clarifications could come at a different time. I just wanted to make sure that was okay, what I did, especially tonight. During --

COOK: I think that's totally desirable.

JOHNSON: Okay. All right. Well, thank you. And, Jacqui, good job, thank you very much for

making this thing a lot, lot cleaner. Appreciate it.

KAMP: Thank you.

JOHNSON: Okay. With that said, I'm going to take it back to us. Hold on here. I lost my place. I'm sorry. We don't have any questions.

JOHNSON: With that said, I'll accept a motion and a second. One more time, quickly, before I say that. Does the Planning Commission have any comment? Okay, hearing none, I'll accept a motion and a second.

WISER: Karl?

JOHNSON: Yes, ma'am.

WISER: Are we going to take public testimony?

JOHNSON: We should, yeah, on this. I guess we should, huh. Let's back up. I lost the page is what I did. I got caught in my thoughts. All right. Here we go. Give me one second. All right.

If written comments were received prior to February 17th, they were submitted to the PC members and posted on the Planning Commission website. We will now take oral public testimony as we did earlier this evening. Sonja, it is now your turn to speak.

WISER: Thank you. If anyone from the public would like to comment on this proposal, now is your opportunity. You need to let us know that you would like to be called on by either clicking the raised-hand symbol at the bottom of the list of participants on your computer screen or pressing star 3 on your phone's number panel. Staff will unmute you, if your hand is raised, when it's your turn to speak. Public comment is limited to three minutes. You can raise your hand now.

Larisa, are there any members of the public wishing to speak?

SIDOROV: So, I see Jim Byrne and Teresa Hardy, but that might be from earlier. I'll go ahead and unmute Jim now just in case he still has something to say, but we'll see. Jim, can you hear us?

JOHNSON: I can't hear Larisa very well. Do we have anybody that's wanting to speak?

WISER: Jim Byrne? I see his hand raised but he's not speaking. Teresa Hardy. She probably -- Teresa. Jim Byrne, I see your speaker coming in and out.

BYRNE: (Inaudible) try and find anything (inaudible).



WISER: Jim Byrne. I see no one that's wanting to speak.

**Return to Planning Commission**

JOHNSON: Okay. Thank you very much. We will now close the public testimony portion of the hearing and return to the Planning Commission. Ask staff, there was no public testimony. The Planning Commission will now deliberate and make a motion on the Rules and Procedures Updated Proposal. Did the Planning Commission have any comments? Gentlemen, I'll quickly go through your names again. Just pipe up if you'd like. Bryant Enge.

ENGE: No.

JOHNSON: Bryan Halbert.

HALBERT: No. I like the proposed changes. They make sense and they kind of bring the document up-to-date based on how we operate.

JOHNSON: Thank you, Aldo. Or excuse me, Bryan. Aldo Lampson Veranzo.

VERANZO: No change.

JOHNSON: Thank you. Matt Swindell.

SWINDELL: Nothing.

JOHNSON: Eldon Wogen.

WOGEN: No comments.

JOHNSON: At this time, I will accept a motion and a second, gentlemen, from somebody.

SWINDELL: Karl, this is Matt Swindell. I make a **MOTION** we accept the Rules and Procedures as proposed.

VERANZO: This is Aldo Lampson Veranzo, I **second** the motion.

JOHNSON: So, we have a motion and a second. Sonja, will you take a roll call calling each PC member by name in which you will vote yes or no.

### **ROLL CALL VOTE**

ENGE: AYE  
HALBERT: AYE  
VERANZO: AYE  
SWINDELL: AYE  
WOGEN: AYE  
JOHNSON: AYE

WISER: And that's a 6 to 0.

JOHNSON: Thank you. The motion passes. This concludes the public hearing portion of tonight's agenda.

### **OLD BUSINESS**

JOHNSON: Is there any old business? Hearing none, we move on.

### **NEW BUSINESS**

JOHNSON: Is there any new business?

ORJIAKO: Planning Commission members, this is Oliver Orjiako, Community Planning Director. We are still monitoring any decisions coming out of the Council and the Governor as to when we will probably likely go to in person but stay-tuned. As soon as we know more, we will pass that information to the Planning Commission. So, thank you for your patience. I know how frustrating it is for members of the public to do this virtually, but we will see what happens. And as we know more, we will share that with the Planning Commission and the public; so, thank you. That's all I have.

### **COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION**

JOHNSON: Thank you, Oliver. Are there any comments from members of the Planning Commission? Okay. Gentlemen, thank you for your patience tonight with all the little things that happened and appreciate everything you guys do. Sonja, could you give us our next time we meet, offhand, by any chance?

WISER: Right now, for March, we don't have anything on the docket, but we'll be getting together with you. I'll be e-mailing you in the next few weeks and then giving you the update for April.

JOHNSON: Great. Thank you very much. Gentlemen, thank you. And special thanks to our staff

and, of course, as always, Cindy Holley, you're a jewel. Thank you for being patient. Our hearing is now adjourned.

### **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://clark.wa.gov/community-planning/planning-commission-hearings-and-meeting-notes>***

Television proceedings can be viewed on CTVTV on the following Web Page at:

***<https://www.cvtv.org/program/clark-county-planning-commission>***

Minutes Transcribed by:

*Cindy Holley, Court Reporter – Rider & Associates Court Reporting  
Sonja Wisner, Program Assistant, Clark County Community Planning*