



Clark County Planning Commission

Karl Johnson, Chair
Matt Swindell, Vice Chair
Bryant Enge
Steve Morasch
Bryan Halbert
Eldon Wogen
Jack Harroun

CLARK COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION THURSDAY, AUGUST 17, 2023 MINUTES OF PUBLIC HEARING

Public Service Center
Council Hearing Room, 6th Floor
1300 Franklin Street
Vancouver, WA
6:30 p.m.

CALL TO ORDER

Planning Commission Rules of Procedure

SWINDELL: Okay. We'll call this meeting to order. Good evening, Planning Commissioners, members of the public and staff members. I would like to call this hybrid public hearing to order for Thursday, August 17th, 2023. My name is Matt Swindell. I'm the Vice Chair of the Planning Commission.

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

County staff will present first and then Planning Commission can ask questions. Next, we will invite the applicant to speak, if there is one, then members of the public who wish to provide testimony.

When we get to the public comment portion of the agenda, we will provide more information on how to participate both virtually and in person. However, if you are in person tonight and wish to provide comment on a hearing agenda item, please sign up via the sign-in sheet at the back of the room.

During public testimony you will have three minutes to speak and remarks should be directed to the Planning Commission only. Do not repeat testimony that has already been provided.

At the conclusion of the public testimony, staff and the applicant may respond to comments and the public portion of the hearing will then be closed. The Planning Commission will then deliberate and make a recommendation to the County Council.

For both the virtual and in-person members of the Planning Commission and staff, please ensure your microphones are muted unless you are speaking. Planning Commission members, when you make a motion and/or second a motion, please state your full name for the court reporter.

Does any member of the Planning Commission have any conflicts related to the hearing items tonight? Hearing none, we'll call roll call. Sonja.

ROLL CALL VOTE

ENGE: HERE
HALBERT: HERE
MORASCH: HERE
WOGEN: HERE
SWINDELL: HERE
HARROUN: ABSENT
JOHNSON: ABSENT

WISER: 5 present.

Staff Present: Oliver Orjiako, Community Planning Director; Christine Cook, Senior Deputy Prosecuting Attorney; Susan Ellinger, Planner III; Michael Sallis, Planner III; Jose Alvarez, Program Manager II; Harrison Husting, Transportation Planner; Sonja Wiser, Program Assistant; Bart Catching, Planner II, and Cindy Holley, Court Reporter.

Other: Rose Newberry, Consultant

GENERAL & NEW BUSINESS

A. Approval of Agenda for August 17, 2023

SWINDELL: Okay. With that, can I get a motion for approval of the agenda for August, 16th (sic), 2023.

HALBERT: Bryan Halbert. I'll make a **motion** that we adopt the, or that we accept the agenda as presented.

SWINDELL: Can I get a second.

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

SWINDELL: With that, you can call the roll.

ENGE: AYE

HALBERT: AYE

MORASCH: AYE

WOGEN: AYE

SWINDELL: AYE

WISER: 5/0

B. Approval of Minutes for June 15, 2023

SWINDELL: Motion passes 5/0. With that, can I get approval for minutes from June 15th, 2023. Can I get a motion.

HALBERT: Bryan Halbert. I'll make a **motion** that we approve the minutes from June 2023.

SWINDELL: Can I get a second.

ENGE: This is Bryant Enge. I'll **second**.

SWINDELL: It's been moved and seconded. May we call the roll.

ROLL CALL VOTE

ENGE: AYE

HALBERT: AYE

MORASCH: AYE

WOGEN: AYE

SWINDELL: AYE

WISER: 5/0.

SWINDELL: Motion passes.

C. Communications from the Public

SWINDELL: With that, we are now at the point in the meeting where we will be accepting comments from the public for item agendas not on the, or for items not on the agenda. Do we have anybody that has any items they would like to talk about? And I see someone there.

WISER: Thank you.

SWINDELL: Can you please state your full name and address for the public record and speak right into that mic right there. You might want to turn it on.

HOLLEY: And spell their last name, please.

SWINDELL: Oh, yeah, and spell your last name.

HEDGEPATH: Thank you. My name is Janet Hedgepath, H-e-d-g-e-p-a-t-h. My address is 505 N.W. 45th Street, Vancouver. Land planning is a vital and important task and I appreciate the time and dedication you all have given to the community by volunteering to take on this work and thanks to the staff for all their diligent work.

Land use planning is not easy. It requires seeking out and synthesizing a wide variety of viewpoints and interests. Recently there have been some discussions regarding the role of preference given to developers in the building community.

In observing your meetings and deliberations, the voice that is most often heard and seems to be given the most weight is that of the builders and the development community.

While they do have an important outlook which certainly needs to be part of a decision-making, theirs is just a narrow slice of your constituency and often not the growth being planned for.

As an example, the Housing Option Study. While the development and building group are primarily white, male, Gen X and older and homeowners, the optimism of the proposed affordable housing is most likely a very different demographic.

Older people who no longer have a family to raise and don't want to be in a big house, Gen Z and the millennials who are foregoing or postponing marriage and/or children and also don't want to spend their Saturdays weed and feeding the front yard. Single parents whose main concern may be the safety and health that a middle class community will provide for their children. Where are their voices?

I have heard this body plead for public input. I know you welcome people to come and voice their concerns and ideas yet you can generate a sense of uselessness when people oftentimes come and voice their concerns of health effects, environment, safety, sustainability and these are accepted but then they're dismissed as obstacles or as too costly.

In going forward especially in working on the Growth Management Act Update it will be necessary to develop more balanced collaborative plans. That balance solution will require not just hearing the concerns of the wider community, but giving those concerns and perspectives thoughtful consideration and weighing them on an equal footing with those in the development community.

As my dad used to say, I know you hear me but do you heed me. It's time to heed those unrepresented voices. Rather than imagine win/lose outcomes, seek to develop a collaborative

outcome that works for all the citizens of Clark County. Thank you for your time.

SWINDELL: Thank you for your comments. Does anyone else wish to have to speak to the Planning Commission on anything not pertaining to tonight's agenda?

WISER: There are no Webex callers. There are no phone callers on Webex so we can return it to go to the public hearing.

SWINDELL: Okay. Thank you. Okay. With that, I got lost here in my notes.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

1. **Adoption of a new 2023 Clark County Aging Readiness Plan** to replace the existing plan adopted in 2012. The new plan will address changes since adoption of the original plan including updated data, maps, technologies and services and include a new emergency preparedness chapter.

Staff Contact: Susan Ellinger, susan.ellinger@clark.wa.gov, 564-397-4516

WISER: Item IV, Public Hearing Item, Matt.

SWINDELL: Up to here. Oh, I thought you were going to read these comments here. I apologize. Okay. So we'll go on to Susan.

ELLINGER: Thank you. For the record my name is Susan Ellinger and I'm a Planner with Community Planning. Today's an exciting day for us, we've been working on this project for quite a while. To my right is Jenna Kay, another planning -- another Planner with Community Planning and we both helped staff the Commission on Aging.

In 2021 the Commission on Aging realized that the Aging Readiness Plan which they helped to implement was going to be about ten years old, so they took the initiative and put in a budget request and asked Council for money to update the plan.

That was approved and so since that time we have, we put out a request for proposals and we brought a consultant, Dudek, to help us rewrite the existing Aging Readiness Plan.

So I'm happy to introduce Rose Newberry who is, has been the project manager for this project for the last year and she's going to start the presentation off and then it will come back to me for a little bit and we'll be available also for any questions that you have at the end of the presentation. Rose.

NEWBERRY: Thank you, Susan. As was mentioned my name is Rose Newberry and I'm a project manager at Dudek and I've been project manager for the Age Readiness Plan Update. Next slide. First we'll talk about why we're here and the purpose of today's meeting. Next slide.

Since the last time you saw me, we will review the project background and I will provide an overview of the public engagement we had throughout the planning process. I'll provide an overview of the goals

and policies from each chapter. We'll talk about how to read a strategy. Next steps for the plan and then answer any questions you or the public may have. Next slide. This is the Project Background. Next slide.

So as Susan mentioned, the original Aging Readiness Plan was approved in 2012 and it was developed through a lot of community input and continuing collaborative development.

In the original 2012 plan included five chapters, living healthier and longer in our community, housing options for our ageing population, transportation and mobility, supporting your health, well-being while being independent and more to give turning silver into gold, such as a volunteer bond to engagement.

The original plan included 91 strategies and annual progress reports created by the Commission on Aging. Next slide. I'll also talk about how the Aging Readiness Plan is implemented because it's an interesting plan.

It highlights best practices and recommendations throughout the jurisdiction including the county. It does not mandate that any particular action is taken, instead there's a roadmap of options for the county and cities to adopt, make community Clark County more age friendly.

It also sets standards for community involvement and monitoring, so understanding how to engage the public and see if a plan is working or the strategies adopted are working. And lastly, it connects planning, advocacy and service providers. This plan is not up to the county or the city for land use, it's all about service providers including emergency first responders in the area.

The AAADSW is the Area Agency on Aging and Disabilities of Southwest Washington and so it connects those pieces together to make sure that they're communicating for the end goal of age friendly and age readiness in Clark County. Next slide. I'll hand these next slides over to Susan.

ELLINGER: Thanks, Rose. So Commissioner Enge asked for a summary of how the existing Aging Readiness Plan had been implemented, so I wanted to give you a few more additional details on that topic.

As Rose mentioned, the Aging Readiness Plan was adopted in 2012. Soon after the adoption the Commission on Aging was formed and the Commission is a nine member volunteer group that's charged with implementing the Aging Readiness Plan.

They also provide leadership and addressing the needs of the aging community members and support projects that ultimately benefit all ages. And I'm happy to let you know that we have a few of our members here in the audience tonight.

The Commission has created useful resources for our community members such as the Universal Green Design Idea Book that's shown on the slide. The book includes suggestions on ways to build new or modified existing homes to make them visitable by anyone or enable a resident to age in place.

Examples of modifications to make a home visitable include a no step entry into the home, doorways wide enough for someone in a wheelchair and the location of an accessible bathroom on the first floor. The City of Ridgefield created an incentive program to build visitable housing based on recommendations from the Commission.

The Commission also advocated for several changes to County Code, these included updates to the Cottage Housing Code and the revisions to the Accessory Dwelling Unit Code in 2018. Both of these allow code -- both of these codes allow for the creation of smaller more affordable housing units that can prevent -- that can provide great opportunities for aging in place.

Another was the addition of the requirement for pedestrian access ways to be built in the new developments to better connect homes to major transportation routes and services. Next slide, please.

Another example of the Commissions work is their support of the creation of the Clark County Elder Justice Center. The Elder Justice Center responds to reports of abuse of older citizens and other vulnerable adults. They also recommend that a sheriff's deputy be assigned to the Elder Justice Center team.

The Commission was a partner on a weatherization improvement project -- a weatherization improvement program grant for moderate income households in the Vancouver -- in Vancouver. The grant focused on neighborhoods with a large concentration of households over 60 years old with electric heat. And as a part of that program, the Commission conducted outreach to get the word out to residents.

The Commission has completed several projects to help educate decision-makers and the public about issues relating to older adults. Some examples include proclamations, local access television interviews, community presentations, contributions to newspaper articles, hosting nationally recognized speakers, facilitating community discussions and the creation of the Silver Citizen Award.

The Silver Citizen Award is presented annually and recognizes older adults over the age of 60 for their acts of service and valuable contributions and vitality of the community.

And during the COVID-19 pandemic, the Commission shifted focus to the impacts of the pandemic on older adults which led to the addition of the Emergency Preparedness Chapter to the updated Aging Readiness Plan. I'm now going to return the presentation to Rose to further address the 2023 update to Aging Readiness Plan.

NEWBERRY: Thanks, Susan. Go to the next slide.

HOLLEY: Could you sit just a little closer. I'm having a hard time hearing you.

NEWBERRY: Yeah. Is that better?

HOLLEY: Yes. Thank you.

NEWBERRY: Perfect. I'll stay right here. So why update the 2012 plan? It's a really good plan. So we have some notes up here. One was the need to address natural and human-caused hazards. That's what the Commission thought was the biggest missing piece in the 2012 plan.

It's included needing to incorporate what we've learned from the pandemic and basically the focusing on older adults. There's also a larger generation for people reaching retirement age now which leads to a very diverse both in age, race and income of older adults and to recognize that and address it.

Fourth, to monitor the progress and see how the 2012 plan has succeeded and if anything in there is no longer relevant or been (inaudible) to remove it. And then also the world is very different than it was in 2012. There's new transportation options, increased housing costs, housing options and zoning regulations. And then also a big increase in technology and virtual communication both of loved ones and the service providers, the doctors. Next slide.

And we also wanted to review where we were in the planning process. So first we reviewed the documents including the old plan and other Clark County planning documents, the area on aging area plan. We conducted stakeholder interviews. This was people that were in charge of implementing the plan or had special interests.

We then did data gathering and sharing. This is really, just commend county staff on helping us go through all 91 strategies and explaining if they had any progress, if they were complete or if they had been abandoned.

After that we did focus group meetings for smaller groups talking about what makes Clark County age friendly or what could, and then any hurdles or opportunities. We then evaluated all the new strategies, asked for feedback from the public on the strategies, we asked them for details on why they were important.

Then we went back to the public and asked them for to prioritize those strategies. Then back to our desks, made a draft plan which is online and now we're here hoping that you will recommend the plan for adoption. Next slide.

I'm going to give an overview of the Public Engagement we heard. So as I mentioned on the previous slide we had the stakeholder focus groups for each of the existing chapters, so Transportation, Support Services caregivers, Housing, Healthy Communities and then Emergency Management.

We asked them what makes the community age friendly. We populated the screen as you can see on the slide with what they thought was age friendly and then asked to get to these they said access to healthcare or engaging communities of color, what are the barriers and what are the opportunities and then we brought that back into our planning process. Next slide.

Then we did our strategy workshops. So as you can see on the slide we had a large board for each strategy and then the public has sticky notes, these large type of sticky notes to answer who, where, when and why and so looking at our strategies from the 2012 plan trying to figure out exactly who it's for, where in the county it needs to prioritize, when it needs to happen and why it needs to happen.

Each strategy had its own board and these responses help us revise and shape our strategies to meet these specific needs that were highlighted by the public. Next slide.

And then our final engagement event was our prioritization workshop. So we gave the community five dots per chapter and they got to distribute them how they would like on the strategy that's important to them.

Additional comments as you can see on the screen were received through sticky notes to help if we were missing something. And then the amount of community support for each strategy influenced the final decision process.

And we also included in the plan what we call foundational policies, these are things that either the public was extremely interested in or that we thought were important to have happen first, they unlocked the power of other strategies and those are highlighted in the plan. Next slide.

I'm going to give a brief overview of each chapter. So our first chapter is Healthy Communities which is all about healthy food and exercise and healthy living. So our first goal in Healthy Communities was to improve access to healthy food and one strategy in that chapter was to expand access to fresh and local food. Next slide.

Our next goal was to create safe and acceptable park, green spaces and community gathering spaces including setting clear park standards for new parks and private development to meet the National Recreation and Park Association standards. Next slide.

Our third goal was to create a welcoming and age friendly built environment which includes improving the sense of physical safety and security of neighborhoods, especially at night, by adopting Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design or CPTED principals. Next slide.

Our fourth goal was to develop local and community based healthcare resources including developing a geriatric mobile outreach program. Next slide.

Our fifth goal was to provide resources to caregivers including providing educational opportunities to caregivers and older adults about virtual communication with doctors such as telehealth and instant messages to take some of the burden off of caregivers. Next slide.

Our next chapter was Housing which is all about providing a multitude of affordable and accessible options. So our first goal was to provide a range of housing for multigenerational communities. One strategy for that was to allow co-housing in low density residential zoning districts. Next slide.

Our second goal was to provide housing that enable people to age in place, so staying in their own home or community if their abilities change. So one strategy here was to incorporate universal design such as that green guide book Susan showed you into the building code. Next slide.

Our third goal was to support the development of more affordable housing including promoting higher density and mixed use developments on underused properties. Next slide.

Next we have our Mobility Chapter, so how to safely get around, walking, biking, rolling in a mobility device or taking transit. Our first goal here was to design transit options for people who are older or have a disability, including improving infrastructure to be more comfortable for older adults and people with disabilities. Next slide.

Our second goal was increasing alternative transportation options in areas not well-served by transit lines such as in the more rural areas. One strategy here was to increase the use of neighborhood electric vehicles or golf cart like vehicles. Next slide.

Our third goal was design communities for safe walking and rolling for a range of users and abilities and this included shortening block lengths so that it's more walkable and shorter distances between destinations. Next slide.

Our fourth goal was to promote land use patterns and design standards that encourage walking, rolling and transit use including requiring accessible public buildings located close to the street. Next slide.

Now we have our Civic Involvement Chapter or how to get older adults involved in their communities. Our first goal was supporting the efforts of neighborhood associations and other volunteer groups to reach and engage older adults this includes connecting with AARP resources and networks to expand the capacity of local governments. Next slide.

Our next goal was to support cross-cultural and intergenerational community events including connecting youth and school organizations with older adults. Next slide.

Our third goal was to continue to offer a variety of engagement opportunities in person and online this includes developing best practices for hiring older adults and sharing them with business associations. Next slide.

In our last, in our new chapter is the Emergency Preparedness Chapter. Our first goal and probably the most important one is to mitigate the impacts of potential hazards before they can occur such as reducing the transmission of airborne diseases. Next slide.

Our second goal was to prepare for natural hazards through education and improved communication including developing older adult specific alerts and communication channels. Next slide. Our third goal was to provide essential services during hazard events including improving access to healthcare during hazard events. Next slide.

I'll walk you through How to Read a Strategy. So the short version of what I just read you is the ones at the top, which is our strategy title. On the left-hand side of the screen you can see we have a Score, this one is scored New because it's new to the plan, it's a score out of 5.

A full 5 means it was complete and done, 1 means it was not accomplished in the 2012 plan and a 3 means maybe it happened somewhere but it's not widespread through the county yet and the plan has a definition of the scoring guide in it.

Next we have Resources. So for this one there's a few links people can click on to see examples of how to do this in other communities. We also have Case Studies for some of our strategies which are local to Washington or Portland, examples that have been successful to use as a model in other parts of the county.

And then Data, this is for the county or other local governments to look at and understand how to measure if this strategy was successful. On the right-hand side we have Measure Description which is a much longer and in-depth explanation of what the strategy is and in this example how to expand access to fresh and local food.

We have a Type, this is Advocacy. The type explains what planning tool you're using, so are you advocating for a change, is it a code revision, is it service provider and this informs the score in the data because each type of strategy uses different tools and measures of success.

We included Interested Parties, so these are agencies or implementers, a city might want you to contact with them or contact when looking to implement the strategy. And then lastly we defined in the Key Terms we thought were not already in the progress content. So the county or a city in Clark County readiness plan should both pick it up, understand the strategy and have a lot of resources at our fingertips to implement this successfully. Next slide.

We have our Next Steps. So the first bullet has happened in the past, we already had our work session with you on August 3rd. Now we're here today having the hearing after we hope you approve this for recommendation. We'll go to County Council for their work session next month on the 13th. And then finally go to our County Council hearing on September the 26th. Next slide.

And then thinking about what happens after we're hopefully adopted. The ARP will serve as a tool for many cities and towns in Clark County as they individually prepare their communities for the aging population and our comprehensive updates.

We're hopeful that the ARP will improve inter-jurisdictional coordination to address issues that span across jurisdictional boundaries, this includes natural hazards that may affect multiple cities or even service providers, fire departments, (inaudible) and (inaudible) resources that interact with multiple cities.

The Commission on Aging will produce annual work plans that will tie moving strategies forward in the plan. And then lastly staff will review planning code and ordinance strategies to suggest timing of

requests to the county and cities. Next slide.

And with that, myself and the staff, the county are happy to answer any questions about the plan.

SWINDELL: Okay. Great. Thank you. Great presentation. A lot of information in there. A lot of hard work went into that I can tell.

Questions from the Planning Commission

SWINDELL: With that, I'm going to ask the Planning Commission if they have any questions. We'll start with Bryant; do you have any questions for Rose or Susan?

ENGE: No. I concur with you, Matt, that this is a lot of good information, a lot of hard work. I appreciate Susan showing the good work of what they've done in the past in terms of strategies that had been implemented, so that's great, so thank you for that information, Susan, and again, Rose, a lot of good information. Thank you.

SWINDELL: All right. Bryan.

HALBERT: Sure. Thanks. I concur completely with Bryant and -- but I'd just like to ask one question. When this program is adopted and implemented, who follows through with the agencies that will be using this?

ELLINGER: Again, for the record, Susan Ellinger with Community Planning. So the Commission on Aging is really the overview, has the overview of the plan and is charged with implementing the plan. We as staff assist with that effort, but the Commission also works with a lot of departments in the county and presents to the city councils of each city, each, every year.

They also work with a lot of service providers, so they will invite service providers to come to their meetings and coordinate with them on different, different programs and projects and they have quite a few different partners such as C-TRAN, the Area Agency on Aging, a group called Community In Motion that works on transportation issues, so they work as the coordinator of all those groups to try to implement the strategies.

HALBERT: Great. Thanks.

SWINDELL: All right. Steve, do you have any questions?

MORASCH: Excuse me. No questions. Thank you. Great job everyone.

SWINDELL: Eldon, any questions or comments? Eldon, are you with us? Did we lose Eldon? Oh, he's on the phone. Okay. Well, we can circle back. And with that I don't think we have, Karl didn't join us yet. No? Okay.

SWINDELL: With that said, I'd just like to say fantastic job, that's a lot of work everybody put into that. I've read the comments that came in just right before the meeting here, they got entered in the public record, and I mean it's just heartfelt that everybody's been working really hard on this thing, so just great job to everybody, that's all I have to say really. So with that, we'll now open the hearing for public testimony and I'll give it to you.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

WISER: Good evening members of the public. Please note to be a party of record you must submit written testimony before, during, or prior to the close of tonight's hearing, or provide oral testimony at the public hearing, or request 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 August 17th, 2023, they were submitted to the PC members and posted on the Planning Commission website.

Tonight's hearing is being transcribed by a court reporter, so please spell your first and last name and speak slowly. Public comment is limited to three minutes. So tonight we'll start with Webex callers first. Bart, is there anybody that has raised their hand?

CATCHING: We have one person online but I don't see a hand raised.

WISER: Okay. So we'll start with in-person comments next. We'll begin with the participants in the hearing room. When our Chair calls your name on the sign-up sheet, please come up to the front and provide your name and address for the record. If you do not wish to provide public testimony, please say so. So, Matt, can you call the names on the sign-in sheets and have the people come forward one at a time.

SWINDELL: Okay. The first name I see here is a Cass Freedland.

FREEDLAND: Is it on? Wonderful, this is on. My name is Cass Freedland. It's spelled C-a-s-s, F-r-e-e-d-l-a-n-d. Should I give my address as well?

SWINDELL: Sure.

FREEDLAND: It's written on the sheet or it's 2306 S.E. Baypoint Drive, Unit 100 in Vancouver, 98683. I am the vice chair of the Commission on Aging and I want to thank the Planning Commission for this chance to offer my really enthusiastic support for the updated Aging Readiness Plan and ask that you approve the adoption of this timely and really important document.

For the past 18 months COA has been deeply engaged in updating the founding 2012 Aging Readiness Plan to address new challenges facing aging adults in Clark County and to anticipate the surge and the number of residents aged 60 or better over the next decade.

Working with our consultant Dudek we heard feedback from more than 500 community members through survey responses and written comments, 74 people participated and 6 focus groups and 3 community workshops and we are so grateful for the time and thoughtfulness of everyone who has participated in the project to date. And as the result of the lessons learned from an unprecedented pandemic, the additional chapter on Emergency Preparedness is again very timely.

We believe the updated Aging Readiness Plan to be current, relevant and strategic and we thank the Planning Commission for your consideration of our request for its approval for adoption. Thank you so much all.

SWINDELL: Thank you. Okay. We have a Franklin Johnson. Good evening, sir.

JOHNSON: Good evening. My name is Franklin Johnson. I'm currently the newly elected chair of the Clark County Commission on Aging. My name is spelled F-r-a-n-k-l-i-n, last name is J-o-h-n-s-o-n. I'm at 1408 S.E. 181st Avenue in Vancouver, the zip code is 98683.

I also want to thank the Commission for the opportunity to testify and support the Aging Readiness Plan. I'm not going to go into a lot of detail since my partner covered a lot of that, but I do want to say that I think our focus in the coming year is going to be on community engagement and outreach so that we can make a concerted effort to try and avail seniors and anyone needing that kind of assistance, the myriad of resources that are available for them.

I'm sorry, my fifth year on the commission and to be honest there's so many things that I was not aware of at the beginning that I've really come to appreciate and I think it's important to be able to spread that information as well.

One of the things that's been really, really critical to the work that we've done over the last couple of years has been the support provided by Oliver Orjiako and the planning staff and especially the support that's been provided to them by allowing the support for Susan Ellinger and Jenna Kay, we couldn't have done this work without them.

We spent probably the better part of two years meeting virtually and they overcame significant technical challenges to allow us to continue to function and be effective, and so my appreciation and understanding of their value has increased over the years, so I just want to let that be known for the record.

I'm asking also that you approve this plan because I think the steps that we've taken to update it have been appropriate. I think that the value of the plan especially with the addition of the sixth chapter on emergency preparation is really critical to be a spur to get that information out to the various communities.

We've had sessions at senior housing centers, we've had a number of really in-depth participation comments from people in the public so for that we're appreciative and that's why we feel that this plan is relevant and should be adopted. Thank you. And I just want to ask if you have any questions of

me.

SWINDELL: I know I don't, but thank you very much for all of your hard work, five years you've been doing this yourself.

JOHNSON: On the Commission, not to this report.

SWINDELL: Yeah, on the Commission, but thank you very much for what you do, that's a lot of hard work out there that our public needs so thank you.

JOHNSON: Thank you.

SWINDELL: Okay. With that, I don't have any more names written down.

Return to Planning Commission

SWINDELL: All right. With that, I will bring it back to the Planning Commission. Bryant Enge, do you have any questions or comments at this point?

ENGE: I believe the update to the readiness update plan is consistent with the updates that we recently made concerning the middle housing and smaller single-family code updates, so I believe the goals and strategies in this readiness plan update is consistent with that. That's my only comment.

SWINDELL: All right. Thank you. Bryan.

HALBERT: Sure. I also want to thank the members of COA and their work that they've, to bring this forward and to engage the staff and come up with, update this plan, it's ten years, ten years since it's been updated. It really looks like a fantastic roadmap and a resource for our aging population, so thank you very much for that. No other questions.

SWINDELL: Okay. All right. Steve Morasch, any comments?

MORASCH: No. No questions or comments just agreeing with the prior Planning Commission members and reiterating great job everyone on the work on this matter. Thank you.

SWINDELL: Okay. Eldon, did you join us again? He dropped off. Okay. All right. And I guess my only comment at this point would be I'd really love to hear how this, the next year you're going to be really working on public engagement and getting out there.

I mean, I think I mentioned before, my mother just recently passed and before her passing, it, you know, to know that all these resources were out there for her, you know, in her final years would have been fantastic, just her quality of life, you know, things that she could have been doing, I wish I would have known more.

So I think it's really, really neat that you guys are doing that and really important for our community because we do have an aging community here, so... Anyway, with that said, I will ask for a motion from someone.

ENGE: This is Bryant Enge. I make a motion to recommend to Clark County Council the update of the Clark County Aging Readiness Plan.

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

SWINDELL: It's been motioned and seconded. Sonja, you want to call the roll.

ROLL CALL VOTE

ENGE: AYE

HALBERT: AYE

MORASCH: AYE

WISER: Did Eldon Wogen leave? Okay.

SWINDELL: An enthusiastic AYE.

WISER: 4 to 0.

SWINDELL: Motion passes 4 to 0. All right. Excited to hear what's going to happen in the future with that. Okay.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS, continued

2. **Clark County Community Planning is proposing a new section of code to site Essential Public Facilities:** A proposal to add a new code section, 40.260.077 Essential Public Facilities, that will create a process to site essential public facilities. This will include amendments to the following existing sections and chapters: 40.100.070 Definitions; 40.510.030 Type III Process-Quasi-Judicial Decisions, and 40.510.05 Application Submittal Requirements. Chapters that would be cross referenced and updated are, 40.210 Resource and Rural Districts; 40.220 Urban Residential Districts; 40.230 Commercial, Business, Mixed Use and Industrial Districts; and 40.250 Overlay Districts.

Staff Contact: Michael Sallis, Michael.Sallis@clark.wa.gov or (564) 397-4544

SWINDELL: With that, now we're ready to move on to our second item agenda and that is our Essential Public Facilities. And, Michael, take it away.

SALLIS: Good evening. Good evening members of the Planning Commission. For the record my name is Michael Sallis and I'm a Planner for Clark County Community Planning. We're here to discuss the update for Essential Public Facilities. Next slide.

And this is what we have kind of the agenda and that's to talk about a little bit of the background as well as proposed action and then our staff findings and recommendations, and sort of the next process after this. Next slide.

So just to give you a little bit of a background. Essential Public Facilities or EPF means any public facility owned or operated by a unit of local, state or federal government, public or private utility, transportation company or any other entity that provides a public service as a primary mission and is typically difficult to site.

EPFs include but are not limited to facilities listed under RCW 36.70A.200 and may also include facilities such as regional wastewater treatment facilities and hospitals. And the next slide, couple of slides you'll see some of the examples that we have. Next slide.

This is kind of, I added this slide because one of the questions that members of the Planning Commission was why now and so I wanted to make sure that you guys understood why we're doing this at this point. Each county planning under GMA under RCW 36.70A.200 shall establish a process for identifying and siting Essential Public Facilities. Essential Public Facilities was not defined in the existing code so that's part of the reason why we're doing it. And then lastly, the County needs a process to site and also identify Essential Public Facilities within the county. Next slide.

If an EPF does not present a siting difficulty, it would be permitted through our Type A development review process and would require a conditional use permit. If it is considered difficult, then we would do it under the Type III process and still would be required to do a conditional use permit.

EPF sitings, I'm sorry, EPF siting process is to allow for a county to impose reasonable conditions on the EPF to mitigate the impacts. The review process for siting EPF would include public noticing requirements as well as opportunities for public comment. Next slide.

These amendments are consistent with all applicable requirements under GMA and the WAC and the comprehensive plan and may respond to substantial changes in policy, better implement applicable comprehensive plan policies and reflect changes in federal/state law. So some of our findings are -- is that we would better be able to implement EPFs in the future under RCW 36.70A and WAC 365-196-550. Next slide.

So as a recommendation, the staff recommends approval of the EPF and its amendments. And sort of our next steps, since we had a work session back on the 3rd and we'll have the hearing today and then after that we'll have a work session with Council, we're looking for September 20th or so and then have a hearing after that. And next slide. And we'll open it up to discussion and questions.

Questions from the Planning Commission

SWINDELL: Okay. Thank you. All right. Bryant, do you have any questions?

ENGE: Not for staff at this time.

SWINDELL: All right. Bryan, do you have any questions?

HALBERT: Sure. Thanks, Mike. And do you know, this may not be directly related to the EPF, but are there any EPFs that are currently in the planning process that would benefit or be sidelined or delayed because of this adoption?

SALLIS: No. We have a process that, that we have in place, what we don't have are applications that are coming in for those that are difficult at this point.

HALBERT: Thank you.

SWINDELL: All right. Steve, do you have any questions?

MORASCH: No questions at this time. Thank you.

SWINDELL: All right. With that, I don't have any questions either. It's pretty, seems pretty straightforward. With that, we will now open the hearing for public testimony. Sonja.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

WISER: Okay. Bart, can you share the instructions on the screen. And we'll start with the participants that have joined via computer or on the telephone. Are there any people calling in, Bart?

CATCHING: There's one person online but their hand is not raised.

WISER: Okay. We will begin then with any participants in the hearing room. When we call your name on the sign-up sheet, please come up to the front and provide your name and address for the record. Is there anybody here in the hearing room that wishes to speak? There are none. We can return it to the Planning Commission.

Return to Planning Commission

SWINDELL: All right. Seeing no movement there, we will now close the public testimony and bring it back to the Planning Commission. All right. With that said, I'll just open it up to the Planning Commission, does anybody have any comments that they would like to make at this time based on the fact we just asked that question?

MORASCH: I have comments.

SWINDELL: Go ahead.

MORASCH: I'm trying to figure out how to start my video. Does anybody else want to have

comments while I figure that out? My button disappeared. There it is. Wait, is my video running?

SWINDELL: Yes, we can see you. We can see the top of your head.

MORASCH: All right. I can't really -- is that better?

SWINDELL: There we go, now we got the, now we got it.

MORASCH: Okay. So I mean we had some discussion at the work session, and I'm looking at my notes, I had some concerns about I guess not about adopting the proposal in general but more about the way the proposal is written. I think it needs a little more work.

I mean, these are controversial projects and I've got several concerns, but I mean I don't know that, I don't know that we could just do an amendment. I mean, I'm probably going to vote against it in its current form because I don't think I'm able to, you know, work all the amendments out, you know, in one public hearing.

One of the concerns I have is there's some language in the, in the proposed ordinance that seems to require the examiner to defer to staff on certain factual matters and I mean given that these are controversial, I think that the examiner should be the one to, you know, ultimately have the authority to make the decision.

I think the members of the public would feel more comfortable, you know, because the examiner is, you know, supposed to be sort of an independent decision-maker and so I would want that changed.

I also, I didn't see anything in the ordinance that talked about, you know, what the process is for site selection and, you know, sort of what are the criteria that should go into that process and nothing that would give the examiner the authority to do any kind of independent review of the site selection process.

So I would like to see that addressed because I think members of the public when you're sitting one of these controversial projects they're going to want to make sure that there's some independent review of the site selection process because that's really where the decision ultimately, you know, is made.

Once, you know, once we all decide this is the site, then it's sort of a done deal at that point and I know in some of the past controversial projects there's been arguments raised that, you know, site selection was something that the examiner should be reviewing, and based on the code in effect at that time the examiner basically said, no, I have no authority to review site selection, that's done, you know, at an earlier stage by the agency without public input.

And so I would really like to see something in this ordinance that directly addresses the site selection process and gives, creates some criteria for it and gives the examiner some ability to, you know, review and come up with an independent, you know, decision on that.

And then finally there was some language in the proposal that I found to be confusing with respect to the criteria. There's several sections that read like they're criteria but then there's one section that says, you know, these are the factors that the examiner is going to look at, so I think the language needs to be clarified there as to, you know, which sections are criteria and which aren't.

And so because there's these many things that I'm concerned about and I don't think they can be addressed just by, you know, having us try to rewrite it because the rewrite would be significant, I'm probably just going to vote to reject it at this time. And that's all the comments I have at this point. Thank you.

SWINDELL: Thank you, Steve. Really good thoughts on those issues. Appreciate your thoughts. With that said, I really don't have any comments at this time for staff or questions. And with that, I will --

ENGE: Matt, just to comment. Is there an opportunity to ask a question then about the criteria that Steve was talking about, it was, and maybe I missed it, but it was my understanding that the criteria hasn't changed, it's just where it is in our existing documents and so this would just be adding a specific code section to consolidate and put that information in along with cross-references.

I just want to, I just want to be clear in terms of exactly that we're not developing any new criteria here, what we're doing, what we're doing is consolidating and creating a code section based on the criteria that we already use, and I guess that's a question for staff, I just want to be, I just want to find that out.

SWINDELL: Did you catch that? I think it was a question, right, you were just asking to clarify that? Did you catch that?

SALLIS: Yeah. That's exactly right. I mean, we're using existing criteria that and standards that we already have on file that's already in the code.

SWINDELL: Okay. Thanks, Bryant.

SALLIS: Oh, hang on a second.

ENGE: Thank you. I just wanted clarification.

SALLIS: That may not be necessarily true.

SWINDELL: We're going to get some more comments here.

ELLINGER: This is Susan Ellinger for the record with Community Planning. Some of the criteria that are in the new proposed section of 40.260.077 are new criteria and that are not in the current code.

SWINDELL: Did you hear that, Bryant?

ENGE: Okay. That's what I wanted to hear. Thank you. Thank you.

SWINDELL: And, Steve, I believe that's what you were, you were commenting on, you were questioning that; is that right, Steve?

MORASCH: That was part of my comment, yeah, that there are new criteria and part of the comment was that I think it's a little confusing to me because in Section D it talks about the application submittal requirements and some of this sounds like criteria, you know, an assessment of the suitability of the proposed location in terms of local, county, regional and/or state needs in order to minimize public costs, environmental impacts, discern suitability of the facility location in the county or within another jurisdiction, that's in Subsection D.1.g, that's under Application Submittal Requirements.

But then Section E has the Decision Criteria which are different and I don't see the same kind of language in E with respect to the sort of the site selection process. It appears to me there's some new criteria here and I think they need to be massaged a little and I would also like to see a little more detailed of a criteria with respect to the site selection process.

SWINDELL: Okay. Thanks, Steve. Susan, did you have -- nope? You're okay? All right. All right. Mike, did you have anything? Do you have anything? No? All right. With that, Bryant, you're all good, you got all your questions answered?

ENGE: Matt, thank you, yes, I did.

SWINDELL: Okay. All right. Bryan, are you good?

HALBERT: I was going to ask Steve - Bryan Halbert here - hey, Steve, on the site selection process, isn't that done by the applicant knowing the criteria that they need to meet prior to selecting that site and that this ordinance would give them more of that, that criteria so they select the site and then begin the approval process or the site plan review process?

MORASCH: I don't believe that's the case. I don't think currently there really are any criteria that they have to use for site selection. I mean, the agency can do what it wants, they can, you know, pick whatever site they want, use whatever sort of criteria they want.

I mean, unless there's an independent review of the site selection process under the criteria, then, you know, there is, you know, there is no, there is no criteria, it's whatever the agency says it is.

If you get to the examiner and you say, well, they didn't meet this criteria and the examiner says, well, I can't review that, that's not a criteria under the code, then, you know, then nobody ever gets to really review these things. And once you've selected a site, it's a foregone conclusion that they're going to get approval, so that's my point on it.

HALBERT: Yeah, thanks, Steve. However, most sites are zoned with certain criteria, they have

environmental constraints on them and, you know, we evaluate those before we even select a site and begin a process. Do public and state agencies have a different way of getting through or getting a site plan approval through this process?

MORASCH: Well, they go through the same process as a private entity would, but in my experience the way these things get applied, if you're a private developer they get applied a lot more strictly to use than if you're representing a public agency trying to site a public process, I'll just say that.

HALBERT: Yeah, thanks, Steve.

SWINDELL: Okay. Thanks, Steve. And it looks like --

MORASCH: So without some specific criteria in the code saying there's going to be an independent review of the site selection process, I don't believe there ever would really be an independent review and it leaves the public feeling, you know, like they never got their day in court so to speak when they're, you know, upset because, you know, the agencies picked a particular site over, you know, some other site.

SWINDELL: Okay. Thanks, Steve. It looks like Oliver might want to chime in here. Oliver.

ORJIAKO: Yes. This is Oliver Orjiako, Community Planning. I believe that Planning Commissioner Bryan Halbert touched on what I wanted to say as well. And Planning Commissioner Steve Morasch is correct, but often we have the zoning in place, we have what uses are allowed in that zone and I don't think we are going to be proposing new criteria in terms of site selection.

It is up to the agency and to the property owner or project developer to select the site that fits them, they create access and so forth, so we're not going to, I don't think that there is any new criteria for site selection, so I'm not sure really after reading the code where we are proposing a site selection process.

Now, if you're talking about a regional airport, for example, and it is a state or a private entity is doing that, they're going to look at this site, does that site meet their own specification depending on their need. If it's a hospital, one of the things that a hospital will have to do for example is to get a Certificate of Need in a community before they even look for a site, we don't determine that for them.

So we're not really proposing, I don't see why we will be proposing a site selection process, that is going to be difficult or you make so many projects not subject to approval if we get into the site selection process and making that decision for any agency or including say Clark County for example. So I share your thought on that because it is up to the applicant.

I'll give you an example. The State which recently sited behavioral health facility, looked at the site, purchased the site, the site is permitted in our code and they went through the process. The only thing that separate us from them is that they took responsibility for the SEPA review and not us because we are not the lead agency, so we didn't get into site selection process for the State just as an

example.

SWINDELL: Okay. Thank you for that clarification. I appreciate your comments. Steve, does that, do you have any questions for Oliver? I want to make sure you get opportunity here.

MORASCH: No, I think I'm all right. I don't have any questions. I think, you know, we probably respectfully disagree about the need for independent review of site selection process.

I think that was one of the legal arguments that was raised in that behavioral health facility. I think that he's talking about the facility that's going in near WSU-V, you know, the public was not happy that that facility which houses people that are required to be in 24/7 lockdown, you know, that it was sited so close to schools and churches and residences when there were other potential sites in the county that DSHS looked at and decided without a whole lot of analysis that they were going to pick this site over one of these other sites.

Their analysis really boiled down to this site was on the market and the other sites weren't, but DSHS is an entity with condemnation authority so they can get whatever site they want.

And there were other sites which by their own admission had less environmental impact and weren't located as close to as many schools and residences, but, you know, they picked this site and, you know, so once they pick the site it was a foregone conclusion that it would get approved.

So that, that's an example, one example of, you know, where some review of that site selection process may be helpful, but it sounds like I don't have a majority on this so I guess I'll be voting against it and we'll see where the vote lies.

SWINDELL: Thanks, Steve.

ORJIAKO: Did you want to say anything?

SWINDELL: I appreciate all of your comments and thoughts. Do you have something else, Oliver?

ELLINGER: Yes. Susan Ellinger with Community Planning. I just wanted to outline and I understand Commissioner Morasch is maybe saying this is not enough, but the submittal requirements do require a written analysis providing documentation of our alternative site investigation and indicating whether any alternative sites have been identified that meet the minimum site requirements.

And one of the criterion for, one of the criteria for consideration, sorry, is the applicant has reasonably investigated alternative sites as evidenced by a detailed explanation of site selection methodology, so that is one of the criterias that they will have to satisfy.

SWINDELL: Okay.

HALBERT: Yeah, Susan, I think what Steve's rub is that the Hearing's Examiner wouldn't have any ability to refute the study and that it's strictly a, it's not an independent review I think is what he's refuting.

SALLIS: Yeah. And if I could say a little bit more over one of the issues that he brought up with regards to the public participation whereas the applicant has provided a meaningful opportunity for the public participation and the siting decision of the development of mitigation measures and other things that are associated with the site selection.

SWINDELL: Thank you. Oliver.

ORJIAKO: I have nothing else to add. I know Commissioner Morasch knows very well that if a site is difficult, those are some of the issues that are discussed in terms of what type of mitigations and what type of condition, so impact, depending on what the impacts are, we staff review that with the applicant and in some cases with input from others to specify what type of mitigation might be necessary.

I was here when the University was sited, there was a lot of opposition to that, but then we begin to talk about mitigation and how to make that University enable to majority of the neighborhoods out there and they have.

The same is true when Legacy Hospital was sited, the same issue was raised and we talked about mitigation, it was a very difficult site but they decided to mitigate for that as well, just using that as an example that this will not significantly change in terms of ability to site some of these difficult to site facilities.

We're not talking about an airport. We will have the same issue if an airport is going to be sited here in Clark County. Matt, you may remember when issue came up about siting Evergreen Airport in Ridgefield, same issues, you talk about it, you discuss it and you find a way to mitigate, and if you cannot mitigate, the project doesn't go through.

I can use Tesoro as an example here at the Port, they couldn't mitigate and the governor vetoed that. So there's some of this that we write the criteria or we set site selection criteria and it makes it difficult, but this is more of trying to create some balance so that we're not really creating difficulties for to site some of these facilities.

The issue is how do you, do you as a county provide the process for siting of some of these facilities. You cannot reject them. You have to just provide a process on how to site them.

SWINDELL: Thank you, Oliver. Okay. With that, I will ask for a motion.

HALBERT: Bryan Halbert here. So I'd like to make a motion that we recommend adopting or that we recommend the proposed, the section of code to site Essential Public Facilities.

SWINDELL: Can I get a second.

ENGE: Matt, this is Bryant Enge. I will second that motion.

SWINDELL: Okay. We have a motion and a second. Sonja, you want to call the roll.

ROLL CALL VOTE

ENGE: AYE

HALBERT: AYE

MORASCH: NO

SWINDELL: AYE

WISER: 3/1.

SWINDELL: All right. Motion passes 3 to 1. That concludes the hearing.

OLD BUSINESS

SWINDELL: Do we have any old business that we need to attend to? None.

NEW BUSINESS

SWINDELL: Any new business? Oliver.

ORJIAKO: Yes, good evening again, Planning Commission members. If I may, I just want to give you heads up that I will be coming to the Planning Commission from time to time to provide you update as to where we are in the periodic plan update. So just want to give you heads up that I will be coming to Planning Commission, either myself or staff from time to time to provide you update on where we are.

For example, the Councilors have made a decision on the population to plan for from 2025 to 2045. They recently made a decision on the number of employment or made a decision on employment forecast. We are going to be having a work session with Council on how we use the Vacant Buildable Lands Model for estimating what is vacant, which is underutilized, that is set for August 30th. Following that we will get into a decision on planning assumptions.

So I'm going to be also providing update to the Planning Commission as we move forward before we even get into the allocation. And I know majority of the cities are doing the same thing, going through their own planning process within their city council and planning commission updating them as to where they are, the plan is not due until June 30th, 2025.

SWINDELL: Okay. Thank you for that update.

COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PLANING COMMISSION

SWINDELL: Comments from members of the Planning Commission, anybody have any comments?
All right. Hearing none, we'll adjourn this meeting.

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 CVTV 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 Wiser, Program Assistant – Clark County Community Planning