# Development and Engineering Advisory Board Meeting

February 6, 2025 | 2:00pm - 3:30pm | Public Service Center

**Board members in attendance**: Mike Odren, Andrew Gunther, Seth Halling, Eric Golemo, Daniel Wisner, Sherrie Jones

#### Board members not in attendance: James Howsley, Ryan Wilson, Terry Wollam

**County Staff**: Victoria Abram, Melenie Davis, April Furth, Rod Swanson, Naomi Patibandla, Ross Hoover, Glen Yung, Devan Rostorfer, Oliver Orjiako, Dianna Nutt, Maureen Patronaggio,

**Public**: Justin Wood, Brandon Erickson, Teresa Hardy, Trista Kobluskie, Jackie Lane, Britney Salter, Amy Thatcher, Houston Aho, Noelle Lovern

Call to Order: 2:00 pm

- Administrative Actions:
- Introductions
- DEAB meeting is being recorded, and the audio will be posted on the DEAB website.
- Review/adopt last month's minutes (adopted)
- Review upcoming events:
  - COUNTY COUNCIL Work Sessions:
    - February 5, 2025, 9:00 am
      - Department Overviews for Community Development, Public Works and Community Planning
      - Timeline 2025 Comp Plan update
  - COUNTY COUNCIL Meetings:
    - February 4, 2025, 10:00 am Link to Agenda
      - Consent Agenda
        - County Council Appointments & Letters of Acceptance
        - Human Resources: Bargaining Agreement
        - Internal Services: Expense Authority for EMS, Amendment No. 4 – Golf Course Management Agreement
        - Public Works: Right of Way Dedication Deed, Notice to Contractors – Bids for Harmony Sports Complex Project
      - Separate Business
        - Community Planning: Historic Preservation Commission's 2025 Historical Promotions Grant Program
        - Public Works: Notice of Hearing & Resolution Petition to Vacate
  - PLANNING COMMISSION Work Sessions:
    - February 6, 2025, 5:30 pm
      - Comprehensive Plan Update
      - Comprehensive Plan Policy: Community Framework Plan

- Comprehensive Plan Policy: Schools (Chapter 10)
- Comprehensive Plan Policy: Annexation (Chapter 12)
- Comprehensive Plan Policy: Shoreline Master Program (Chapter 13)
- PLANNING COMMISSION Public Hearings:
  - No agenda items posted as of 2/6/2025
- NEXT DEAB MEETING:
  - March 6, 2025, 2:00 pm
- DEAB member announcements:
  - Update on DEAB open positions after all other agenda items.
  - Work Session with County Council schedule correspondence via email with staff for follow up.

### Parks Department Discussion

### Presenter: Mike Odren

- Mr. Odren begins the discussion with a history of the Parks Department Recommendations.
  - Possibility of using private development projects that often have a recreational aspect to them (pocket park, trails, etc.) for a reduction in the PIF.
  - DEAB was presented with a significant increase of PIF several years ago (2018-2019).
    - Staff provided a great breakdown on how the PIFs were calculated, which were primarily based on acquisition/procural costs of land.
  - Why is there such a deficit in the county with regards to park land as mandated through GMA and the Parks Plan itself?
    - Schools were not being counted in the inventory.
    - DEAB looked at how the development community could partner with PAB to reevaluate this inventory.
  - This presentation is a summary of recommendations presented to Council in 2019, after the Park Impact Fees were raised significantly; Approval was given with the caveat that DEAB would work with the PAB to come up with solutions and efficiencies to meet goals.
- Ross Hoover, Manager of the Parks & Nature Division:
  - Mr. Hoover states that there is a lot of passion for parks, trails, natural areas and open spaces, and everyone understands the benefits, because they're vital to the future of Clark County.
  - There are huge projections for growth within Clark County, which will pass Spokane County in terms of population soon.
  - The Park System Plan that is in place now is being updated in 2026. Trails will be an important component of the update, as trails are highly valued by many.
  - A robust, comprehensive Parks Impact Fee rate methodology update needs to happen. The existing methodology is based upon a level of service that is calculated using acres per thousand residents.
  - During the work session at Council this week, it was discussed that the Parks Division is in a structural budget deficit, a projected deficit that will continue to grow. Parks department is working council to receive guidance on how to address deficit.
- Mr. Odren states that DEAB hopes that opportunities for public-private partnerships would be an integral part of that update.
  - There is a lot of active development within Clark County, and private developers would want to partner with the Parks Division if it resulted in a

reduction of impact fees, which would reduce the cost of a home to the public over a variety of housing densities.

- DEAB wants to make sure that the parks inventory is being counted correctly and want to create public-private partnership opportunities for Clark County that occur in other jurisdictions.
- Other jurisdictions that offer impact fee credits for development:
  - Mr. Wisner states that he is actively working on a project with City of Vancouver where they are entering into an agreement
  - Mr. Odren states that City of Camas does, and that the City of Ridgefield might; they have a comprehensive parks and trails plan.
- DEAB will connect with Mr. Hoover when it is the appropriate time to engage again.

## Stormwater Code & Manual Proposed Updates

## Presenter: Trista Kobluskie

- Significant changes to the current Stormwater Code & Manual are to be submitted to the Department of Ecology by June 2025.
  - OTAK is assisting the county with its Stormwater Code & Manual update in response to the latest Phase 1 Municipal Stormwater Permit, which was reissued this past year for a 5-year period.
    - One of the requirements for updating this stormwater permit is for Clark County to update its stormwater codes for development and redevelopment.
    - The county is also taking this opportunity to assess over 100 requests from the community to make other improvements to the code manual.
  - Presented are the changes that would impact Title 40.386 and the Clark County stormwater manual books 1 & 2. Mandated changes have already been discussed with DEAB.
- Requested Changes:
  - $\circ$  Book 1, Section 1.3:
    - Request: building demolition be added to the definition of landdisturbing activities.
    - This would not actually update anything in the Stormwater Manual, but it would update the county's interpretation of land-disturbing activity, and potentially update county processes, permits and/or forms. Other jurisdictions have interpreted building demolition as land-disturbing activity.

- Mrs. Furth asks, are there other jurisdictions that have interpreted building demolition as not land-disturbing activity?
  - Ms. Kobluskie states that OTAK will research to provide an answer.
- Book 1, Section 1.6.3 & Title 40.386:
  - Concentrating flow onto adjacent properties:
    - There is language present that describes the prohibition of concentrating stormwater runoff onto adjacent properties and a prohibition against blocking existing drainage from adjacent lots; the idea is to change the grammar to make the prohibition clearer, move it up in section 1.6.3, and to add it back to title 40.386 Section 20, Standards for Stormwater Control as item E.
- Book 1, Section 3.2.1:
  - Figure 3.1 allows pre-settling before infiltration BMPs, which conflicts with standards from Book 2 that require basic treatment for underground infiltration BMPs.
  - Request: Require basic treatment in front of all underground injection controls (UICs), which includes dry wells and infiltration trenches if they have perforated pipe.
  - The purpose of this proposed change is to protects those UICs from fouling from sediments so that they continue to function and maintain their function as long as possible.
- Book 1, Section 6.4.3 & BMP C241:
  - The design guidance for sizing of temporary sediment pond (BMP C241) contradicts the requirements from section 6.4.3., specifically element #3, which states that construction site stormwater discharges shall not exceed the discharge durations of predeveloped condition for the range of predeveloped discharge rates from 1/2 of the 2-year flow through the 10-year flow as predicted by an approved continuous flow model. The commenter would like this language to be removed from 6.4.3.
  - Meeting this requirement is only for those sites that trigger a minimum requirement #7, which is flow control, and that some of the other design guidance in BMP C241 would be applicable to other sites that are controlling erosion on their construction sites but are not triggering minimum requirement #7.
  - The proposal is to add instructions in the BMP C241 that states that if a site does trigger minimum requirement #7, the construction site stormwater discharges shall not exceed that discharge duration.

 Ms. Kobluskie states that these requested changes will be sent out to DEAB to be given 2 weeks to review and distribute for comments, and then OTAK will return for the DEAB meeting in March with follow-up to these comments and to discuss Infiltration Policy Assessment, with some hopeful improvements to the clarity of how geotechnical requirements for sites that are used in infiltration are written or enforced.

#### **Public Comment**

• Provided by Brandon Erickson & Teresa Hardy

**Meeting adjourned**: 3:30 pm Meeting minutes prepared by: Mariah Shandra Reviewed by: Victoria Abram