

Development and Engineering Advisory Board Meeting
April 10, 2025
2:00pm – 3:30pm
Public Service Center
6th Floor Training Room #679 & Remote Participation via Microsoft Teams

Board members in attendance: Ryan Wilson, Mike Odren, Terry Wollam, Andrew Gunther, Seth Halling, Eric Golemo, Sherrie Jones, James D. Howsley

Board members not in attendance: Dan Wisner

County Staff: Brent Davis, Harrison Husting, Rod Swanson, Melenie Davis, Naomi Patibandla, Dianna Nutt, Shannon Nashif, Victoria Abram, Steve Gallup, Oliver Orjiako, Michelle Monaghan, Maureen Patronaggio

Public: Houston Aho, Ian Harkins, Jackie Lane, Justin Wood

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 as amended)
- Review upcoming events:
 - COUNTY COUNCIL Work Sessions:
 - April 8, 2025, 9:00 am
 - Law and Justice
 - Forest Management
 - April 9, 2025, 1:00 pm
 - Work Session: DEAB Annual Update/2025 Work Plan
 - April 16, 2025, 9:00 am
 - Jail Financing Options with PFM
 - Comp Plan Policies
 - COUNTY COUNCIL Meetings:
 - April 8, 2025, 10:00 am
 - Public Hearing: 2025 Capital Budget Technical Adjustment
 - PLANNING COMMISSION Work Sessions:
 - April 3, 2025, 5:30 pm
 - Amendment to Ordinance 2022-07-01 Chelatchie Bluff
 - Neighborhood Traffic Management Program (NTMP)
 - PLANNING COMMISSION Public Hearings:
 - April 17, 2025, 5:30 pm
 - Amendment to Ordinance 2022-07-01 Chelatchie Bluff
 - NEXT DEAB MEETING:
 - May 1, 2025
- DEAB member announcements:
 - Updates on DEAB Member replacements
 - The County Manager's Office will update staff as soon as selections have been made.

Road Modification Review

Presenter: Mrs. Davis

[Road Modification Review: Team Structure and Operation Rev. 3.7.25](#)

- This published document is to establish the roles and responsibilities of the team, their structure, and insight into the decision-making process. It doesn't discuss the submittal process or requirements. Another document is being created to set out Road Modification guidelines, information on the submittal process, etc.
- The new state timeline requirements require the Road Modification process to be more efficient, so that reviews and decisions can be made in compliance.
- Road Modification Team meetings are held virtually. If a required attendee cannot attend a scheduled meeting, they will provide comments beforehand so that those comments can be reviewed during the meeting. We would also confirm with required attendees after the meeting to gain additional feedback if needed.
- Historically, the process would include documents sent back and forth between our team and the applicant; we are streamlining it down to one document, the EVR staff report, which will be the only documenting decision, and will be distributed to the applicant within 5 business days of the meeting.
- The earlier developers can submit their Road Modification applications, the better.
 - *Mr. Odren: Can we submit a Road Mod application before a Land Use application? We were able to submit a draft before, which was what we used to gauge what staff would think of the proposal.*
 - *Mrs. Davis: We are going to offer Road Mod consultation meetings, where developers can present their projects, ideas, issues, etc., and get feedback from staff. We anticipate these being 30-minute meetings, with one per project. These won't incur fees, won't need a previously submitted permit or case, and are to be requested in advance of a Land Use application where then afterwards, the actual Road Mod application would then be submitted.*
- EVR Staff Report documenting the decision will be distributed to the applicant within five days of the road modification team meeting (Monday of the week following the meeting). The decision is final.
 - Prior to the EVR staff report, if there are concerns from the developer (something didn't get addressed properly, there was miscommunication) the applicant may contact the Development Engineering Engineer on receipt of the EVR Staff Report to discuss and there is an escalation process that can be utilized.
 - After the decision, any changes would have to be made through the post-decision appeal process.
- If staff is recommending a denial, they will contact the applicant's engineer.
- After Pre-Application, an engineer would be assigned to a Road Mod case; before Pre-Application, applicants should reach out to Ms. Patibandla. After

Pre-Application would be the best time to reach out to your staff engineer for a Road Mod consultation meeting.

Neighborhood Traffic Management (NTMP)

Presenters: Mr. Husting & Mr. Gallup

- This presentation is to introduce the Neighborhood Traffic Management Program (NTMP), provide history and background of the project, background of the traffic engineering teams, and the current tools being utilized to address customer service requests, as well as their limitations. There will also be an overview of the process framework for the program and examples of traffic management tools that could be utilized, how the program would be supported and what would be needed for its implementation
 - The project team evaluated similar projects throughout the state and throughout the Portland, Vancouver metro area - they provided 3 concepts. In 2023, PW presented those 3 concepts to the council. The council requested a recommendation of only 1 at a later date. PW is going to be moving forward with recommending the level 2 concepts that can be found in the [concept report](#) provided.
- Traffic Engineering Team received 400 calls in 2024; 70-80% of these calls were related to speeding.
- NTMP would provide County staff with tools and funding to systematically reduce speeding, improve safety and identify problem areas.
- Process Overview Steps:
 - 1. Resident Request: Residents or neighborhood association submit traffic concerns.
 - 2. Evaluation: County staff collects data and determines eligibility.
 - 3. Engagement: Collaboration with residents to develop solutions.
 - 4. Implementation: Prioritization and action based on funding and feasibility.
- Projects that would be approved would go through design and would be scheduled and added to the 6-year Transportation Improvement Program.
 - *Ms. Jones: Is the intent here that you'll take the data you've already collected from the 400 calls received last year to start making changes, or are you restarting this year with new data?*
 - *Mr. Gallup: This is a new program that we're starting. This system would be more equitable throughout the county. We still have those complaints on our list that we are addressing, but this new program won't start until next year.*
- The budget will be \$500k yearly, with \$250k going towards the salaries of the additional (2) full-time employees responsible for managing and responding to traffic complaints, and the other \$250k towards implementation. Budget is funded from the road operations fund.

- Next steps include seeking council approval at public hearing on May 20th, to include in the 2026 budget. Program launch with initial projects prioritized in early 2026.

Land Use Timeline Management

Presenter: Mr. Davis

- Follow up on the land use timeline management from prior DEAB meeting.
- Clarification provided - In terms of asking to add days to the review process; if you need 60 days for other revisions, Land Use isn't planning on matching that; days added to the review process will only be the greatest amount what is being requested if it is concurrent.
- Mr. Wilson: I've had items brought up in the second round of early issues that weren't brought up in the first round. My concern is that if there are items that the planner didn't notice and were identified later – how would that be addressed?
 - Mr. Davis: We would give additional feedback if something came up during the review process, but past round one, the applicant would have to request a hold if they wanted to address it. If we must make revisions, we need time to review those changes. Too many cycles will consume all available review time. Under the new statute, we are liable to refund fees if we miss our timelines.
 - Mr. Wilson: Are 2 rounds for early projects too many?
 - Mr. Davis: Type 2 Reviews have a bit more flexibility. In a Type 3 Review – it gets challenging. We have 78 days to get to a hearing, and 92 days to get to a decision. If an applicant is willing to work with us to get everything corrected when going into a hearing, that's a different situation than when an applicant pushes us into a hearing when we know they're not prepared. We aren't proposing to put any of this in code, primarily so we have flexibility to adjust or change our process without having to submit a code amendment. If allowing for a second early issues review is going to work out better for all involved, we can certainly adjust the process.
 - If a requirement can be conditioned, Mr. Davis is in support of doing so.
 - If it's a Type 2 Review, a draft will be sent out. If there's something wrong with the condition, there's an opportunity to address it.
 - If it's a Type 3 Review, we can resolve the condition issue through the hearing process.
- Suggestion from AKS group to offer an early issues meeting; like meetings development engineering offers after first round review comments.
 - When early issues began, Clark County did include a meeting. I don't know if they stopped occurring because of COVID-19, but even prior to that, often the meetings were cancelled. However, Mr. Davis is in support of providing that option, if requested.

- Ms. Jones: Have we reviewed how other counties operate? There are several counties that already have a shorter timeline (not specific to land use process) than Clark County, and I'm curious if there are any specific parts of Clark County Land Use review process that have been identified as being inefficient or unnecessary.
 - Mr. Davis: If there are specific examples of jurisdictions that have shorter timelines than Clark County, we would be interested in viewing those. Our experience within the multi-county group we met with is that many of those jurisdictions have not strictly enforced timelines and they're at a loss on how to comply with this new statute.
 - There are other avenues that we're pursuing that aren't focused on a process timeline; we are still developing and piloting concurrent review for site plans. We recently met with the City of Vancouver for an internal debrief to compare and seek out their experience for the couple of cases we've started to test concurrent review on, to develop more framework for a formal process. I'm hoping I can bring this to DEAB in the not-to-distant future.
- Mr. Halling: I believe the public notice sign needs to be posted onsite 30 days prior to the hearing, and currently the hearing date is tentative to be set immediately after fully complete. Based on the flow chart it looks like it'll be set after early issues are resolved, which doesn't allow time for the sign to be ordered with the necessary information on it.
 - Mr. Davis: The hearing scheduling is something that we're struggling with, because the code requires us to schedule a tentative date. We must meet the 78-day deadline, even if a project gets delayed or put on hold. If we do not block out a hearing date, then we may not have an open slot for a hearing when needed.
 - Mr. Odren: For City of Camas – we have a sign made with an empty date field, and once the date is established, we add it later. The requirement is that the final hearing date must be posted 14 days in advance of the hearing.

Public Comment

- No public comment.

Meeting adjourned: 3:30 pm

Meeting minutes prepared by: Mariah Shandra
Reviewed by: Victoria Abram