

**CLARK COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF PUBLIC HEARING  
THURSDAY, JANUARY 19, 2012**

Public Services Center  
BOCC Hearing Room  
1300 Franklin Street, 6<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Vancouver, WA 98660

6:30 p.m.

**CALL TO ORDER**

DELEISSEGUES: Good evening everyone. I'd like to call the Clark County Planning Commission to order for January 19th I think. Before we have roll call, I'd like to formally welcome Commissioner Eileen Qutub and Commissioner Jim Gizzi to our Planning Commission. And with that, we'll have roll call, please.

MORASCH: HERE  
WRISTON: HERE  
USKOSKI: HERE  
QUTUB: HERE  
BARCA: HERE  
GIZZI: HERE  
DELEISSEGUES: HERE

Staff Present: Chris Cook, Prosecuting Attorney; Oliver Orjiako, Community Planning Director; Colete Anderson, Planner; Mike Mabrey, Planner; Steve Schulte, Public Works; and Sonja Wisner, Administrative Assistant.

Other: Cindy Holley, Court Reporter.

**GENERAL & NEW BUSINESS**

**A. Approval of Agenda for January 19, 2012**

DELEISSEGUES: Is there any changes to the agenda for tonight?

ORJIAKO: No.

DELEISSEGUES: Okay. Then have a motion to approve the agenda for tonight.

BARCA: Motion to approve.

USKOSKI: Second.

DELEISSEGUES: All in favor.

EVERYBODY: AYE

**B. Approval of Minutes for December 15, 2011**

DELEISSEGUES: Any changes or corrections to the minutes for December 15th, 2011?  
If not, motion to approve.

BARCA: Motion to approve.

USKOSKI: Second.

DELEISSEGUES: All in favor.

EVERYBODY: AYE

DELEISSEGUES: Well, we need roll call, we kind of skipped, no, we didn't skip roll call,  
did we? I forgot my little booklet on parliamentary procedures.

BARCA: Okay. We're on C now. We're on III C.

DELEISSEGUES: That's the trouble.

WRISTON: Look underneath your seat, Dick. Sorry.

**C. Communications from the Public**

DELEISSEGUES: Are there any communications from the public on any issue that's not  
on our agenda for tonight? Seeing none, then we'll move on to the public hearing item,  
Clark County Aging Readiness Plan for 2011. Staff report, please.

**PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS & PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION**

**A. CLARK COUNTY AGING READINESS PLAN 2011:**

Clark County and its cities are anticipating rapid aging of our residents. By 2030,  
one in four residents will be 60 or better and people older than 85 will increase by  
50 percent. To prepare, the county appointed an Aging Readiness Task Force to  
assess our community's readiness to serve as a home for an aging population and  
identify necessary resources and services not in place at this time. Ideas gleaned  
from the workshops, surveys, and best practices from other communities were used  
to develop the plan. County staff is seeking Planning Commission's agreement to  
forward the Plan to the County Commissioners for consideration. The Aging  
Readiness Plan is available for viewing at [www.clark.wa.gov/aging](http://www.clark.wa.gov/aging).

**Contact: Colete Anderson (360) 397-2280, Ext. 4516**

**E-mail: [colete.anderson@clark.wa.gov](mailto:colete.anderson@clark.wa.gov)**

ORJIAKO: Thank you, Chair Deleissegues and members of the Planning Commission. For the record my name is Oliver Orjiako, Director of Clark County Community Planning. With me this evening is Colete Anderson, also staff on our community planning. We have some members of the task force who are here this evening and I anticipate that they will individually speak in support of the plan as we go into the testimony.

What I will do this evening, Planning Commission members, is to quickly set the stage as to why this plan was put together. I will not go into details in terms of the 91 recommendations that came out as a result of the plan. We have had numerous work session with the Planning Commission. We provided you the hardcopy of the plan as well as the disk accompanied the plan and in it are the recommendations of the task force.

What I will say is that this is an effort that where the Board in 2010 appointed a 25 member task force to work on this project. We, staff, and the task force were engaged throughout the process what I will call an extensive public outreach with the residents of Clark County that participated throughout the planning process and what you have before you this evening is the recommendations of the task force.

Why, if I may, why are we here and why is this issue significant. Some of it may be as I go through and as you go through the recommendations of the task force, you will see that there are some of their recommendation that are land use related and some that aren't. I perceive that in the future as the Board considers the plan, we will be coming back to the Planning Commission to engage the Planning Commission and the community to implement those recommendation that are more land use related.

But why are we here. Like other areas throughout the nation Clark County is anticipating a huge surge in our elder population. And in 2009, if I may, the Southwest Washington Agency on Aging and Disability in conjunction with Washington State University Vancouver campus held a workshop on the margin what you may call silver tsunami and Commissioner Marc Boldt took us through that workshop.

And after that workshop from what we heard the expert was telling us that baby boomers, those born between 1946 and 1964, are turning 60 and that by 2030 approximately one in four in Clark County will be 60 or better and the question becomes are we ready to plan for that change in demography on our changing population and what are we doing and where are there gaps that the community as a whole can come together and identify and propose how to move forward to accommodate our changing demography.

And this plan is not only for the older population, we believe that this plan is for the entire population as we move forward whether it's in provision of sidewalks or parks or other component of their recommendations of the task force. So that's really the genesis for beginning to put this plan together.

If you look at this segment of the population it goes from 60 to say 85. If you look at where Washington as a state ranked, we are number 11 in terms of our change in population and where we are relative to the rest of the country. As I indicated, what the expert is telling us

is that by 2030 one in four county residents will be 60 or better. And another way to look at that is if you look at the current makeup of the county population, by 2030 the county total population will be about roughly speaking 580,000.

The trend, then, indicates that that segment of the population will have grown by about 158 percent. That's a huge difference in a relatively short period of time. And the task force in looking at this changing demography looked at five separate areas and that's included in your report. Housing, transportation and mobility, support services, civic engagement and healthy communities and there are challenges and strategies that you will see throughout the plan on how to begin to deal with those challenges and their recommendations in your report.

And what I will do is just quickly stop there. I and Colete are here to answer questions that you may have specifically relative to the plan. And what we will be asking at the end of your public hearing is the Planning Commission to forward a recommendation of approval of the recommendations of the task force to the Board of County Commissioners for their own consideration.

We are not here before you to discuss how the plan is going to be implemented, this is the beginning of that conversation. As I said before, this is really a development of a public policy on how to address the emerging changes in our demography. I will sincerely like to thank staff that worked on this and also members of the task force and many county residents who participated throughout the workshop in articulating the challenges and their recommendations that is before you. So I will stop there. Thank you for allowing me to make this brief remark to you.

DELEISSEGUES: Oliver, could you just go over some of the actions that were recommended by the task force and if possible what the priority and implementation would be just to kind of bring us all up to speed. I don't know, did you get copies of that?

GIZZI: I did, yes.

DELEISSEGUES: You did. Did you have a chance to look at it?

GIZZI: Absolutely.

QUTUB: Yeah, I read it.

DELEISSEGUES: You're a lot better informed than we are.

ORJIAKO: If I take for example civic engagement, the recommendation for example is how can we assist seniors to re-career by developing for example senior talent pool. Expand neighborhood association to include neighbor-to-neighbor programs for example.

On healthy communities there are strategies to encourage sustainable urban agriculture for example. Expand the park facility categories to include urban parks and to provide

incentive for development of urban plazas, open spaces and trails for example, and improve the sense of physical safety and security in our neighborhoods.

If I go to housing there's a recommendation to coordinate with the building industry to provide what folks are calling universal design standards and this will be to really inform, provide information. It might be optional when it's implemented, it may not be written to be very similar to what you find in our code, it probably will be optional.

And it will be just to provide information on what to do to make your house more safe, whether it is installing different entry, not necessarily ADU required but if you'd like to do something to widen or to make your entry ADU accessible, that opportunity is there and we will show you how to do that and other improvement that you can make to your home to be more adaptive to your life-style as you get older, some of those type of changes.

On transportation one of the recommendation is to look at ways to promote and empower or support volunteers who build or who want to build sidewalks or off-street trail. Change our road standards also to encourage connectivity between neighborhood.

This is an area where we have to work with the development community, not so much of telling them how to develop their subdivisions but where practical to minimize cul-de-sacs and hammerhead and have it so that there could be more connectivity so people can walk and get their neighbors, get to know them, and develop other human services council that provide funds for transportation mobility to encourage more coordination of transportation services.

There's some language or some recommendation where appropriate to engage C-TRAN in some areas that as they develop their own system to encourage some development or some services that will be helpful to our elder population.

Those are just brief summary of some of the recommendations. They are structured in such a way that some of this recommendation may be done in a short-term, some in a mid-term and some in a longer term. Short-term may be zero to three years, mid-term four to seven years and beyond. So this is going to be a continuous process as we go through the implementation of the recommendation. No decisions have been made in terms of how to prioritize which one comes first.

DELEISSEGUES: Thank you. Does anybody else have questions of staff?

QUTUB: Yes, I do, Mr. Chair.

DELEISSEGUES: Go ahead.

QUTUB: In looking at the housing section of this, I see mid-term some things about the universal design which is very good. In fact the whole report is very good, it's a lot of hard work went into it and some very good ideas, but I note that there under the medium term in the housing there is a mandate that ten percent of all residential units in single-family

development or per multi-family buildings are to use universal design, the level adaptable to five percent to make it fully accessible and I guess the word "mandate" would be my question.

As we forward this as a recommendation, each time that the word "mandate" comes up is that going to be reviewed again? Will that be reviewed? Of course the County Commissioners are going to be looking at it, but this will all go through the process again, this is just a blueprint?

ORJIAKO: Thank you for the question. I think my response will be that it is an area where not only the County but all our partners; i.e., the cities, are going to be looking at this. It is something that the Commissioners could recommend that it be countywide planning policy whereby each jurisdiction would have their own.

Because the way that the recommendation is structured we don't believe that what fits in Vancouver will be appropriate let's say in Camas or Washougal or any of the other cities, so they will tailor some of this as it pertains to their own community.

The whole idea is that when you look at our existing housing stock and compare that to what we really need to meet the needs that we've identified and if you make it optional, it is something that you will not see right away, but it will be on individual needs to be able to do something relative to their own home or their own situation.

So the word "mandate" is something that the Board will look at and other communities will look at and say does it make sense to make this as a countywide planning policy. We have a similar requirement when we did the comp plan and it's still our policy requiring each of the local jurisdiction to have a minimum or a mix of single-family and multi-family, we might use the same approach as we look at this recommendation.

ANDERSON: But to further add to that response is that there isn't anything in the recommendations this evening that is going to be implemented through your action this evening, so that element would go through another public involvement component and come back through this arena with more detail and further decision at that time.

QUTUB: Okay.

DELEISSEGUES: Any other questions?

GIZZI: Well, I do. I guess it would mainly be a point of clarification, but I think the 91 recommendations can seem overwhelming a little bit, but based on some discussions we've had with staff and what I saw in the report, it looked like it's basically broken into three phases.

The first phase being some more outreach and information to get the public and the county government involved in the process and I'm asking if it's a fair characterization, but basically we're looking at the report as a recommendation to go to the Board to move

forward to further discussion on each of the 91 points.

So we're not making any changes here, we're just recommending. We're agreeing that the report is a good start and it is just there to further more discussion if I'm not mistaken?

ORJIAKO: That's correct. And if I may add, I think in your packet you'll see letters of support from the jurisdiction that we visited would be to Vancouver, Camas and all the other cities in your packet.

What is not in your packet this evening are two additional letters that came in today, one from the Vancouver Housing Authority and the second from the City of Washougal and in their tone of that letter of support you can see that they want the recommendations to move forward. We're not asking you to change any. Sometime in the future where the Board and the community begin to engage everyone on how to implement this, there will be some sorting out that needs to occur.

QUTUB: Mr. Chair.

DELEISSEGUES: Jeff, do you want to add something?

WRISTON: No.

DELEISSEGUES: Just you guys are just having your own hearing. Steve, did you have something?

MORASCH: Oh, sure. Just for clarification I think my understanding is if I'm a developer or a property owner when the Board adopts this, that's not going to change my ability to develop anything at this point, there will be a whole other public involvement where there will be more detailed discussions and eventually code implementation and that might change things, but that's off in the future.

Kind of like we did with the Highway 99, we adopted a subarea plan that didn't have any regulatory component, it was more to get the discussion started on the details and then when we got the code changes, then that was what actually changed the regulations?

ORJIAKO: That's correct.

MORASCH: Yeah. Okay, thank you.

ORJIAKO: That's correct.

DELEISSEGUES: Eileen.

QUTUB: Mr. Chair, yeah. I do understand that this is a very preliminary process, but I think that it's important that if we read something in the report that sounds like it may be a little onerous or should be looked at perhaps by the Commissioners when they receive this

that we should talk about it. So that's one reason.

When I see the word "mandate" it's a cautionary note that it's looked at very carefully. And I understand there would be hearings afterward, but I just wanted to go on the record with that. As well as one other thing if I could.

ORJIAKO: Sure.

QUTUB: And that's in the transportation in the other codes it talks about changing the code to bring commercial properties up to the sidewalk and in my reading of this report I didn't see anything that really would make that any more efficient for anybody than having them back where you can park in front of the building. So it was just a couple of red flags that I saw that I had to comment on.

ORJIAKO: Again, thank you. And some of that will be property specific where it is convenient to do and we're not going to be requiring that there be a retrofit or folks do something totally different.

So in some cases where you're let's say on a given corridor where that is practical there are some benefit in doing so and have worked well in other communities where you bring, this is more of a design issue, access issue, and where it's practical it's been very successful.

QUTUB: Thank you.

BARCA: Recognizing that this is pretty much policy and that we adopt policy all the time that uses words like "encourage" and "promote," "engage," they themselves don't carry any kind of weight of change or finality, but it does at least put us on record as to the direction which allows us to then set the stage on what we really do want to look at in the concept of perhaps modifying or changing for a particular policy.

So a lot of work has gone into it. I think it's very well conceived and the issues that we're facing with aging are not unique to the county and are being addressed throughout the nation, so I think it's just right in line with what you would expect of an urban environment to be able to start looking at the demographics and tackling the problems.

DELEISSEGUES: Valerie.

USKOSKI: Yeah, I'd just like to echo with what Ron said and looking at what we've done with the cottage housing, putting that in place, and then some of the public outreach with the livable, walkable communities. When you take the long-term approach and look at how all that comes together, I think that this conceptual plan is a good start to head down that road and see where we end up.

DELEISSEGUES: Jeff.

WRISTON: I think again a conceptual plan is a --

HOLLEY: Mic.

WRISTON: Sorry. I think a conceptual plan is a good place to start. As I always say the devil's in the details so see what happens after this.

ORJIAKO: Right.

DELEISSEGUES: If there's no further questions of staff, we'll go to the sign-up sheet. We have first on the sheet is Lisa Rasmussen, do you care to testify?

### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

RASMUSSEN: First?

DELEISSEGUES: Sure. Come right up.

RASMUSSEN: Do I sit, stand?

DELEISSEGUES: Yes, sit and speak into the microphone and state your name and address for the record.

RASMUSSEN: Lisa Rasmussen, 8809 NW 17th Avenue, Vancouver, Washington. Got to move over here, we adjusted for Chuck. And I was one of the task force members. I was the chair on three of the subcommittees. I would like to address what you had asked about the parking and pulling things back and answer it on what we as a subcommittee looked at and why.

And being a member of C-TRANS committee and SWWAAD committee, one of the issues for the aging population that takes transportation is that it drops them off at the sidewalk. We used the new WinCo over off of Andresen as a model for people to visualize.

So they get dropped off at that street level and then they have to figure out how they're going to get all the way back. Now if they're in a wheelchair and it's electric, it's pretty easy. If they're in a manual chair and the weather is like it is now, it's not a lot of fun. They have to go in, do their shopping and then turn around and come all the way back out.

Some C-VAN will come up and drop them off if they have paid or other things, but for the majority even at the mall they are transitioned far away and so this was one of the areas that we were looking at is what would be the harm in moving that building forward in the parking lot. They could have parking all the way around, that gives them more accessibility and that is crucial for our aging population.

I've gone to all of the task force things, but I'm a guardian ad litem and I was a caregiver for my parents for 19 years so I understand what the difficulties are. We're fortunate in our

county that with the 25 members, and we did work very, very hard, is that there is a group of us that wants to continue on with this. We have all volunteered our time in the past and want to volunteer it in the future.

So in regards to the 91 recommendations, while they're scat in the report to you, it was a lot of hard thought and process into it. We had some members, and we still have members, that are tackling the housing problem and codes and implementation and transportation.

So my plea to you is that you've all graciously said that it's a good step, but it is just the bear minimum step, there's a long way for Clark County to go. We are leading in our state, there is not another county that has even addressed this issue, not even Oregon, we've been applauded by a lot of different states for that that have come and spoken.

Cowlitz County, I was at an informational thing put on by Southwest Washington area on aging and disability and their community wants to adopt this and to start that up in the Cowlitz area as well to get it up. So with that, if you have any questions, I'm open.

DELEISSEGUES: Any questions of Lisa?

RASMUSSEN: Thank you for your support.

DELEISSEGUES: Well, thank you very much for your testimony. Next up is Chuck Frayer.

FRAYER: Chuck Frayer. I'm at 7609 NE 152nd Avenue out in the Orchards area. And I guess I'd like to kind of back up just a little bit and bring back to you the number one out of every four in the next 20 years.

Now just think about that and just think what it's going to go and be like to try and find a disabled parking spot. Think about that. And do you think we have enough disabled parking spots right now. Now that's just one example of what we're talking about here.

Also I am on the Vancouver-Clark County Parks and Recreation Commission, I'm a commissioner over there, and I got involved with that because of the need for us to be looking at accessibility in this community and I got involved with this because of my background with universal design.

Some may go and say that I'm an expert in the area of universal design. I really don't call myself an expert because simply an expert is just somebody that knows a little bit more than the average Joe Blow that's walking down the street and I might know just a little bit more whenever it comes to the area of design for the disabled.

I've co-authored a couple of different books and have been very active in the whole area of universal design not only for outdoor recreation but also for facilities and buildings. And so I was asked to participate on a subcommittee with looking into developing code for

designing residential housing to be more universal in concept.

And I have to say I've been involved over the years in a lot of different things, all the way from the Americans With Disabilities Act to this and I have to say that this is probably the most dynamic piece of work that I've seen in my 40 some years with Federal government, and I am so proud of where we are going in this community. Many other agencies and communities across the United States are watching what we are doing right here, watching what we're doing today.

Now in our research, whenever we were looking into who's doing what with universal design, who's written what and everything, there's a lot of documentation, a lot of somewhat proposed codes, but back East, but nothing out here in the Pacific Northwest, nothing in the state of California. And let me tell you, there are a lot of people that are sitting there watching where we are going with our development of proposed codes for residential housing.

And so whenever it comes to universal design, you have to remember that it is for everybody and if you design a house like my own to be accessible, then it will be accessible from that point on for how many years, literally 50, 60, 70 years, and how many different families are going to go and benefit from that.

Now I understand that a lot of people think that designing to be universal is a little bit more expensive and everything, but when you really look at it it is not, it's actually cheaper to be able to go and do that. So I encourage you to pursue this and get involved with what this is really all about and I'd like to thank you for your time.

DELEISSEGUES: Thank you. Any questions of Mr. Frayer?

WRISTON: I just have one or two. You were talking about housing and the design, as a homebuilder we offer accessibility as a option, are you suggesting that accessibility should be mandated in every home? In other words, I mean, accessibility has more to do than just getting into the house and maybe lower counters and things like that which someone who's 6 foot 4 finds lower counters --

FRAYER: That's not universal.

WRISTON: It's not universal, right, but I'd be curious on your comments on where you see this all fitting in with homebuilding and, well, really commercial building or anything.

FRAYER: Well, we're a long ways away from mandating, okay.

WRISTON: Right, I agree.

FRAYER: Right, and the comments about mandating and everything. If it was me I believe it makes total sense to be able to go and do that. Now there's different levels of ability and accessibility that can go and be built into a facility or into a residential home.

It doesn't have to go and be totally accessible, okay, you can go and have some of simply being able to get from the street or from where a person goes and parks their car to be able to get through the front door and then visit. How many times, how many places I can go, how many of your homes can I come to your home and be able to go and do that. I can't.

Now wouldn't that be a wonderful thing to be able to do just that, be able for me to be able to pull up, get out of my car and get through the front door, wouldn't that be a wonderful thing to do.

WRISTON: No, and I agree with you, and I'm not arguing with you, but we live in an area that has extreme topography, for instance.

FRAYER: Sure.

WRISTON: And we have things like split level homes --

FRAYER: Sure.

WRISTON: -- things like that.

I'd be curious, I'm just kind of picking your brain so that when this goes from conceptual to something written in code, how do you see us dealing with that?

FRAYER: Well, like I said there's different levels of being able to go and do that. Not all homes, not split levels, not two stories, are going to be able to go and be designed to be what we would call fully universally accessible and everything.

However, there's absolutely no reason. If it was up to me and I was the person, guess what, it makes total sense to me. It's dollars saved way down the road to be able to go and do that; however, I'm not that person.

And I do understand the political world out there and I do understand the lack of education in this particular area and so there's a long ways to go with this. But I can tell you that the interest is definitely out there and many contractors that I've talked to that they are genuinely interested in the concept. They're kind of like, well, whoa, wait a minute now, what are you talking about here.

But I think that if you don't start someplace, guess what, we're just going to continue to do the same ole, same ole. That's what we will do. Why, because that's what we're comfortable with doing. We do not like change and that's what we're talking about here is change.

WRISTON: Yeah. And I agree with you that the contractors, including ourselves, are interested in providing options that are accessible or extended features that are

accessible.

I guess the hurdle that we have to jump over is how do you do that and at the same time make it attractive to customers that are looking for something that they're not really thinking that far down the road. So we're conceptual right now and these are things we have to think about.

And you mentioned parking spaces one out of four, I drive in and a lot of handicapped parking spaces aren't filled, we should probably build into the code some flexibility or something. I don't know how we do this, but as this day comes, then you have the ability to add more handicapped spaces as they become filled.

Now there are times when they are filled, and again I mean no offense by this, but more times than not --

FRAYER: No, I understand.

WRISTON: -- they're not filled or someone's using someone's --

FRAYER: Right.

WRISTON: -- sticker or whatever. And, yeah, you know where I'm going on that, so...

FRAYER: Right. Well, if I could give you one example, this was about eight months ago, my wife's mother is 82 years old, lives in Salt Lake City, and so we were really thinking about moving her here and we were going to buy her a home here.

So we went out to a neighborhood that was being built for 55 and above, okay.

WRISTON: Gotcha.

FRAYER: What do you think I found?

WRISTON: Probably not what you were hoping to find --

FRAYER: Exactly.

WRISTON: -- unfortunately, yes.

FRAYER: Exactly. That's my point. And these people had the gall to be advertising for whom and were they using, you know, the front door, you could not get up one step, two steps to go and get in.

WRISTON: Not to mention bathroom doors and everything else.

FRAYER: Not to mention anything else. We're not even talking getting through the front

door so you can just imagine what the rest of it looked like. However, in their showcase room where you get into and everything really nice wood, very nice materials and all of that kind of stuff, that's what they were really all about.

And there were some folks that came in, I'm 60, I would say they were my age or maybe, well, I would say they were my age, ready to go, they were going to go and buy a home.

And so they heard me talking to one of the salesmen and the lady turned around and says, oh, what are you talking about and I says, well, I don't want to steer you away from this, these wonderful beautiful homes and everything, but two years down the road, three years down the road when you have some problems, guess what you're going to be doing, you're going to be spending money to go and put in what, a ramp, to go and be putting in handrails, to go and widen the doors to go and get into the bathroom and they turned around and walked away.

WRISTON: Well, I'll give you some --

FRAYER: That's what we're talking about.

WRISTON: Well, I'll give you some good news in that I'm generally known on this commission as being somewhat anti-regulation because I think that business, if one in four people are going to desire this, then business usually will adapt to that, they don't need regulation or government coming in and telling them what to do.

I will give you some good news, at least from my side, the contractors and homebuilders are already looking at this, and I think you mentioned that, and they really are.

FRAYER: Yes, they are.

WRISTON: They're looking at it and they're looking at it in ways of making it desirable not only for the present, how you might feel in the present, but for the future. So that's just a commentary on my end.

DELEISSEGUES: I think you've made your point. I think we're not going to solve this problem tonight right here and now. We appreciate the discussion and I'm sure --

WRISTON: I'm sorry, did that violate Robert's rule?

DELEISSEGUES: -- the next thing you need to do is when this goes before the County Commissioners is be sure you're there and let them know what your views are too.

FRAYER: I certainly will.

DELEISSEGUES: And appreciate your testimony and --

FRAYER: Thank you.

DELEISSEGUES: -- and I think we're --

WRISTON: Sorry for the dialogue between the private and us up here. We had a work session where we're not really supposed to really talk to you, so...

FRAYER: Oh, okay.

WRISTON: So I'm sorry. I think it's good. I think it's a good exchange.

FRAYER: I understand that myself.

WRISTON: But I've been told to behave myself so I'll try better next time. Thank you.

DELEISSEGUES: Next on the sign-up sheet is Jim Wilson.

WRISTON: Sorry, that was my hand.

WILSON: Oh, dear. Well, good evening, I'm Jim Wilson. I live at 27811 NE 14th Court out in Ridgefield zip code. And as Lisa suggested, and Chuck as well, this was a turning point in my architectural career. It's a turning point in my business, if you will, since I just turned 70.

And it was many years ago when I was a teenager and I never knew my grandmother Wilson out of a wheelchair. She had arthritis and she lived in a little two-story house that we always went once a year to visit. And my brother and I were there and she mentioned that she hadn't been upstairs for about six years and we grabbed that wheelchair and we hauled that lady up those stairs and let her run around up there for about two hours and she was like a kid in a candy store and that left a very dramatic impression on me.

I shared the last six years of my Forest Service career with Mr. Frayer. We were the accessibility team for Region 6 which meant he was the one that was out there on the front ground verbalizing with the rangers and the folks, I was the one in the background with the code and the technical expertise to address whether or not we were going to remodel the building for one stinking person so that they could use the toilet.

And the thing I really appreciated about Mr. Frayer's association through all those years was unlike tonight where you got a little emotion going, he's always been very gentle and kind about his situation, which as many of you probably know he's been in for a good many years and this really is a matter of the heart and not the code.

This "mandate" is a nasty word, I appreciate your disappointment that it somehow made its way into that sentence, but following up on the testimony that Chuck just offered you is when I built our house, and I just did that 12 years ago, I knew that it was going to be two story, but I knew that all of the bathing and sleeping facilities were going to be on the ground floor, I knew that there were not going to be steps to get inside the front door, I

knew that the door was going to be 42-inches wide so that there would be no problem getting furniture, appliances in and out of the house.

I knew that I was going to sink the sitting room a foot because the pool house I designed had six levels and by golly there was a two-foot drop into the living room and I was just picking up on old design style, but I also knew when I built the mudroom bathroom I was going to go up to the department store and pick up some towel bars which I provided blocking in the walls and so I firmly screwed them so that my mother-in-law would have a toilet that she could safely use in our house. I was also careful when I did the hallways to make them a little wider than normal than code required.

And I appreciate Jeff's testimony. I didn't realize you were a builder but now I do. Obviously from my position as an architect we as licensed professionals are in an outstanding position to effect social policy and the care and comfort of our seniors as they age.

My wife happens to be involved for 23 years in Alzheimer's disease testing with Summit Research Network in Portland, her boss has equal number of years in Alzheimer's research, and I always temper my remarks to people with I'm talking about healthy aging people, that's what we're talking about tonight, but he always tells me, Jim, the most important factor in aging is social engagement.

We in this county face tremendous numbers, probably 85, 90 percent of our aging want to do it in place, and some of them are real hardcore about it, but what happens just like our neighbors, he's 80, she's 76, they bought the house about seven years ago and they have steps everywhere.

She fell two weeks ago, he has fallen. He is caring for her right now but it's just a matter of time. They have themselves in a predicament where they purchased a house that they cannot age safely in. The market does not provide an opportunity for them to sell the house and move to a retirement center, which they would love to do.

So what happens, the Wilsons are on their list for emergency calls. I've told them I'm there if he needs me. And I know just from looking at your eyes that's where you are with your neighbors when this condition happens and it's really happening.

One of the things that Lisa whispered in my ear, we were so fortunate to have a booth at the last Clark County fair and it gave us an opportunity to stand in front of our pictures and pass out the Senior Messenger, but it was really amazing how many people steered completely away when they saw the gray-haired people on the pictures, when they saw the gray-haired people standing there smiling and offering to talk to them about the aging readiness task force and the tremendous excitement that we had about the aging population.

We will probably never know all the effects, but I would share with you when I was standing there there were two young ladies talking very quietly among themselves and

staying on the complete opposite side of the aisle until finally they gathered up their courage to come across. And they were in their early teens and they literally said is there some way that we could volunteer and be involved with the aging population, we would love to talk to them.

Another major event was one of our public meetings, yeah, Dick, I'm going to finish in five seconds, a public meeting where an 83-year-old retired banker stood in front of our public audience and said I had 30 years of gainful employment, but I've had the last 10 in absolutely life forming and life changing because now I volunteer and I get to sit and listen to people tell their stories and I get to give them the gift of giving back. Thank you.

DELEISSEGUES: That's very interesting, but what are your recommendations as far as our voting either to forward this to the County Commissioners or not? Does the plan in your opinion contain enough of the information or direction or recommendations that you think would take care of some of the problems or help some of the people that are going to need that kind of help in the future?

WILSON: I certainly would recommend that you forward the plan with your blessing. I think that as we've testified it's definitely a very strong beginning and it's definitely going to require a lot of people changing their mind-set and their heart-set about this tsunami.

A lot of people are going to be ill and a lot of people are going to require a lot of medical attention and we didn't address a lot of that on the housing subcommittee that I participated in or the task force itself. And obviously we had 12 months to work and it's a huge undertaking for that period of time.

DELEISSEGUES: Anyone have any questions for Jim?

WRISTON: No, just a comment. I thought your testimony was very clear where you came from. Thank you.

WILSON: Thank you.

DELEISSEGUES: Questions?

WILSON: Thank you very much.

DELEISSEGUES: Thank you, Jim. Yeah, thank you. The last person I have on the sign-up sheet is David Kelly.

KELLY: Mr. Chair, my name is David Kelly, I'm the executive director of the Southwest Washington Agency on Aging and Disabilities. Oliver mentioned our agency was the agency that sponsored the forum in conjunction with WSU Vancouver on the idea of getting ready for the aging boom.

DELEISSEGUES: Just for the record could you state your address.

KELLY: Yes. Oh, my personal address is 1008 NW 59th Street in Vancouver, Washington.

DELEISSEGUES: Okay, thank you.

KELLY: Thank you, Dick. My brief comments will be just to applaud the work of Oliver, Colete and all the planners that worked on this. They shepherded a volume of public comment and it was really interesting, it was well advertised, well attended, 200 plus people came to each of the five forums. Or right around that number. I also want to applaud Commissioner Boldt and the County Commissioners for allowing the work of the planning group to move forward.

I would certainly encourage just as a person that works in this field we deliver services, we are not planners with the expertise that Oliver and his staff bring to the table, but I just wanted as an agency director to encourage you to not only endorse this plan but to move forward with it.

And know that during the course of this year there will be some items that will come before you that you will be able to grapple with and deal with and I have every confidence that that will take place, but I'm going to encourage a positive vote to move this forward to the County Commissioners. I know that they're looking forward to that.

DELEISSEGUES: Thank you. Any questions of Mr. Kelly? Okay. Well, thank you very much for your testimony.

KELLY: You bet.

DELEISSEGUES: That concludes the names on the sign-up sheet. Anyone else in the audience wish to testify? Okay, seeing none, we'll return it to the Planning Commission for deliberation or motion.

### **RETURN TO PLANNING COMMISSION**

QUTUB: Mr. Chair, I move the Planning Commission forward to the Board of Clark County Commissioners a recommendation of approval and to begin implementing the plan.

DELEISSEGUES: Second?

BARCA: I'll second that.

DELEISSEGUES: Moved and seconded that the Planning Commission forward a recommendation of approval to the County Commissioners to begin implementation of the task force recommendations. Any other discussion on the motion? May we have roll call, please.

**ROLL CALL VOTE**

MORASCH: AYE  
BARCA: AYE  
GIZZI: AYE  
USKOSKI: AYE  
QUTUB: AYE  
WRISTON: AYE  
DELEISSEGUES: AYE

DELEISSEGUES: See, that's pretty good. We never have 7 to 0, never, so your testimony was very effective.

**PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS & PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION**

**B. Amending CCC 40.630.040 to provide for an option to pay Traffic Impact Fees in installments**

The proposed code amendment would provide developers with the option to pay transportation impact fees in a lump sum, without interest, or by installment with reasonable interest over a period of five years.

The County will require security for the obligation to pay the transportation impact fee, in the form of a recorded agreement and lien, a deed of trust, a letter of credit, or other instrument determined satisfactory by the development approval authority.

**Contact: Mike Mabrey, Community Planning (360) 397-2280, Ext. 4343 or  
E-Mail: michael.mabrey@clark.wa.gov**

We'll move on to the second item on the agenda which is something, where is it, we're going to amend Clark County Code 40.630.040 to provide an option to pay traffic impact fees in installments.

MABREY: Good evening, Commissioners, indeed that is the proposal before you. It's a code change to implement a policy that was discussed at a Board work session in November. The work session was on ideas for job creation initiatives that would encourage development particularly in the construction industry.

Mike Mabrey, Community Planning staff.

I wanted to correct some of the background in the staff report. I subsequently found out that although RCW 39.92.040 says what it says, that's not the provision under which our traffic impact fee program was adopted. So approval of this option to pay over time is not mandatory based on State law, it's something that the Board was interested in pursuing as I understand it.

So the proposed action is an addition of a paragraph to the current section on collection of impact fees that states that traffic impact fees the developer would have the option to pay by installments with interest over a period of five years and that the County would require security for that obligation to pay in the form of a recorded agreement lien, deed of trust, letter of credit, other instrument deemed satisfactory to the approval authority.

We have been working on the format of that agreement and I think we have it fairly well dialed in. There would be fees for the recording of the lien, release of the lien, and some of the administrative costs that would be incurred by the Community Development staff and the Treasury staff to implement and administer this program.

There's not been a lot of public involvement on this. It principally affects developers and the timing of their fee payment. We took it to the Development Engineering Advisory Board and they unanimously recommended approval. We did hear from the City of Vancouver. There's a letter in your packet that arrived by e-mail in which they expressed concern that changes to the TIF program that affect timing of collections might impact the timing and scope of implementation of the capital facilities plan.

I'd like to note that this proposal is not a waiver of fees, it simply provides the option for the developer to pay over time with interest, so it's unlikely that it would result in fewer fees being collected.

In fact the intention of this is to increase traffic impact fee collections by making the payments more flexible such that some developments that may not have the cash flow to proceed with building and paying all their fees all at one time would be able to proceed with their development.

The traffic impact fee is a fairly small percent of the total funding plan for capital projects and so a minor change in timing of the collection of traffic impact fees is not likely to affect the scheduling or completion of transportation capital projects.

With that I'd just like to note that the recommendation from staff is for approval of this change to Clark County Code 40.360.040.

DELEISSEGUES: Any questions of Mike?

WRISTON: I wasn't at the work session, have you defined what "reasonable interest" is yet?

MABREY: Yeah, it's pegged to the Wall Street Journal.

WRISTON: Pegged how? Pegged like?

MABREY: I can read you the language. The interest rate -- well, let me find it. "The interest rate charged shall be the prime rate as published in the Wall Street Journal which is the rate that banks loan to their preferred customers." So it would be --

WRISTON: Good. That's reasonable.

MABREY: Yeah.

WRISTON: Very good. Thank you.

USKOSKI: I have a question on that. If that fluctuates does their interest rate then fluctuate or is it locked in at the time?

MABREY: It's locked in at the time of the agreement.

DELEISSEGUES: Any other questions?

QUTUB: Mr. Chair, just a clarification. On the second page of the staff report it says 40.630.40 so is it 40.360.40 or 40.630?

MABREY: Yes, it is 360. That is a typo. Sorry about that.

DELEISSEGUES: Any other questions?

BARCA: I'm wondering about when we go ahead and get this instrument of debt that we're going to go ahead and collect interest on we will be holding it for the period of time, the City made some type of reference or concern about whether it was going to impact the capital project or not, you're stating that it's not likely to because it's a small enough amount.

Are we in a position, then, if we own this instrument of debt that we could actually market that and go ahead and capitalize on it, sell the debt?

MABREY: No. The leverage that we have is a lien on the property and either a letter of credit or a bond or some other financial instrument that would be acceptable. I know bonding is not very favored in the market right now, but there's a number of different ways that we currently accept security for subdivision improvements for instance, it would be very similar to that process. It's not something that we would be able to market and cash in.

BARCA: So we wouldn't be able to raise capital through the instruments themselves.

DELEISSEGUES: Any other questions?

USKOSKI: Yeah, actually I have a few for you. Relating to on how we collect those impact fees, I know during the work session Randy Printz had brought up some questions as far as if somebody defaults on the property, it goes into bankruptcy and it's resold, how are we addressing the impact fees that would have been tied to that property?

MABREY: Well, we would still have a letter of credit or other security and we'd still have a lien on the property. I know we wouldn't be in first position, but presumably if that use goes away, you have a building and you have no more traffic coming out of it so the impact goes away, I would assume that we would have some ability to prevent a new tenant from taking over that building without making the County whole.

USKOSKI: And the second question that I had was in regards to if we're collecting impact fees that are supposed to be funding public improvements for road projects and we've only collected a portion of those fees and the City comes in and annexes that area once the fees have been allocated to a particular project but we haven't collected, how does that work?

MABREY: We have an interlocal agreement with the City that clarifies a lot of the details about how funds are transferred in areas in which there's unincorporated county. Like in East County there's a few pockets where we collect traffic impact fees, we don't have projects so we turn the fees over to them.

So it's an administrative detail that they're concerned about and we understand there needs to be some amendment to that agreement to clarify what happens in the event of annexation for instance, but we're talking with them about those issues.

DELEISSEGUES: Other questions? Thank you, Michael. Anybody in the audience wish to testify? Steve, Chris, Oliver? Okay.

BARCA: Nobody else from the public?

DELEISSEGUES: Seeing none, deliberation.

WRISTON: Oh, do we get discussion or a motion?

DELEISSEGUES: A little bit.

WRISTON: Oh, a little bit, that would be awesome.

BARCA: Anybody else?

WRISTON: Anybody else, correct.

DELEISSEGUES: Okay, thank you, Jeff.

WRISTON: Yeah. No, I honestly think this is a step in the right direction on behalf of the County and the development community to try to work out ways that are going to make things more affordable.

And right now in the next, this is just my opinion and this is discussion but this is my opinion, in the next year or two we have a little bit of a window where most people are

working off of distressed properties and things like that, but eventually we're going to get to a point where if we want new development in this county, the impact fees and things like that are going to far outweigh the cost of land and home prices, commercial building, industrial, everything else is going to have to catch up, so I think this is a step in the right direction.

My only thing would be, and we've said this many times on this commission in all my years here, is that I would suggest that we take a look at this again. Sunset it or take a look at it again in a few years, see how it's working, see if it's helping people.

And I say that with a bit of reservation in that every time I say that I don't know that, and other Planning Commissioners here have been here a long time, I'm not sure that we've ever seen things come back to us that we say should sunset. But this is something that I think is needed right now and I think more is needed. So I think it's a step in the right direction, but I would say we should take a look at this and see how it's working.

BARCA: Commissioner Wriston, I'm interested in understanding, do you feel that this could actually be detrimental sometime in the future by having this?

WRISTON: No. Actually I think that from a developer standpoint I think this will always be something that will be a useful tool for a developer to make something more affordable. Any time you can defer something, even if it's just for a matter of months, I mean we actually sit down and talk about right of entry where you can go in and build and do all these things and try to defer certain payments for a matter of months.

So if you can talk about deferring payments at a reasonable rate, which the prime rate is a reasonable rate, for a period of time, that will do nothing but help development. Believe it or not what I was saying is there may come a time again where we get back into balance and this is no longer needed.

And I guess I'm looking at it from the County side where perhaps we need to relook at it and see how it's not only working from the development side but how it's working from the County side as well that deferment. Because someone's going to have to pick that up somewhere along the line and there's I think more to come with this.

I know the County is looking at various ways at looking at concurrency and a model that may, I can't remember what it was called, but I know that it's a graph.

MABREY: The glide slope.

WRISTON: The sliding slope?

MABREY: The glide slope.

WRISTON: The glide slope, thank you, the glide slope to concurrency and all that might come with this, but I'm saying it on behalf of the County, not just the developer but on

behalf of the County as a whole, that we might want to take a look at this in six years, five years or whatever, and see how it's working on both sides of the equation.

BARCA: So for public benefit?

WRISTON: For public benefit and private is it working on the private side too, but definitely on public benefit.

BARCA: Thank you.

DELEISSEGUES: Yeah, I think you're right, Jeff. I think when, if and when the economy gets back on track, then maybe we don't want to string out the payments over a long period of time because with that there could be an immediate increase in growth and you would need the capital up front to go ahead and take care of some of the capital improvements that are needed without, you know, any time you allow people to make payments over time there's going to be a lag time in collecting the money obviously.

MABREY: Right.

DELEISSEGUES: And I don't know if it had ever happened or not, but Clark County was certainly a hub of growth you might say at one time where we needed all the money we could get up front to take care of the capital improvements that we needed to take care of that growth. I think Jeff's right, it's something that we ought to look at periodically to see if it is serving the need at that time.

WRISTON: Yeah, if I could say one thing more. Unfortunately developers, and not just residential but commercial, industrial, et cetera, with lending the way it is right now and being as tight as it is right now people are looking towards private lenders and rates are much, much higher. So any time you can defer anything to a reasonable interest rate is a good thing, but hopefully that changes and I think, Dick, that's what you're saying.

DELEISSEGUES: Any other comments?

MORASCH: Yeah, I just have a quick comment. And I'm going to support the proposal, and I mentioned this at the work session, I just want to say it on record, I would actually prefer a situation where we're deferring the payment of these impact fees until the occupancy permit or the occupancy of the building because that would address the City's concern of having impacts but not yet getting the money in to address those impacts because occupancy is when the impacts occur.

So if you get the money at the time of occupancy, you've now got the money when the impacts occur. That would also allow people to pull building permits and start their project without having to come up with the money up front which seems to be the problem with lenders and things is getting that money up front versus getting it on the back end and it wouldn't extend it out too far in the future.

Now I understand that County staff had some reasons why they didn't support that, and I understand those reasons, and so I'm still supportive of what we're doing here today, but just wanted to get my comments on the record about the occupancy.

WRISTON: I would agree.

DELEISSEGUES: Anything else? Anybody? Motion then.

WRISTON: Well, I'd just discussion, I would since Steve brought up a new subject I would agree believe it or not that makes a huge difference on occupancy, especially on spec homes and things like that that you're building.

And believe it or not the three or four months, five months, six months that you can delay that interest running on occupancy permits, and I'm not sure administratively the big problem, I mean you just hold off on issuing the occupancy permit until the impact fees are paid or an installment contract is entered into.

BARCA: Any comment from staff on that before we move on?

MABREY: Well, I think that is an area of discussion, but it's not part of the current proposal and so we can talk about it another time I guess. There are certainly some administrative issues with the certificate of occupancy being an effective trigger that allows collection of significant fees and the tracking mechanisms necessary to ensure that you collect those fees at that time. I know there's a lot of commercial buildings out there with no certificates of occupancy.

DELEISSEGUES: Somebody want to make an attempt at a motion?

BARCA: Oh, it shouldn't be that hard.

DELEISSEGUES: It shouldn't be.

BARCA: I'll make a motion to go ahead and accept staff recommendation on the amendment to Clark County Code 40.630.040 allowing for installments on the transportation impact fees.

USKOSKI: I'll second that.

DELEISSEGUES: Moved and seconded. Any discussion on the motion?

MORASCH: I think you meant --

QUTUB: You need to amend the motion.

MORASCH: -- 40.360.040.

QUTUB: I think it's the wrong number. That's the typo that you're looking at.

MABREY: The typo, right.

DELEISSEGUES: Right.

BARCA: All right.

DELEISSEGUES: Okay. Roll call, please.

**ROLL CALL VOTE**

BARCA: AYE  
MORASCH: AYE  
GIZZI: AYE  
QUTUB: AYE  
USKOSKI: AYE  
WRISTON: AYE  
DELEISSEGUES: AYE

DELEISSEGUES: I think we'll take a break and get back here five after 8:00.

MORASCH: Are you sure we can't push through?

BARCA: We got one left.

DELEISSEGUES: Do you want to go ahead?

HOLLEY: Yeah, let's finish.

BARCA: It's back to order now.

DELEISSEGUES: We'll now resume the Planning Commission after our break.

MABREY: I think we can keep this one short.

DELEISSEGUES: We'll move on to amending Clark County Code 40.350.020 to provide for concurrency approval prior to development.

## **PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS & PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION**

### **C. Amending CCC 40.350.020 to provide for concurrency approval prior to development application**

The proposed code amendment would provide developers with the option to apply for concurrency review and approval prior to submitting for a pre-application conference. These pre-application concurrency approvals would expire if a fully complete application is not submitted within 180 days from the date of the concurrency approval.

**Contact: Mike Mabrey, Community Planning (360) 397-2280, Ext. 4343 or  
E-Mail: michael.mabrey@clark.wa.gov**

BARCA: Is that a motion?

WRISTON: Almost.

DELEISSEGUES: It could be.

MABREY: That's indeed the subject of this is again came out of a November 22nd work session with the Board looking for ways to stimulate job creation and this concept basically does one thing, it changes the timing at which you can apply for a reservation of capacity in the concurrency program.

Currently you have to have a fully complete application. If this is approved you'd be able to submit a traffic study and apply for the concurrency letter at any time even before you come in for a pre-application conference and the intention is to increase the predictability up front for developers so that they know whether that hurdle is going to come and what some of the costs and mitigation issues are going to be when they come in with a development.

So the process for actually adopting early concurrency is really two minor code changes, one to Section E.2 which tells you where you are in the queue and the timing of your review so it identifies that concurrency reviews that are submitted before applications are just tested whenever they're received, are treated like basically any other application.

And, finally, the Section J we're adding a sentence C which clarifies that if you don't have a fully complete application within 180 days of your concurrency approval, then that concurrency approval expires. Again, this was unanimously recommended for approval by DEAB and that's the only comments that I've received on this one.

DELEISSEGUES: Any questions of staff? Do you have a question?

WRISTON: No, I don't have a question, it's discussion.

DELEISSEGUES: Nobody in the audience wants to testify I assume? Very reluctant audience to testify. Seeing none, we'll return it to the Commission for deliberation or a motion.

GIZZI: I make a motion that we accept the language for the code change to provide for early concurrency.

MORASCH: Second.

DELEISSEGUES: Moved and seconded we amend Clark County Code 40.350.020 to provide for concurrency approval prior to development application. Discussion on the motion?

WRISTON: This is one of my two times to speak so discussion on this motion.

DELEISSEGUES: Yes. Yes, you have been deprived.

WRISTON: I think this is another good step, which I haven't seen all that much in Title 40 changes. I think this is a great step and I think it's a fair step because concurrency is a moving target. I mean it can change quickly in terms of when you get out there and do traffic counts and things like that. So I think when you allow it to be done prior to pre-app, I think that is a step in the right direction so I applaud the County for doing that.

DELEISSEGUES: I think we ought to just mention for the record that both of these had unanimous approval from the Development Engineering Advisory Board too so that was good too.

WRISTON: Yeah, absolutely.

DELEISSEGUES: Any other discussion? Can we have roll call, please.

**ROLL CALL VOTE**

QUTUB: AYE  
USKOSKI: AYE  
GIZZI: AYE  
BARCA: AYE  
MORASCH: AYE  
WRISTON: AYE  
DELEISSEGUES: AYE

**OLD BUSINESS**

None.

**NEW BUSINESS**

None.

**COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION**

BARCA: I'd just like to get it on the record that I really appreciate that Commissioner Boldt helped spearhead the aging task force recommendations and the work that staff did. I haven't seen other communities really tackling it to the extent that that study did and I just think it's a great model for us.

DELEISSEGUES: Any other comments? If none, we're adjourned.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The hearing adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

All proceedings of tonight's hearing can be viewed on the Clark County Web Page at:

**[http:// www.clark.wa.gov/longrangeplan/commission/06-meetings.html](http://www.clark.wa.gov/longrangeplan/commission/06-meetings.html)**

Proceedings can also be viewed on CTV on the following web page link:

**<http://www.cityofvancouver.us/cvtv/>**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Chair**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Date**

*Minutes Transcribed by:*

*Cindy Holley, Court Reporter*

*Sonja Wiser, Administrative Assistant*