

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

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

6:30 P.M.

CALL TO ORDER

DELEISSEGUES: If we can be seated, it's 6:30 and I'll call the Planning Commission to order for tonight. Can we have roll call and Jeff said to mark him present.

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

Staff present: Chris Cook, Prosecuting Attorney; Jonnie Hyde, Community Health Manager; John Wiesman, Director of Public Health; Brendon Haggerty, Project Coordinator; Jan Bazala, Community Development Planner; Sue Stepan, Development Engineering Manager; Sonja Wisner, Administrative Assistant; Cindy Holley, Court Reporter.

B. Approval of Minutes for March 15, 2012

DELEISSEGUES: We've got approval of the agenda for April the 19th and also for March 15th. Any changes or corrections to either of those? If none, all in favor of approving the minutes.

BARCA: I make a motion to approve.

QUTUB: Second.

DELEISSEGUES: All in favor.

EVERYBODY: AYE

C. Communications from the Public

DELEISSEGUES: Anyone in the audience wish to bring anything before the Planning Commission that's not on tonight's agenda? Hearing none, we'll return to the public hearing items for tonight. And the first one is Clark County Growing Healthier Report of 2012. Staff report, please.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS & PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION

A. CLARK COUNTY GROWING HEALTHIER REPORT 2012

The Clark County Public Health Advisory Council has evaluated the health of Clark County and is recommending healthy strategies to improve the design of our communities. The report recommends policies to be considered in the next Comprehensive Plan update. County staff is seeking Planning Commission's agreement to forward the Plan to the County Commissioners for consideration. The Growing Healthier report is available for viewing at www.clark.wa.gov/public-health/community/growing_healthy/index.html

Contact: Jonnie Hyde (360) 397-8000, Ext. 8122

E-mail: jonnie.hyde@clark.wa.gov

WIESMAN: Great. Good evening, Commissioners. I'm John Wiesman, I'm the director of Clark County Public Health. Good to see you tonight. You have before you tonight the growing healthier report which looks at how the built environment, that is the way we plan, develop and physically build our community, can impact the health of our citizens.

Two weeks ago we delivered to you the report and discussed the ways that we can improve health through planning. Tonight we ask that you forward to the Board of Clark County Commissioners a recommendation to approve the integration of the growing healthier report into the next comprehensive growth management plan update.

In 2010 the Board of Health charged Public Health with developing a health element for the comprehensive plan. The Public Health Advisory Council is a board of appointed volunteers whose collective understanding of health issues led the Board to request that they serve as the technical advisory committee for this project. I want to formally acknowledge and thank the Council for making this their top priority for the last 15 months and for being actively engaged.

Will the members who are here tonight of the Public Health Advisory Council please stand and be recognized. Thank you. There are actually 20 members, we have a number of people who are ill and had other commitments who couldn't be here, so we're pleased to have them.

The growing healthier report provides community planning with a framework for a health element by looking at the built environment and land use which is how we plan and develop

our community can impact the health of our citizens. The main purpose of tonight's meeting is for us to give you and the public an overview of the report and for you to hear directly from the public.

After taking their testimony you will all deliberate and it is our hope that you will approve the report and pass it on to the Board of Health and Board of County Commissioners. Tonight you're not being asked to endorse specific policy recommendations, rather you're being asked to recommend again to the Board of County Commissioners that they adopt this report as a lens for the creation of the health element in the next comprehensive growth management plan update as you did with the aging readiness task force report.

Community Planning will then take it from there and will come back to you next year as they review this document and start to formulate specific recommendations for the 2016 growth management plan update. We thank you for your consideration of this report.

Next Brendon Haggerty is going to describe the extent of the public engagement process and then Dr. Jonnie Hyde will briefly review the findings on the health impacts that are the foundation of this work. Then, finally, Joan Caley who is a member and a former chair of the Public Health Advisory Council will wrap up and then we'll have time for the testimony. Thank you.

DELEISSEGUES: Fine.

HAGGERTY: Good evening. I'm Brendon Haggerty with Clark County Public Health. The growing healthier report has support from a broad array of community members and represents substantial input from many stakeholders. I want to give a brief overview of some of the processes we've been through to integrate feedback from community members and organizations and to acknowledge the effort each of them have made in participating in the process.

With the help of Community Planning and with Community Choices, Clark County Public Health kicked off the outreach process for the growing healthier report in February of 2011 with a symposium for planners and policymakers on how health relates to the built environment. Later that spring we held two open houses and launched a community survey that attracted over 700 responses. We also spent time reaching out to key stakeholders such as the Food Systems Council and the neighborhood associations of Clark County.

After being given the green light for this project to begin in 2010, the Board of County Commissioners has been formally updated three times in work sessions, one of which was the joint session with the Public Health Advisory Council. And this commission first heard about the project with a joint session with the Vancouver Planning Commission in February.

Two weeks ago we joined you for a work session to update you on the report. As the policy recommendations became more developed we again reached out to stakeholders and

experts to get their feedback through consultations and a survey process. Last Tuesday the Public Health Advisory Council presented the report to the community out at the Vancouver library.

At that event we shared some of the roughly 70 stories we heard from middle school and high school students about how their neighborhoods impact their health. Since we started this process we've received letters of support from many organizations including the Comprehensive Health Education Foundation, Pete Mayer, Director of Vancouver-Clark Parks and Recreation, Kristine Perry, Chair of the Clark County Food Systems Council, Warren Neth, Executive Director of Urban Abundance, Joseph Kortum, the President of PeaceHealth Southwest, the neighborhood associations of Clark County and the City of Vancouver long-range planning.

The report you have before you represents analysis and integration of all the input that we've received from officials, content experts, the Public Health Advisory Council and the community at large. At the time of publication this report also includes the most current research and best practices for which reliable and valid data exists.

I also want to mention that we have multiple ways for the public to access this report. We have limited printed copies available on the back table tonight along with some USB drives with electronic files. We also have postcards with the web address where the report can be found on the Internet, as well as executive summaries available on the back table. And with that I'll hand it over to Dr. Hyde to tell you more about the report.

HYDE: Thank you, Brendon. Hi, I'm Jonnie Hyde with Clark County Public Health. And some of you have seen this before so we'll try to move through it fairly quickly and rearranged it a little bit. These are the eight topic areas of our report that we chose to focus on. The physical characteristics of neighborhoods, towns, cities and rural areas in which we live influence our health in countless ways and research shows that our surroundings have a greater impact than medical care on health across the life span.

The next slide. The process that we undertook included on each of these topic areas a comprehensive review of literature and all of the research we could find about its relationship to health, a study of current conditions in Clark County, and then from that policy recommendation specific to Clark County for how to improve health in each of these by affecting each of these areas.

The last time we had the health impacts on each slide they were a little repetitive so we did something a little different here and it just shows the complexity of what we're looking at and the range. So lack of healthy diet and physical activity, all of them affect overweight, obesity, diabetes, heart disease, cancer and mental health. In fact they are now the leading preventable cause of cancer would be physical activity and healthy food.

Exposure to violence and social isolation is affected by social settings and neighborhoods

being safe and connected. That doesn't apply to all of them but it applies to that cluster. Housing has tremendous health impacts that some of which are also tied into those affected by diet and physical activity, some of which are affected by the environment, so there are many interrelationships here.

Socioeconomic status is perhaps the largest in that it affects all other areas, and that was difficult to show, but people having resources and financial resources to cope with their lives and to determine what kind of settings they live in and what kind of lives they live have a distinct advantage in the sense that their health as a group is always at a higher level than those with lower incomes. These are just some of the health impacts that we're looking at and trying to find ways to address through recommending changes to the built environment and land use practices.

The importance of physical activity and obesity just as one example of one of the health impacts is reiterated by this or made visible in this report by the CDC that was released March 28th, 2012 that says that physical activity and an unhealthy diet have been second only to tobacco as a preventable cause of disease and death. Tobacco use is declining whereas physical activity and whereas obesity is increasing rampantly across the country, so it is a key preventable cause that we really need to address.

They go on to say that continued progress against cancer will require individual and community efforts to promote healthy weight and sufficient physical activity so they're essentially calling us out to try to address this as a community. The next slide. Thanks. I'm going to quickly go through each of the topic areas.

Access to Healthy Food. The way that it impacts health that we can impact increasing access to healthy food is by increasing proximity to healthy food and by increasing the mix of health or changing the mix of healthy to unhealthy foods. Research has shown that when people are closer to healthy food stores, they're more likely to eat healthy foods and have less obesity and when there is a higher ratio of healthy to unhealthy foods versus the other way around the same result occurs.

It's important to do this because in Clark County two-thirds of adults and one-third of 10th graders are either overweight or obese and an intervention needs to be done soon if not yesterday. 41 percent of residents live near fast food or convenience stores, only 17 percent live near supermarkets or grocery stores. And again the research says that if a grocery store or supermarket is walkable distance which is about a half a mile, then obesity is lessened.

Active Transportation and Land Use is a way to get physical activity. It involves movement between places that's integrated into your daily life. Just like if you have a neighborhood market, you're going to walk to the market to pick up a gallon of milk, that's physical activity, and it's not that you set out to exercise that day. And the more it's integrated into daily life that there are destinations to walk to that you want to go to or need to go to, the better the outcomes will be.

In Clark County many neighborhoods lack the infrastructure to support physical activity safely and lack walkable destinations so people don't, they leave in their car to get where they need to go. And most residents do rely on automobiles for commuting as well as for non-commute travel to get around town.

Parks and Open Spaces is another way of increasing physical activity would be by increasing access to parks. Access within Clark County is fairly good, about half of Clark County residents live within a half a mile of a park access point and proximity is one of the characteristics of parks that will increase physical activity and reduce obesity. Parks that have features like basketball courts or recreational equipment and are well maintained and feel safe, those are also more likely to be used.

So you're looking at the question of both the location of parks, the number of parks and the design and are they designed in a way that people go out and use them. We also consider open spaces to be park land because contact with nature has been shown to also have very positive effects not only on obesity but mental health. So that's the park section. Next slide.

Economic Opportunity is another area that we targeted because, again, health, wealth has been shown to be the single largest determinant of health outcomes. People who are financially well off can access healthcare and can access other resources, gyms, those kind of things, vacations to deal with stress, so we can access many of those things if we have decent paying jobs that people without those resources cannot access.

When you have that ability you have an advantage in terms of being able to manage your health issues. The pathways to obtaining a good enough income to be able to take care of yourself well is finding employment which often requires educational attainment and at a Bachelor's level or beyond and a high school graduate, and a high school graduation.

In Clark County we have a slightly lower poverty rate than the rest of the state, but the percent of adults with a Bachelor's degree or higher is the lowest in the metro area, 26 percent of our residents have Bachelor's degrees. We have slightly higher on-time graduation rates from high school than some of our neighbors, but at the same time we don't have high enough, just matching your neighbors does not mean that you've reached the target you need to reach. I think it's 76 percent of our high school students graduate on time, we'd like that to be higher so that they can complete their degrees and go on and have a potential to earn an income.

Affordable, Quality Housing, the way to keep housing from causing health issues, to prevent it from being a health risk, is to make sure there's enough of it that's affordable, to make sure that housing that is unhealthy because it's so old and has not been well maintained or is structurally deficient so it presents risk is to rehabilitate it. And there is a plan for the homeless I understand and a way to deal with homelessness would be perhaps to adopt that plan and find a way to try to get people off the streets which is as they are one of the most

at-risk in terms of health.

In Clark County we've used a housing and transportation index which I know the County uses a median income measure to look at whether or not housing is affordable and by that measure there's a lot of housing in Clark County, but that is primarily directed towards people who will own housing, who can purchase it and not renters. So about a third of our population rent and so for them there is not as much affordable housing as rents have actually gone up some as housing prices have gone down, but using this housing and transportation index uses a 45 percent cutoff figure.

If you use more than 45 percent of your income on housing and transportation, then you're living in unaffordable housing and in Clark County 76 percent of residents live beyond their means in that they are spending more than 45 percent of their income on housing plus transportation, and this is a measure that's starting to be widely used including by the Federal government recognizing that the cost of gas is no longer an incidental cost, it's become a major part of household expenses.

People in the rural areas and people who commute long distances to work are at a significant disadvantage and may be living in unaffordable housing even though on the books it doesn't appear that way. There is also a risk of some unhealthy housing in Clark County. Radon is a high risk here, 21 percent of houses that were tested for radon tested above the recommended levels by the EPA. That's an area that I know new building standards address but older housing still presents a risk of that.

Climate Change and Human Health, warming, in the 100 years from 1880 to 1980 temperatures rose in this country, or around the world I guess, about a half a degree, not very much, they're now rising a half a degree every decade so about ten times faster than we've experienced before. These variations are both by locale, there are variations by locale.

The Pacific Northwest we're less affected certainly than some other areas and can be grateful for that, although we probably can anticipate many people moving here some day; however, warming will result in earlier Springs, it's going to result in more rain and less snow with greater chance of flooding and longer, dryer summers with greater chance of extreme heat and more extreme heat days.

And extreme heat is important because it has caused more weather related deaths than any other weather event. Earthquakes, hurricanes, tornados, floods, none of them have been as damaging in terms of human life as extreme heat days. And that's been seen in Europe, it's been seen in Chicago and large cities around this country.

Some of the things we need to address to deal with climate change would be public awareness, initiating water conservation programs aggressively, floodplain land use and not building in floodplains where because there is likely to be a lot more flooding and extreme heat days with the elderly in particular being at risk because of their body's inability to adjust

to that kind of change.

Environmental Quality, the ways that we can address and improve the environment would be to decrease air pollution because air pollution is a risk for respiratory disease and that slide I showed you earlier it's got a number of adverse effects if there is air pollution, water pollution, including the loss of our drinking water and agricultural resources should they become polluted.

In Clark County there's a higher risk of cancer from air pollution than in other areas of the state as indicated by the green on the map and the darker blue area and that's probably in part because we're one of the more populated and because we share this metropolitan region air area. Only one of ten of our watersheds was in good health in 2010 so clearly there we're facing some difficulties in terms of the impact of water potentially on our aquifer. There's no monitoring system required for small public water systems on wells. So there are a number of areas where there are risk of contamination from water and air pollution that really need to be addressed in terms of human health.

The last area is Safety and Social Connections and this really has to do with people's ability to use all of the healthy resources that are available in the county. I mean you could sidewalk every street in this county and have bike trails everywhere, but if somebody's afraid to go out their door because there's violence in their neighborhood, there's graffiti on the walls, they don't trust that it's safe in terms of high traffic speeds, they're not going to use those resources, so people need to feel safe in their neighborhoods and safe on their streets in order to use the resources available to them.

Crime can also make them feel unsafe. The creation of third places has been shown to help unify neighborhoods. If people have a place where they can gather safely, it could be a library, it could be a local coffee shop, it could be a community center, but some place where people can get together and talk.

There have been studies in really poor rundown neighborhoods which we don't have very many of those, but where people can come together and actually plan how are we going to address this and they start modeling different behaviors for their kids and there's really a change in terms of ownership of the neighborhood and the feeling that it's up to them to make it a decent place to live. Unintentional injury is a leading cause of death among younger age groups, that's primarily from traffic injuries, so that's one of the things that can make a neighborhood feel unsafe.

Our next step if you recommend this to go forward tonight we have a Board of Health hearing scheduled and then in June we would go in front of the Board of County Commissioners for their approval and then this would go to Planning for incorporation into the comprehensive plan. I thank you and if you have questions. Oh, sorry, Joan, Joan is going to wrap up for us. Joan is on our advisory council.

CALEY: Good evening, Commissioners. My name is Joan Caley and I'm here representing the Public Health Advisory Council. Our council is very excited about the work that we've done in the growing healthier report and we're very eager to partner with the Planning Commission to improve the health and well-being of all people in Clark County. On behalf of the Clark County Public Health Advisory Council I ask you to approve this resolution adopting a health lens for the next update of the comprehensive growth plan using the growing healthier report as a guide.

With your approval this will be placed on the work plan of Community Planning and will start us on a path of including health concerns in the way we grow. Our council formally approved and endorsed the content of the eight research papers that provide the background for this report, the report itself, and all policies and strategies that are listed within. And so we are proposing this resolution to you that you adopt this report for the future health of our community. Thank you.

DELEISSEGUES: Thank you. Any questions of any of the four presenters? If none, I attribute that to a good job that you did in our workshop, so appreciate that.

HYDE: Thank you.

DELEISSEGUES: So if there are no questions of staff, we'll go to the sign-up sheet which is on its way. Thanks. The first name I have is Laurie Lebowsky, do you wish to testify? No. Okay. Next is Mark Collins. Probably got it wrong.

COLLIER: Hello. My name is Mark Collier, my writing's not the best.

DELEISSEGUES: Collier, okay, thank you.

COLLIER: I'm on the advisory --

DELEISSEGUES: Would you give us your address too for the record.

COLLIER: It's P.O. Box 1476, Brush Prairie, 98606. And I'm a member of the Advisory Public Health Council and what I kind of learned through the process is how much the built environment does affect health. We have a diversity of people in Clark County in regards to living areas and social and economic status, environmental conditions, by having the health element in the comp plan it basically provides an opportunity for conditions to thrive by having all these eight elements into the plan. To me it's a start to having a better and healthier community.

And pretty much it was as part of the advisory council going through all these chapters and the research that was done into it you can really see how the built environment does play a role in health. Thank you.

DELEISSEGUES: Any questions of Mark? Thank you for your testimony. Next on here is Marilyn Darr.

DARR: Hi. My name is Marilyn Darr, I'm also a member of the advisory council. I'm a family physician. I appreciate the ability to comment today and I wanted to thank the preparers of the presentation, it was excellently done.

DELEISSEGUES: Can we get your address for the record.

DARR: I wrote it on there, but it's 1119 SE 80th Avenue, 98664. Thank you. But I'm a family physician, I've practiced for about 25 years, 20 of that in Clark County. I see a variety of people from babies to older people. And as a family physician my whole view of the world is prevention.

Having said that, I spend most of my days treating inflammatory diseases, inflammatory diseases that are absolutely secondary to obesity and the choice of food and food-like substances that people have and eat. It is incredible when you think about the amount of heart disease, cancers, osteoarthritis, obstructed sleep apnea, all of this is related to our diet.

People that have lower social economic abilities sometimes don't make good choices, we have school systems that don't make good choices for their children as well, and it takes a community or a village to do all of these things together and I just urge this is such a well-thought out plan with a lot of science behind it and I urge the council to really think about this and to adopt it. Thank you.

DELEISSEGUES: Any questions? Thank you very much. Last on the sign-up sheet is Mark Maggiora.

MAGGIORA: Maggiora. You only get three tries.

GIZZI: And we're not tested on spelling?

MAGGIORA: What's that?

GIZZI: We're not tested on spelling?

MAGGIORA: No, not this time, maybe next time.

DELEISSEGUES: Or penmanship.

MAGGIORA: Thanks for the opportunity to come before you and --

DELEISSEGUES: Well, just for the record could we get your name and address?

MAGGIORA: Yes. It's Mark Maggiora, 3204 Y Street in Vancouver, I live in the Rose Village neighborhood part of the Fourth Plain corridor revitalization effort. I've got a letter here that I'll leave with staff that I've written in support of this effort and I'd like to read that to you and I have a couple of comments in addition. Mr. Dick Deleissegues. Is that good?

DELEISSEGUES: We're even.

MAGGIORA: I am the director and founder of Americans Building Community, we're a community development corporation focused on neighborhood revitalization in the Fourth Plain corridor. We're submitting this letter in support of the growing healthy report, an update to the Clark County comprehensive growth management plan.

Americans Building Community is a community development corporation devoted to revitalization of the Fourth Plain corridor within the context of the City of Vancouver's subarea plan. Subarea plans serve as an extension of each authorizing jurisdiction within the state of Washington for implementation of policy and investment of public resources.

Our emphasis is on mobilizing people who live, work and play in this part of our community to take ownership for the quality of their lives. We facilitate grassroots investments towards creating a healthier living environment through strategic alliances and mutually beneficial partnerships with community agents like Clark County Public Health.

We serve as a party to the Department's partnerships for healthy neighborhoods initiative and the Public Health Advisory Board is signatory to our asset based community development memorandum of understanding, a framework that mobilizes citizens in building community capacity around their inherent strengths and thereby lessening dependency on ever shrinking public resources to address citizen well-being and meet livability needs.

This action before you and ultimately the Board of Commissioners is a landmark event. Recommendations within the report on all eight aspects of the built environment are essential elements for assuring we plan for and design a place where people thrive. They fully deserve to be considered on an equitable plane with existing measures of success currently defined within our existing comprehensive plan.

Your affirmation of this report moves our community forward by directing both citizen as well as policy maker attention on factors that assure Clark County will continue to be both an attractive environment and a community that assures all of its citizens have access to the places and lifestyles to promote well-being, the true foundation for prosperity and happiness. Thank you for your prudent consideration.

Secondly I'd simply say that, number one, I think the staff has done an exceptional job in terms of going through a process that engages a broad spectrum of citizens. The partnerships for healthy neighborhoods is a true extension of this opportunity, it's in action now, so what you do with this decision is simply affirm that and move it to the next level.

And then secondly I think this is commendable for this community to take this kind of an action. It's a leadership move in the state of Washington that says these are important measures for planning any community for its future. Thank you for the opportunity to address you.

DELEISSEGUES: Thank you. Any questions?

QUTUB: Yes. Do we have a copy of the letter you just read to us?

MAGGIORA: I will leave this copy with your staff.

QUTUB: There was one statement in that letter that said something about taking ownership and responsibility of there, would you requote that sentence?

MAGGIORA: Yes. Exactly what I said there is that the design of the asset based community development MOU is a framework that mobilizes citizens in building community capacity around their inherent strengths and thereby lessening dependency on ever shrinking public resources.

And I think the other point that you were bringing up is our emphasis on mobilizing people who live, work and play in this part of our community to take ownership for the quality of their lives. I think this does a good job of clearly articulating what responsibilities people can take for making an improved life not only for themselves but for their friends and neighbors.

QUTUB: Well, yes. I see it more as their friends and neighbors taking the responsibility for them and making the choices for them. I would hope that people will take and be responsible themselves, it's a good goal to have.

MAGGIORA: It's a true basis for strong communities is people watching out for one another and supporting one another in meeting their needs.

QUTUB: Yes.

DELEISSEGUES: Any other questions?

WRISTON: Yeah, I have a question. Somewhere in that paragraph you said ever shrinking public --

MAGGIORA: Ever shrinking public resources.

WRISTON: Right. In what context were you saying that?

MAGGIORA: Well, the reality of today. I mean we have a shrinking public pie to tap into in terms of addressing citizen needs and so the design of the asset based community

development framework is the one where it recognizes that there's lots of assets out there but there are often few on-ramps for those resources to be mobilized and to be effectively applied.

So the whole essence of the A, B, C, D framework is that citizens work alongside public agencies tapping into the expertise and skill sets that public agencies necessarily bring to the table, but also basically mobilize their capabilities to be more effective in serving one another, so it ties into the other council members' comments.

WRISTON: Right. So you're not proposing that this falls somehow on private resources or anything else, you're talking in general about, I guess, public resources being used in conjunction with resources within the community or community organizations or what have you?

MAGGIORA: The optimal scenario is all sectors see that they have an inherent role and responsibility so it's really should the private sector see an opportunity to be a contribution and have the wherewithal to contribute, then there's a clear mechanism for them to be an instrumental agent. But it's not simply that public health falls in the realm or responsibility of any particular entity, but it's a community wide effort.

So it's really a cross-sector multi-institutional framework of looking at -- you look at the elements in this plan and they are not dependent upon any one agency for success, it really is a call out to the fuller community that we need to have everyone understand what role they may play and how can we effectively work with one another to fulfill upon those needs.

WRISTON: Right. Okay, thank you.

DELEISSEGUES: Other questions? Okay, thank you very much for your testimony. That's the last name on the sign-up sheet. Is there anyone in the audience that wishes to testify on this matter? Seeing none, we'll return it to the Planning Commission for deliberation.

BARCA: I have a couple of comments I think I want to make in reference to the report. In the educational component that you display I'm wondering about the opportunity to show Clark County's either average population or perhaps the percentage of population of median income in reference to the metro area because you show that we are low in the context of Bachelor degrees but that may not necessarily tell the whole story about how well or poorly the county is doing in comparison and I think that kind of rounds out both higher education and then the general workforce.

HYDE: We were just actually looking that up this afternoon, some information about that, and I'm going to turn this to Brendon who worked with me on it and has that data with him.

BARCA: Oh, certainly.

HAGGERTY: I think it's a really good point that it doesn't necessarily translate to income all the time for everyone and I think the most recent census figures show that Clark County compares fairly well with other counties in the region in terms of median income.

One of the pieces of research that we relied on in formulating this shows that there are spillover effects for an increasing number of folks with Bachelor's degrees or higher, but more importantly it's sort of a broad indicator of educational attainment.

I don't want to focus too much on the Bachelor's degree itself and so that's why we also tried to bring in figures on high school graduation in Clark County which also compare fairly favorably with many of our neighbors.

With that said, educational attainment is really truly one of the greatest predictors of overall health and everything that we can do to nudge that bar upward helps improve the health of our community.

BARCA: So you're tying educational attainment with a healthy community as opposed to putting it in the context of income disparity and the income itself driving healthy or unhealthy communities?

HAGGERTY: Educational attainment and income are very closely correlated and in general we often combine those two concepts into the broader concept of socioeconomic status and that really explains a lot of overall health both for the community and for individuals.

BARCA: So I'm not trying to be argumentative about the point, but I think you're on both sides of it. If we're saying that income is an indicator of a healthy community and we have a relatively good comparison on income, but you're also saying that an educational component is a measure of a healthy community and at that context we're not as good, it seems like we need to separate the two rather than try and tie them together.

HAGGERTY: I think that's a valid point and we have many ways of measuring socioeconomic status and often they go together but not all the time. Do you want to add anything, Jonnie?

HYDE: Basically the main findings on this which came from studies from Boston and other places is that health equals wealth and that as you go up the ladder in terms of income every step up the ladder lifespan increases and overall health increases. So education is a key way to obtain income.

It doesn't mean there aren't others, but it can become a barrier to obtaining income and I don't know if it can be separated out. I mean I don't know that you can say totally separate from education do a study where you're saying everybody that's got less than a Bachelor's degree but makes a decent living and compare their health would be a study that would need to be done and I don't know that that's been done.

But right now basically having an education is seen as the entryway into high paying jobs or decent paying jobs, not I think certainly having a high school diploma and having a Bachelor's degree I think it's increasingly competitive to get into the job market without those, and I think that's going to continue to be the case, so I don't know that you can separate them. I think what we are saying is that people need the opportunity to earn income to stay healthy and that maybe fewer people would need to leave Clark County if they had higher levels of education and could get jobs.

It's been pointed out I think at maybe one of the last hearings that we have a lot of construction people and they earn really good money doing construction, but that industry has stopped for the moment and so do they have other options beyond that.

I think the more options we can create and the more qualifications a person has whether they may be a carpenter with a Master's degree, but that gives them more flexibility and it gives them a better chance of getting a job that pays well and if they're pigeon-holed into one area, if that area sinks, they sink. So I do think that we're saying that basically education and income are more or less correlated and that both are important in achieving health.

BARCA: I hear you say that although his data says that we have a relatively good median income --

HYDE: We do.

BARCA: -- without the education.

HYDE: Yes.

BARCA: Okay.

HYDE: I think we've had some --

BARCA: I don't need to go over that, okay.

HYDE: I think we've had some high paying blue collar work here.

BARCA: So you make the choice on how you want to present it, I'm just saying that I think it's a false presentation to say --

HYDE: Okay.

BARCA: -- wealth equals health but you only present the high education component as to whether we are or are not, that's all I was trying to say.

HYDE: Okay.

BARCA: Other item is in reference to Clark County Public Health. We treat a lot of people in the noted maladies here, respiratory, diabetes, so forth, I'm wondering if we have the opportunity to actually try and draw some types of correlations that says in an active community you could expect to see perhaps less than or the opportunity to genuinely say that the public would be treating people that would be for the most part healthier if we could do this thereby actually presenting the option that says this is a very prudent public service and it's valid that trails equal less cost at the Clark County Public Health Department, that if you have better air quality, you have less cost at the Health Department.

I think without trying to say that there's a dollar-for-dollar correlation, I think what happens is we talk about encouragement and we talk about promote, but when it comes down to the budget decision the trail doesn't get built and the impact to Clark County Public Health is not noted --

WIESMAN: And I think that --

BARCA: -- they're two separate budget items in a lot of people's eyes, but I think we should really take this opportunity to try and start drawing this together.

WIESMAN: One of the things about Clark County Public Health in particular is we no longer provide clinical services, those services are basically now provided through the places like where Dr. Darr practices so the savings I think a lot of what we're talking about, this isn't in the report, the savings are actually in the community either through healthcare systems, hospitals, having patients who are coming into the system healthier, fewer chronic diseases, fewer of the sort of things that make a disease difficult to contribute because you have multiple chronic diseases and you're trying to manage all of those at once.

I think the payoffs are probably for business, healthier workforce, less time out sick, better productivity so when we look at this we truthfully try to look at this in the largest global sense and this field of research, there's some research that shows decreases for example in obesity based on travel time that Brendon can rattle off more quickly than I can, and the kind of research you're asking for we're also trying to keep getting funded so we can come down to what are the dollars and cents of all of these. It's a pretty brand-new field to get to the level that we would all like to get to.

HYDE: Some of the savings that we would anticipate coming, I mean I don't see the Public Health budget expanding through this. I mean I think --

BARCA: No, no, no.

HYDE: -- and it's not the intention of it, the intention of it really is to help look at how policy impacts health and how land use and the built environment impact health and what kind of changes could be made to help people be healthier.

So I think some of it would involve private enterprise, some of it would involve government, some of it would involve departments that could do things, some of it would involve nonprofits. I mean a lot of the actions recommended in there that they're not all government actions, but it's really trying to create partly a vision of a community that has neighborhood level services in many instances that is walkable, that where people can get exercise as part of their daily life and not have to drive as far, have more disposable income because they're not spending it all on gasoline which can then promote businesses and have a dynamic economy.

So it's just ideas about how to get there, but that's kind of the vision that we see happening and that vision would create healthier people with fewer health issues if those steps were taken.

BARCA: So don't undersell it.

HYDE: Yeah.

DELEISSEGUES: Does anybody else have questions? Jeff, do you have any comments?

WRISTON: I have comments. And my comments really come from being a father of two teenage children and I will tell you I get confused, I think I get a little concerned, and I understand there is socioeconomic interfaces at play here or what have you, but I know a lot of people that are well educated do very well and yet because of their time constraints, their lifestyle, et cetera, they don't necessarily eat that well.

So I get confused when we look at that, it worries me a little bit because, and here's where I'm leading into, because what I have seen as the parent of two teenage children is the most effective thing I have seen yet to date, and it is huge and there may be a generational gap that we're missing here, but it's the education that we're giving our children in our schools as to the health of what they eat and believe me that comes home.

I mean it depends on the child I'm sure, but I know it comes home to my house and I can't even tell you the things that my kids point out that I grab at a convenient store on a trip that we're on traveling, driving or doing whatever and they'll grab whatever I've grabbed to have to drink and they point out this stuff and they say this is bad for you.

They are learning things that I never learned and I have a Bachelor's and a Doctorate and my wife has a Bachelor's, and all these things are socioeconomically they're great, but we didn't learn them, there's this generational thing.

The best thing that I see that we have done is educating our children to realize that kind of like smoking was years ago to realize that the stuff you are drinking, and I can't even name it, is not good or look at what's in this or look at what's in that, it's amazing, I mean it blows my mind.

They know and they're looking and they know what proteins are and they know what carbohydrates are and they know what they're taking in and not taking in. If they're involved in athletics it goes even further, the education goes even further. I just I want to stress that we can look at all these studies, go socioeconomic and all this kind of stuff, but education goes a long way.

The other thing I want to say is I saw something in the paper the other day, and I don't know if it was related to this or not, about 7-Elevens and convenient stores starting to participate in providing healthy food, well, where this bottle came from that contains half tea and half water but did contain purified water, I noticed that the 7-Eleven that I bought it at had right up there in front next to 5-Hour ENERGY and all this stuff that's probably really bad for you, at least my kids would probably point out are bad for you, they had a basket of apples and bananas and things like that and actually the person in front of me was buying them.

So I think there's a huge education thing that goes into this and I'm not sure that it's a socioeconomic thing, I'm not sure it's a walking thing or this or that, I think it's a big education thing and then a lifestyle choice after that because I know a lot of people that like I said that can afford to eat well that choose not to or just choose that lifestyle because they have chosen the fact that they just don't have the time to sit down at dinner with the kids and have a good healthy dinner or whatever and that goes on all lifestyles. So it's a comment, not a question.

DELEISSEGUES: Good. Jim.

GIZZI: Well, I concur with Jeff certainly, but I'd also argue, maybe not argue is the right word, but I don't think this policy really would be looked at as focusing on my child, my daughter or Jeff's kids or maybe not even any of us here.

When I volunteer at the school I see kids in these lower socioeconomic brackets and clearly they're not enjoying a healthy diet and you see what they bring to school for lunch and there is no quality food there and they're taking bags of food home for the weekend because their folks don't have enough food.

I think looking at the health element as a lens for planning and giving us long-term payoff with maybe minor modifications in how we go about looking at transportation and creating the conditions under which my daughter can walk to the grocery store instead of say, hey, dad, can you drive me up there, I mean that goes a long way towards our health.

I look at this plan as a way to use the built environment, to promote health over the long term. I'm glad that we had the earlier discussions in the work session about this being just a lens through which the comprehensive plan will be looked at because there's a lot of very detailed information in here that may or may not be implemented, but to look at it as a way to possibly impact our future policy is I think a good thing.

I just think that looking at the built environment to produce health as a long-term beneficial outcome is something that just can't help but pay off for all of us. That's it.

DELEISSEGUES: Do you have anything else to add, Ron?

BARCA: No.

DELEISSEGUES: Eileen.

QUTUB: Yes, I have a couple of comments. First of all, this is really a very visionary plan that you've done, it's thought out, it has very noble motivation behind it. What my comment's about I also saw the article in the newspaper this morning and I thought, well, this is great because these bananas and apples that were 50 cents apiece were selling, I mean the guy says this is a success.

Well, that is what motivates a businessman, it's success and it's making a profit and it's giving people who come to his store what they want to buy and obviously I thought, well, this really fits in with this whole plan.

There are many parts of it that are just so good, but there are parts of it that I think we need to be careful when we use "mandates," "limitations," "prohibitions" and "requirements" and I like the wording rather that's "allow," "encourage," "work with" or "partner with" and "support" in many of these elements. I just think that we have to be careful about unintended consequences down the road and -- train of thought, train of thought. I'm trying to look at all my notes I scribbled around my paper. I know there was something else I wanted to say here.

DELEISSEGUES: Do you want us to come back to you?

QUTUB: Well, I guess.

DELEISSEGUES: Okay.

QUTUB: I'll think of it.

DELEISSEGUES: Valerie.

USKOSKI: Yeah. I guess the only comments I have tie back to the education and the socioeconomics that Jim had brought up. I do feel that the education is the most important part to educate the youth and the other generations in addition to what the impacts of the choices they make for eating and what those can lead to as far as the inflammation in their system and decrease in their health quality.

If we can educate the public to the extent that they understand what those impacts are, not in

general but even to the level for them specifically that if I eat this I'm going to have X, Y and Z and understand what those are, you've better set them up to understand the choice of if I sit down and eat a doughnut every day, probably not the best choice and this is why and these are the consequences I will pay, that there's no such thing as a free lunch, quote, that comes in there, that you have to understand and make that choice and the better you educate the people, the better prepared they are to make that choice for long-term health.

DELEISSEGUES: Did you find it?

QUTUB: I did. When Valerie said education, that was it. When we had our joint meeting with the City of Vancouver Planning Commission, it came up also that a lot of kids don't know, even I think the doctor mentioned that, they don't even know what some of these fruits, these foods are and when they go to the store, what is this star fruit and how do you eat it. In fact I saw something in the store the other day and I'm like, boy, this looks very strange, I don't know what it is.

However, we also talked about how there was home economics taught and cooking and because I think a lot of this goes back to not having the time or knowing or the knowledge of how to choose and plan meals and everything else.

I didn't see in the section about the food and the availability partnering with educational institutions where I did see it in other parts of this plan and I think that it would be very good to partner with school systems to really think through the idea of having education that helps our kids learn from the very beginning how to eat healthy and to learn what the cause and effect is, that it really does affect your joints and everything else when you eat inflammatory foods.

And things as well as physical education in school, they dropped a lot of these courses, that's kind of a you just may take it, you're not shall, it's not a you shall take it, it's a you may take it. So I think those are things that could be integrated especially in the food availability and so forth.

DELEISSEGUES: Just two things I had and kind of tying in with what Ron was talking about on the education, I think Clark County does a good job from K to 12, I think we graduate probably more kids out of high school than Clackamas County or some of them that you've got the charts on here, Multnomah County, and I think they go to college, but I don't think that there's enough jobs here at the college level to bring them back.

I think that's why we kind of fall down on the Bachelor degree end of it, they have to go to Multnomah County or someplace where the employment's offered that requires a Bachelor's degree.

The other thing, and a few of us on the Planning Commission has been through this exercise of the comp plan update several times, and we do kind of take a look at the 40,000-foot elevation and I've been trying to figure out in my own mind how we can incorporate some of

the specificity you have in your recommendations into something as wide and large as the comp plan where we looked at the amount of land that we have for agriculture and we have for residential, we have industrial, we have commercial, but it doesn't seem like the comp plan offers too much opportunity to get down to the kind of specifics that you have in your recommendations.

I think from my standpoint I would need some help, I think, on trying to get from the micro recommendations of what you do in a neighborhood or down the individual residential or individual and let's expand that into the bigger picture which is the comp plan.

I certainly agree with everything you've said, you've got a lot of good recommendations in here, I just hope that there's some linkage that we can provide into the codes too would be another place for a lot of this that we've just gone through updating our codes, I'd hate to do it again too soon, but some of it it seems to me might be more applicable to the code rather than a broad comp plan.

Well, with that being said, if anybody else has anything they'd like to weigh in or a motion, I'd be happy to hear it.

BARCA: I just want to add one thing based on what you said.

DELEISSEGUES: Sure.

BARCA: I think Dick's comment is really valid for long-range planning to take back and I don't know how broad we could go on the subject, but we always talk about the idea of getting that half-width road improvement in there and make that a requirement, what are our opportunities to say half-width road or a trail of a certain standard or a bike lane for a certain length of track that may be in a greater quantity or length than the improvement requirement of a half width.

I think if we're really serious we're going to have to put some public money into the process somehow, but we can do it at the time of development. If we look at this in the right way those particular pieces of infrastructure should actually make the development more attractive, help add value depending upon where it's going to be, and one form of transportation mode might be changed for a different form of transportation mode.

I would say this is a good springboard into having that discussion about how much latitude does the public portion of any development have towards it.

I'll make a motion to adopt it as written and move it forward to the County Commissioners.

GIZZI: I'll second that.

DELEISSEGUES: Any discussion on the motion? Jeff.

WRISTON: I mean my only discussion --

DELEISSEGUES: I cut you off last time, I'm going to make sure I don't do it again.

WRISTON: Thank you. My only discussion would be that I agree with Commissioner Qutub that I would be afraid of some of it. This is some of the most detailed comprehensive plan stuff that I've seen. When you look at our comprehensive plan it's very high up there and then it makes its way down into code or other policies and things like that.

So I'd be very careful and maybe just something for long-range planning to think about before they go to the Commissioners or warn the Commissioners about and let the Commissioners make their mind up on that. But I would be concerned about the unintentional consequences, the thou shalts and the this and that, that the things that really direct versus this is the direction we want to take.

Comprehensive plan is more meant to say this is the direction we want to take and then the next step is to incorporate that into a code or a policy or a program or something else. So I would be very hesitant on that in this particular policy.

GIZZI: Can I offer up that we had this discussion at length and in detail to make sure that we understood that these were just a series of guidelines and recommendations and that Planning would come up with the details necessary to come up with the policies and code changes for the comprehensive plan.

So all of the mandating language in here is not intended really, I don't believe, to get into code so that's why the language to introduce this was as a lens through which we will approach the comprehensive plan because all of us had expressed some very serious concerns about some of the exacting language in here and that was explained as probably not the discussion for this --

DELEISSEGUES: Well, we have a motion and a second. Is there any more questions on how the motion will be forwarded to the Board of County Commissioners?

QUTUB: I just have the caveat, I will reiterate the caveat that we be cautious about unintended consequences and mandates, that there are many in here, there are many mandates, and if you look at the addendum or where it tells you what's new and what's enhanced and adds to the framework to me clearly these are recommendations that this advisory committee wanted to go forward. That would be my caveat.

DELEISSEGUES: Okay. Any other questions, comments or changes to the motion proposed? Can we have roll call, please.

USKOSKI: YES
QUTUB: AYE
WRISTON: AYE
BARCA: AYE

GIZZI: AYE
DELEISSEGUES: AYE

DELEISSEGUES: I want to thank everybody that has anything to do with this, I think it's a lot of work and it was well-presented, and I know the City Planning Commission felt the same way, and it was a good effort between both the County and the City and I would just say that I hope the other cities in the county get the same opportunity that we've had to consider this in their plans.

WIESMAN: Great. Thank you very much.

HYDE: Thank you.

DELEISSEGUES: Appreciate your work on this.

HYDE: Thank you very much.

DELEISSEGUES: We're going to take a break for about 15 minutes and be back at 8:00.

(Pause in proceedings.)

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS & PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION, continued

B. BIENNIAL CODE AMENDMENTS:

DELEISSEGUES: We'll resume the public hearing for the Planning Commission for tonight and go to the second item on the agenda which is the biennial code amendments. Do we have a staff report, Mr. Bazala?

BAZALA: We do. Good evening, Planning Commissioners. My name is Jan Bazala with Community Development. Tonight we're going to discuss the spring biennial code amendments and we have 31 items ranging from the scrivener's items to some policy changes.

In the additional materials you received tonight there is an addendum to the PC hearing Attachment A which is this document here. This document has some changes that are different than what you have in the main Attachment A that you received a couple of weeks ago, so by and large most of everything is good in here, but when we get to certain items that have changed, I'll refer to this addendum document.

The first eight items on the list are scrivener's errors. Unless you have specific questions on any of them I hadn't planned on going over them for the sake of saving time. Any questions on the scrivener's errors? All right. I will move on and I'll start with the clarification sections.

And technically the first item in the clarification sections which starts on Page 6 of the main Attachment A is a fee related item and you guys don't really need to talk about fees. I wasn't going to go over that first fee if that's okay with you.

I'll start on Number 10 on Page 7 of the main attachment and that is a proposal to add a footnote in the rural zones table that clarifies that front setbacks are measured from right-of-way or street easements. That's common practice in almost all zoning districts that front setbacks are measured to street easements or street right-of-ways, all the other residential zoning districts' tables mentions that as a heads-up to people using the code. This particular table does not mention it so we're just proposing to add the footnote that clarifies that, how front setbacks are measured. It's nothing new, it's just a heads-up.

Number 11, include a reference to activity area in the home business code text to be consistent with language used in the home business requirements table. In the major rural home businesses allow outdoor activity areas and "outdoor activity area" is defined in this section of the code.

There is a table that lists the standards for everything you need to know about major outdoor home businesses and in the table it refers to activity area, but the text immediately above the table in the code that refers to the table uses the term "outdoor storage" and while outdoor storage is a part of activity area, it's not totally the same thing so we're just clarifying that the text should also read "outdoor activity area" instead of "outdoor storage" specifically.

DELEISSEGUES: I had a question on Number 11. Are we there? Is that --

BAZALA: Yeah.

BARCA: Yeah, that's what he's talking about.

DELEISSEGUES: Yeah, that's what I thought. I thought maximum average number of customer roundtrips per day, average roundtrips per day over what period are we averaging? Is it a week or a month or how do you get an average per day?

BAZALA: That's a good question. I think it's maybe intended to be vague to allow a little bit of flexibility. We don't want to keep somebody from having a home business if they're going to have seven customers on a given day and have three the next.

DELEISSEGUES: It seems like if somebody was making Christmas gifts or something and they all showed up on the 24th with 50 people and nobody came for a while I don't know how you would figure average trips per day. Is that too many for one day or who keeps track of it?

BAZALA: Yeah, I'm sure we don't.

DELEISSEGUES: It's just a question.

BAZALA: I think the general intent of the home business ordinance is to kind of cut people some slack, give them a little bit of flexibility so we don't have to monitor stuff like that.

DELEISSEGUES: Maybe the answer is don't ask.

BAZALA: Kind of.

DELEISSEGUES: Okay.

BAZALA: Number 12, moving on to Page 9, this is to remove language that states that minor road modifications do not require separate applications. In the last couple of years we've changed the minor or the road mod section of the code and in that code text we have some specific language that says separate application isn't needed for a minor deviation.

Some applicants have used that to say that they don't have to submit anything for a minor deviation, but in reality at a minimum we need to know what they're proposing and so they need to fill out a form and submit a narrative. This becomes even more important when you have a stand-alone minor deviation request.

So instead of having specific code language regarding the applications for each type of road mod situation, we're proposing to allow administrative processes and handouts to guide applicants towards what they need in each circumstance so we're going to strike the specific application language regarding road mods. Okay with that?

DELEISSEGUES: Was that the one, Jeff, you were asking road maintenance?

WRISTON: Was I asking about road maintenance?

DELEISSEGUES: Yeah. Where you have people that periodically have to maintain their road or they have to come in and get a permit.

WRISTON: Yeah, this would be a different issue.

GIZZI: That was grading.

WRISTON: That would be under Grading.

BAZALA: Yeah, that was a recent code amendment about grading.

DELEISSEGUES: Just checking.

WRISTON: But, no, thank you.

BAZALA: But this isn't it. This is strictly about application processes.

DELEISSEGUES: Yeah, I think we were talking about the quantity of dirt or something.

BAZALA: Yeah, that was a Batch 6 item for grading.

DELEISSEGUES: Okay.

BAZALA: Number 13 is to remove some potentially misleading references to setbacks in the Highway 99 code to clarify that front setbacks are not elective but dependent upon the street frontage type of the particular site.

In the Highway 99 code there are six zoning overlay areas which basically function like zoning districts and within each overlay zone setback requirements can vary depending upon what sort of street frontage you have.

So each overlay section in the code lists the front setbacks as a range, that's one of the things that we're getting rid of, and that that range of numbers might give the impression that an applicant can choose their setback and in reality the range of numbers are really just an indication of what the very building and front setbacks might be dependent upon the road frontage of the site, the storefront, whether it's a storefront or whether it is mixed residential.

So it's just kind of confusing. The code's not changing at all, we're just getting rid of a potentially misleading statistic, if you will.

BARCA: So, Jan, it seemed like it would be worthwhile to have the different overlay values presented somewhere here even if it's just in an exhibit form.

BAZALA: Just to understand?

BARCA: Just to understand what it is, yeah. We're really saying from one to the other to the other because I believe when we went through that the requirements varied significantly by the time you went from the least to the most.

BAZALA: Yep, it can get quite elaborate just on how you overlay the different layers of regulations.

Number 14 is more Highway 99 stuff. It's to clarify some ambiguous terms as they apply to landscaping height and width requirements. There's some text referring to landscaping requirements around trash enclosures and the current language says the sides and rear of the enclosure must be screened with three feet of landscaping at least five-feet deep, that seems kind of loosey-goosey and ambiguous.

Typically the way we would refer to landscaping standards like that would be using the terms "high" and "wide" so it's more consistent with the way we do it in other places of the code.

Number 15, we're now moving into the realm of reference updates which are basically changes that need to reflect prior code changes that come through the system. Number 15 is to provide setback standards for existing single-family detached dwellings in the R-30 and R-43 zoning districts.

In Batch 2B of the retooling our code project the multi-family code was revised and the setback tables were reformatted and as part of that change there was existing language which stated that single-family development in the R-30 and R-43 districts were supposed to use the setbacks for multi-family and when the tables were reformatted that language was lost.

New single-family detached development in these zones is not allowed, but existing single-family structures do exist in these zones and they can be added on to or they can be torn down and replaced and so we do need setbacks for single-family structures in the R-30 and R-43 zones even though new developments are not allowed to come in with those. We're proposing to put that in code text instead of at the end of the new tables.

Number 16 is to remove an old reference to the repeal commercial design guidelines in site plan review section of the code. In the site plan review section there's a paragraph that allows some site plan review standards to be waived if those standards conflict with aspects of the commercial design guidelines, but the commercial design guidelines are gone in the last couple of years and we need to get rid of that old defunct reference to them.

Number 17 is to update references to grading requirements in the County SEPA code. There are some old references to how the grading code used to be formatted which was in the multiple sections of the code, a couple of years ago we condensed all the grading into one section of the code, which is 14.07, so we just missed getting rid of those old references when we made that code update to the grading a long time ago, not this last grading.

Number 18, now we're moving into code interpretations. This is to extend the ten percent or less increase in trip generation exemption for road frontage requirements to rural center properties in addition to urban developments. In the current code urban developments that can be shown to create an increase of less than ten percent p.m. peak hour trips can be exempted from making road frontage improvements just because they're not creating enough demand.

Currently the code does not extend that courtesy to properties in the rural centers and it doesn't seem fair, it's kind of come up a few times over the years, so we're proposing to even out the playing field for rural center properties as well.

Number 19 is to fix ambiguous language and increase the maximum allowable increase in height of a commercial building under a Type I site plan review. In the site plan review section there are criteria that dictate what level of site plan review you need to go through.

One of the criterias currently requires that a Type II site plan, which requires public notice, is needed in order to increase the height of a building by more than 10 percent if the structure is located within 20 feet of a property line, but in addition there's some additional confusing language that state that it also meets the maximum height limit of the zone.

There is no height limit for structures in the commercial zones so we don't know what that language means so we're proposing to eliminate the language regarding maximum height and to increase the percentage that you can raise a building to 50 percent before a Type II review is needed.

BARCA: Okay, question on that one. In your title you talk about commercial building under a Type I site plan review, all of the text appears to be relevant to the Type II so shouldn't we include the language for the Type I to clarify how we're proposing it to be utilized?

BAZALA: Well, there's other sections of the site plan review code that says if you don't require a Type II, you automatically require a Type I unless you're exempt entirely so we'll get there to a Type I by omitting it or by raising the bar to requiring a Type II.

BARCA: So under that circumstance, then, rather than saying a building height by more than 10 percent, you're saying any height up to 49 percent is a Type I and then at 50 percent it becomes a Type II?

BAZALA: Yes.

BARCA: So the building community can freely apply a 49 percent expansion of height knowing that they'll remain within the Type I?

BAZALA: Yes.

WRISTON: 49.9999.

BARCA: 49.99, yeah.

BAZALA: What this really does in going through a Type II it doesn't raise the level of code or anything like that, the code is the same, I mean you need to do the same things under a Type I as a Type II, but if you're under a Type II review, we notify the neighbors, the neighbor will be notified that somebody wants to increase the height of their building.

And the code allows them, there's no height limit in the commercial zone, so the code will say you can raise it as high as you want. Just telling somebody that they're going to increase it a small bit, 10 percent, it doesn't really give the adjacent property owner any ability to affect the project, it's just kind of a courtesy.

And 10 percent doesn't seem like a whole lot. If you had a 20-foot-high building, raising it 10

percent would be just another two feet so is it really worth going through a Type II site plan review which costs quite a bit more than a Type I.

BARCA: So there's no height limitation in commercial zoning?

BAZALA: Right.

BARCA: So how do you know what the maximum is?

BAZALA: That's why we're getting rid of the language regarding the maximum height, it doesn't seem to make any sense.

BARCA: But if we're increasing the height by something where there's no boundary, how does one actually increase the height of it? If there is no height limitation how can you be 49 or 50 percent more than it?

BAZALA: Well, you'd be 50 percent of the existing height of the structure, that's the way I read it. If your existing structure is 100 feet let's say, if you increased it 49 percent you'd be adding another 49 feet.

BARCA: So that's in reference to an expansion of an existing building?

BAZALA: Yes.

BARCA: But what of new construction?

BAZALA: New construction would go through a Type II regardless if it was new construction. I mean just an addition can be a relatively minor thing and it can be done under a Type I, but if they were building a new building and they proposed it to be 100 feet at the get-go, they would be a Type II.

BARCA: So to clarify then, somewhere in here shouldn't we be saying that this is the expansion of an existing building height where 49 percent increase remains a Type I and 50 percent or more becomes a Type II? I thought this actually would allow us the proposal in new construction as well, but you're saying that's not the case?

BAZALA: Right. It's referring them to an increase in height of a structure. If you don't have any structure to begin with, I wouldn't read it as applying to a new structure because you're increasing the height. We could say "existing structure" to make it more clear.

BARCA: Yeah, that would clarify. Thank you.

BAZALA: Yep. That was a really hard one to try to write an explanation for because it can get very wordy.

Number 20, clarify that projects in the Highway 99 overlay areas can be covered under the Highway 99 planned action SEPA if the Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation agrees that no further work is required after the applicant submits a negative archaeological predetermination.

When the Highway 99 overlay was done there was a what's called a planned action SEPA so it said that we've looked at all the basic environmental impacts and basically we're going to do a SEPA for everything so you wouldn't have to do a separate SEPA for a project coming in that area.

But one of the caveats in the language basically requires the State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation to implement and interpret the County's code and I don't think that's the way it was intended. What we're proposing to do is to say that if a site obtains a negative archaeological predetermination under our code and the DAHP blesses that negative archaeological predetermination, then no additional SEPA review is needed.

The way it's worded now is just kind of odd and I don't know how it would really work because the State would be saying we're going to look at your code and we're going to work through your system and we're going to tell you whether you're covered under your existing SEPA or not.

WRISTON: Jan, just a quick question, and this is a little off topic, I'm just curious because a lot of us were involved in the Highway 99 deal, how is that going? Has anyone done anything under it or any changes?

BAZALA: There hasn't been a whole lot of activity that I'm aware of.

WRISTON: Yeah. I drive it every day and I haven't seen it, but I'm curious whether --

BAZALA: I think there's been some relatively minor things. I mean that fee holiday thing hasn't really jump started a whole lot of big stuff.

WRISTON: I was just curious.

DELEISSEGUES: Nobody's undergrounded the power lines, have they?

WRISTON: No. Or do we have that alternative site for, anyway.

BAZALA: Moving on to minor policy changes, Number 21, allow expansion of existing cemeteries in the resource zones. There's a place called the Venersborg Cemetery Association up north and they have a one-acre cemetery that's filled up and they want to expand it but code currently says that cemeteries are prohibited in the FR-80 zone.

In order to alleviate that situation we're proposing that you can expand existing cemeteries in

the FR-80 zone but you still can't start new ones. I think one of the reasons that they didn't want new cemeteries is probably to be consistent with growth management that cemeteries may not be the best use of resource land, but if you have an existing cemetery, how big of an impact is that going to be.

WRISTON: Where are cemeteries allowed? I mean I can look that up if you don't know.

BAZALA: They're mostly in residential zones as it turns out.

WRISTON: Okay.

BAZALA: I think they're conditional uses pretty much everywhere, but they don't make a lot of noise.

WRISTON: I would have thought forest or something like that would have been a logical place for them.

BAZALA: We're allowing expansion but not new ones. Number 22 is to remove the eight-foot building separation requirement in the rural zone setback table. We're not really sure why there are building separation requirements in this zone and not the others. We don't know why there would be any reason that the rural zones should have separation requirements.

There are building separation requirements in the single-family zones but they're dictated by the building code and they're normally six feet, not eight. So even in these zones people will still be subject to building separation code requirements of the building code, but we're proposing to get rid of the eight-foot separation that seems to be special to the rural zones setback table.

Number 23, I'm going to direct your attention to the addendum because there's a minor change that we've made. There is a church in Meadow Glade that has been allowing a free medical and dental clinic or free medical clinic on their site and in the stack of new materials you received tonight there's a number of letters of support of this medical and proposed dental clinic that's at the church site. It's I think off of 189th Street, it's right in Meadow Glade, so in order for them to operate the use table needs to be changed to specifically allow them.

Originally this started out as just adding dental offices, but we've since learned that apparently they're also operating a medical clinic on-site so we're proposing just to cover everybody's bases that dental and medical clinics would be allowed in the rural center residential zones.

This came from the Board's office because that use isn't allowed but it's a church site, they open up certain days a week, they provide free dental and medical care for residents so they're doing a good thing.

DELEISSEGUES: Rather than to allow all these uses in rural centers where we're trying to

maintain the rural character and we're making little cities out of them by adding dental clinics and lodging places and amusement services and health clubs, and I don't know how long the list is going to get, couldn't that one use just be conditional use permit instead of having to change the whole thing for all the rural centers?

BAZALA: I'm not following you. First off let me step back a little bit. There are some other amendments that are dealing with commercial zones and the only thing we're adding to the rural center residential zone or proposing to is just this one use. In the original attachment I included the lists of all the uses in that zone and currently there aren't many things that are commercially oriented, veterinary clinics are listed there but pretty much everything else is residential.

WRISTON: You mentioned dental, but I think I heard you mention medical?

BAZALA: Medical clinics, yeah. The addendum has medical, has dental and medical offices listed, I condensed the whole table down to a page and a quarter in the addendum. It says on Page 2 of the addendum dental and medical offices as a conditional use.

WRISTON: Why conditional?

BAZALA: Because --

WRISTON: I mean because they're limited in size and --

BAZALA: Veterinary clinics --

WRISTON: -- and structure and all of that.

BAZALA: Well, veterinary clinics are currently a conditional use in that zone so we thought it would be appropriate. And in this case for the church, the church needs a conditional use permit. In order for them to do this not only do we have to change the zoning code, they would have to amend their conditional use permit. So in this case by making it a conditional use, it's not going to really affect them. It's not going to make their bar any higher in this case.

WRISTON: I know. We don't get very many opportunities to kind of look at these SIC codes, is that what they're called, or whatever they're called?

BAZALA: NAICS.

WRISTON: Right. Thank you.

BAZALA: They're related. I mean they're kind of.

WRISTON: But we just see this plethora of permitted conditional, not permitted whatever and

it's very hard for us to look at them. I know that some of us have pointed out some things that seem inconsistent, but in a rural zone, and I know we're talking about rural residential and not necessarily rural commercial or some of the other rural zones we have --

DELEISSEGUES: Rural centers.

WRISTON: -- but just given the testimony we heard on kennels and the fact that they're permitted and then a dental office, for instance the dental office that I go to is located in the middle of a residential neighborhood and it's probably the nicest landscaped home short of a parking lot, I don't think you'd ever know that it was a dental office.

BAZALA: Maybe they had a conditional use permit and we made them --

WRISTON: It's on St. Johns, it's not in the rural area, it's on St. Johns, or St. James, but I don't want to waste time going through and talking about that, it just seems like some of these codes that we put "permitted" and "conditional" and things like that are at times arbitrary or inconsistent.

BAZALA: Well --

WRISTON: This I understand why.

BAZALA: This particular one it may be true. It's also trying to do a good thing so it's up to you guys. And Chris Cook is dying to say something.

COOK: Chris Cook, Deputy Prosecuting Attorney. The reasoning for it being conditional I think is precisely so that the impacts can be dealt with to maintain that rural character that Dick was talking about, that would be my guess, and that that's a concern in the rural zone and rightly so.

But the other question that you had, Chairman Deleissegues, why can't we just let that use in and with respect I wanted to point out that all these things that we do because there's one deserving use here, this is a good use and it's just out in Venersborg, the cemetery wants to expand, they end up becoming code changes that do affect the entire county and have ramifications for the entire county.

So it's not just helping out one, oh, golly, we've been there forever or whatever the sad story is, it ends up changing code for the whole county with whatever impacts that has good or bad and you can't do it by just saying, well, they can get a permit.

DELEISSEGUES: My understanding is it's just an occasional use. I mean they have a free dental clinic there like once a month and they move these things all around the county. I know my dentist participates in those things usually on a weekend and sometimes they're in Ridgefield and sometimes they go to Meadow Glade and sometimes they're out someplace

else, so it doesn't seem like an office per se, it seems like a use of space that is occurring only occasionally.

COOK: But that's a use and --

DELEISSEGUES: Well, that's my question, they need a code change for that?

COOK: Yeah. And Ridgefield of course is urban or at least I would assume where they are it's urban --

DELEISSEGUES: Yeah, I understand that.

COOK: -- and Meadow Glade is not.

WRISTON: If that's the case, and I don't know if that's the case or not, if this is a mobile dental clinic or not.

BAZALA: It's pretty much. They're not open all the time is my understanding, but they're located at their permanent facility.

WRISTON: I was going to say otherwise we can deal with it like we dealt with something a couple of years ago with firework stands.

BARCA: Food carts.

WRISTON: Yeah, food carts or whatever. I mean we don't want to discourage mobile things that do a service.

COOK: But do note the breath of this permission. This allows dental and medical offices so that's kind of a big thing in the rural centers.

DELEISSEGUES: Yeah.

GIZZI: So are we not saying that there are any limitations on the size of those offices or facilities or anything like that?

COOK: That would be through the conditional use review process. Again I'm assuming that the notion of that would be to make some sort of attempt to maintain the rural character in the rural centers, but I'm not sure exactly how that could be done. It doesn't say clinics with fewer than 500 or fewer than 5 doctors, it just says "clinics."

BAZALA: We could put a square foot limit on it. It would be cleaner by putting a square foot limit on it. I hadn't really thought about it. And honestly for this particular case I don't know what that appropriate number would be.

COOK: Yeah, that might be a little difficult for the precise folks that this is asked for. I mean maybe they get together in the assembly hall or church here or a gym facility or a cafeteria, who knows how big and how many rooms they use.

BAZALA: I don't really know a whole lot of details on this one to be honest. But I suppose going forward to the Board we could find out some details and consider a limit to kind of preclude the really big stuff.

GIZZI: Or we could limit days of use or hours of use or something like that.

USKOSKI: Well, maybe --

BAZALA: Well, that could be done through the conditional use, limiting certain things.

USKOSKI: Maybe address it rather than trying to put a limit on square footage or something like that that you put something in there that it maintains or reflects the rural character of the area. I mean if it's an area where there's bigger buildings, then it just kind of blends in, but if it's fairly open and not a whole lot, then they're restricted to smaller to match the existing area.

BAZALA: I believe that they're an existing, they've got their buildings already built and the use has --

COOK: Well, with this one.

BAZALA: Yes.

BARCA: Right. It's on the campus of the Seventh-Day Adventist Academy?

BAZALA: I believe that's the name of them.

BARCA: Yeah. So we're really talking about a parking lot that's already in place, we're talking about infrastructure that's already in place, we're talking about it in the context of saying they have come forward and just want to be in compliance.

It seems to me that we're going to create the boundaries in a generalized basis that says to maintain rural character it must meet this criteria A, B, C and D and then we permit it as such. Or we're going to say the conditional use will reflect the rural character and we will allow the individuals that are doing the responsible official activities to make that determination that rural character is being preserved.

I think we're making too much out of this personally. I think this is a group that's just come forward and want to be in compliance and if we find that all of a sudden every rural center is flooded with medical facility requests, then what would we actually have been taking place, medical services within walking distance.

WRISTON: That's terrible.

QUTUB: Wouldn't that be awful.

BARCA: Yeah.

GIZZI: Well, now wait a minute, I live in a rural center --

BARCA: And I never --

GIZZI: -- I've got a pretty strong opinion here.

BARCA: Go for it.

DELEISSEGUES: So do I.

GIZZI: The rural character of our neighborhood is something to be protected so if we're talking about a doctor's office or a dental office that's one thing, but if we're talking about a medical facility that generates traffic on the local street that hasn't been planned for, et cetera, yadda, yadda, that's completely different and I don't know if that's what this is opening the door for or not.

BAZALA: Well, without limits it --

COOK: Well, I don't know that the word "clinic" is defined.

WRISTON: But conditional use --

DELEISSEGUES: Medical office.

WRISTON: 've been through many, conditional use it's day and night to permitted use. Conditional use gives absolute discretion and authority --

BARCA: Right.

WRISTON: -- to the County to really listen to the neighbors, take into consideration everything they're saying including traffic, rural character, really anything they want to, Chris, if I'm correct. I mean conditional use versus permitted, conditional use is a much higher hurdle to jump than permitted.

COOK: It's a higher hurdle but it's not boundless. I don't think --

WRISTON: No, it's not boundless.

COOK: -- that the responsible official people would take into consideration necessarily everything.

WRISTON: No. But I think what Jim was concerned about was a Vancouver Clinic opening a four-story clinic in the middle of a neighborhood. One, I don't see them doing that unless there was an absolute need and use and all of that kind of stuff.

But, two, I think that would be a very high hurdle to jump in a residential rural area and maybe putting Val's language in there about maintaining the rural character, with considerations of maintaining the rural character, protects us a little more. I hate being arbitrary by putting square footage limitations and things like that.

DELEISSEGUES: It's still kind of vague.

WRISTON: We become totally arbitrary when we do that, we just don't know what we talk about when we do that. But I understand and I wouldn't want that coming in next to me either necessarily.

GIZZI: Yeah, it's hard to say. There are situations I think it would be great and there are others where I think it probably wouldn't fit and I don't know how to rectify it or reconcile it.

BAZALA: Maybe allow it in existing buildings somehow?

COOK: So nobody could build a new one even if there were a need or whatever. It can be addressed by an amendment at the Commission's pleasure or not.

BARCA: I think our discussion about rural character is appropriate for every one of these conditional uses that's already here and in place. We're only discussing one, but if you look at all of the conditional uses --

DELEISSEGUES: That's what I said.

BARCA: -- there are many, many that could be much more onerous --

DELEISSEGUES: Yes.

BARCA: -- than the idea of a dental or a medical office.

WRISTON: Dog kennel.

GIZZI: Yeah, there you go.

BARCA: Well, of course.

WRISTON: Dredge up recent memories.

BARCA: Right. So we are way past the situation of going through this line-by-line and I think we should treat this as if all of the other conditional uses are going to be looked at in a rational fashion and medical and dental offices would be looked at in a rational fashion also because if we don't have that premise, then none of these conditional uses are safe.

WRISTON: That's a good point, Commissioner, thank you.

BARCA: Let's not make too much out of this.

BAZALA: We'll move on to Item Number 24 and back to the main Attachment A, this is on Page 20 of the main Attachment A, expand the list of commercial uses which also allow residential uses in conjunction with commercial use to include such commercial uses as lodging places and amusement services such as health clubs.

Again in this case I listed all the allowable uses in the commercial zone just to give it some context, and most of or many of these commercial uses also allow residential uses to co-exist on the same site. Some uses have been previously deemed to be not compatible with residential uses, so we are now proposing to allow residential uses along with lodging places and amusement services because we don't see how those two uses are necessarily incompatible with residential development.

This was a little bit hard to follow, but if you have any questions on what the actual code change is let me know because the actual code text change is very minor, it's only in the first big box in the table, we're adding a line item 10 and 13 that allow residential uses along with them, the rest of the text is just there to show you what the other commercial uses are for reference.

WRISTON: I'll just say I appreciate the context --

GIZZI: Yes, very much.

WRISTON: -- that you've given us. I like that you've given us the other uses, that gives us great context.

BAZALA: Shall I move on?

BARCA: Yeah.

BAZALA: Okay. Number 25 which is on Page 28 of the main addendum, or excuse me, the main Attachment A, to allow commercial outdoor storage of boats, RVs and other contractors and like building or and building materials storage in the UH-20 and UH-40 zones that have a light industrial base zoning.

The areas brought into an urban growth boundary that aren't quite ready for more intensive development are given a zoning overlay of urban holding along with a future base zoning that will say what it's going to build out once the urban holding overlay is lifted.

Once the area has sufficient infrastructure in place or it gets annexed into the city the overlay is lifted and the uses of the base zoning designation are allowed. Right now most of the uses in the urban holding zones are primarily residential in nature, there's really not much that's commercial at all.

However, it seems that if we were to allow commercial outdoor storage in areas that are destined to be light industrial, that would provide a reasonable economic use of the property and still not create excessive demands on infrastructure. If sewer or water isn't to the property, outdoor storage isn't going to put much demand on those types of uses.

This came from the DEAB actually and it seems to make some sense to us. If you had the storage that we're proposing, I mean it is an allowed use in the residential zone, so the storage use could be permanent or it could be short term to be replaced with a higher intensity industrial use once the overlay is lifted and it becomes truly industrial zone. It seems to be a pretty innocuous use of the property.

WRISTON: Outdoor storage, unless I missed something, can you cover it if it's open on four sides or whatever?

BAZALA: Let's see. Typically I would think not, although while I was thinking of this I was kind of envisioning covered storage as well.

WRISTON: That's what I wondered.

BARCA: As soon as you put the word "commercial" on there you're already putting it in the context of saying that they're going to offer some facility and service, unless we prohibit it specifically I would think that we would have to allow that then.

WRISTON: Well, boats, vehicles and RVs, especially boats and RVs, I agree with Ron --

BARCA: It could be cumulative.

WRISTON: -- if you put commercial, one, I mean at least covered, not necessarily on four sides but at least covered, and then somebody puts a structure, they generally need electricity to put heat, keep their batteries trickling and things like that.

BARCA: Right.

BAZALA: Right.

BARCA: Otherwise it's not really a marketable product --

WRISTON: No.

BARCA: -- just a --

BAZALA: We could clarify.

WRISTON: And frankly it becomes more of a mess. I would rather see an organized covered even if it's an open covered than an unorganized mess of outdoor storage --

BAZALA: That's a good catch.

WRISTON: -- with moss and everything growing on everything.

BAZALA: We could say something like commercial outdoor storage including covered storage somewhere, somehow portray that that covered would be okay.

BARCA: I'm not sure that we have to add language. I think it was just a clarification to say how does this read now that storage is not actually prohibiting in the language to create the structure.

WRISTON: Well, outdoor commercial and outdoor kind of conflict with each other.

BAZALA: Well, commercial was put in there so it's clear that if you owned your own boat even living on the site that you can store your own boat, but a commercial activity is like somebody's renting the site so that's why --

WRISTON: To me outdoor is the --

BAZALA: It's an outdoor, yeah, so we could clarify that that outdoor storage and covered storage if that's what you suggest.

WRISTON: Didn't we --

DELEISSEGUES: It might work.

WRISTON: Well, outdoor it depends, it's a question of our intent. "Outdoor" to me means outdoor not covered, although I picture it covered.

BAZALA: Yeah, because I picture it as seeing the RV or the boat --

WRISTON: Right.

BAZALA: -- on open sides, that's kind of the way a lot of them are. But they're covered, otherwise there's not a whole lot of point in --

WRISTON: I pointed out the conflict, but we also ran across this a few years ago, this storage yard for building materials and contractors and things like that and, Jan, I don't know if you were involved in that, does anyone remember what zone that was in?

BARCA: Well, I think when we ran across that that was out actually in the rural area and we were handling it with home business.

WRISTON: Yeah, I think you may be right.

BARCA: Yeah.

WRISTON: I was just curious. I think you may be right, I think it was allowed.

BARCA: We allowed it within the activity zone.

WRISTON: Right. Okay, thank you. Well, we can leave that for later clarification if we want to. Well, it's up to Dick I guess.

BAZALA: Number 26 is to remove irrigation system requirements in the landscaping code. This item actually started out as just clarifying what qualified as a temporary irrigation system and the Board noted that there's a code requirement that landscaping has to survive, why do we tell them they have to irrigate it so we got rid of the whole section.

Number 27 is to allow some flexibility in the landscape code to allow zero foot front setbacks for commercial buildings. Back when we had the old commercial design guidelines there were provisions that if you implemented those landscaping that you could have a zero foot setback.

When we got rid of the commercial guidelines, we kind of lost the ability to have a zero foot front setback so we are now proposing that we add that ability back in but now use the storefront design standards in Appendix F which is the Highway 99 overlay. It basically says make it look nice, do this and that, you can come up right to the property line so we're proposing a footnote to restore that ability.

Now this next one is going to be rather involved, this is in regard to sewer waiver requirement. If you want I could go on and bypass the sewer waiver one, finish up a couple of the easier ones and then come back to it or would you like me to just plow on through?

DELEISSEGUES: Whatever you want to do, it doesn't matter. We're going to deal with it sooner or later.

BAZALA: Well, let's keep it simple and go in order then. This is where we need to look at the addendum. This item started out relatively small and it's to remove specific sewer effluent quantity limits from the sewer waiver criteria and then a little bit later on we started to consider reducing the minimum distance from 300 to 200 feet for which a site could qualify for a sewer waiver.

In the last week or so we got some recommendations from a septic designer with some experience and he presented his ideas to the DEAB and the DEAB liked them and in the handout stuff that you got tonight there is a document that has red ink, the red text, red type font underline.

The gentleman's name is Mike Williams, he's the guy who actually did the work, put this proposed language together, the DEAB looked at this proposed language via Internet exchanges, it was after their last meeting and basically likes all they see. I also forwarded these to the Public Health Department, Aaron Henderson of Public Health, and unfortunately he could not be here tonight, and so I gave you his comments on this sheet tonight as well.

I'll basically summarize, and Mr. Williams is here so he can testify on his proposal as well, but I'll try to summarize what the differences are between staff's revised version of the waiver code and Mr. Williams. Mr. Williams has proposed that, I am now on Page 4 of the addendum, well, basically let me start out at the beginning.

In the urban growth boundary of the county connection to public sewer is a general requirement to obtain a building permit. There is relief to not have to connect to the sewer for projects that don't add sewage effluent or if the project won't add more than 700 gallons per acre per day.

That original language 700 gallons per acre per day is what we originally started out with and we struck that language and basically said if the Health Department can approve a septic design for your site, that's all that matters. That's all this started out with.

Then the idea was, well, there's other codes with the Public Health code that say that you can replace a failed system. If the sewer is within 200 feet, you got to connect, our sewer waiver code says if it's within 300 feet you got to connect, so there's sort of a discrepancy, although it's a little bit different because the health replacing a septic is one thing, not building or not connecting to sewer and building a new septic system could be considered something different.

So let me get to the proposed differences. So Mr. Williams has proposed that multi-family buildings should be able to qualify for sewer waivers. Right now the code does not allow multi-family residences to qualify for a sewer waiver. When I say a "sewer waiver" it means under these circumstances you don't have to hook up to sewer even though everywhere else in the urban area you're supposed to.

DELEISSEGUES: But the Health Department would have to approve the sewer system on the multi-family which would mean they'd have to have a pretty good-sized piece of property to --

BAZALA: Yes.

DELEISSEGUES: -- deal with the drain field and so forth?

BAZALA: Yes.

WRISTON: Or unless it's one townhouse or one attached, it depends on the definition of "multi-family" I guess.

DELEISSEGUES: Yeah, it would be more than --

WRISTON: It could just be one attached product or something like that that would fall under the definition of "multi-family" but really it's only two.

BAZALA: Yeah. I haven't really --

DELEISSEGUES: Whatever it is it would have to be approved by the Health Department.

BAZALA: Yes. But I haven't really, you know, we have duplexes and to be honest I don't really know if we would consider a duplex multi-family or not. I have to clarify that, that's something to clarify.

WRISTON: Or a town home.

BAZALA: Yeah. But the obvious idea would be if you had a ten-unit apartment building should you be able to get a sewer waiver for that. Back in 2003 the code used to allow sewer waivers for multi-family and it was taken out. It was decided back in 2003 that we don't want multi-family getting sewer waivers.

BARCA: How about schools?

DELEISSEGUES: Good question.

BAZALA: Could they qualify under a sewer waiver under this language, I suppose if they had enough land. And there may be other things, I don't know, that looks like a landmine waiting to be stepped on so I haven't considered that.

But one of staff's concerns is that this item started out relatively small but as time has gone by it's like there's more and more stuff coming at us and some of these are starting to get into bigger policy questions.

WRISTON: Can I ask I guess more of a procedural question. Well, what is today, the 19th, so we're getting Aaron Henderson's, the Health Department's response today, DEAB's looking at stuff online, we've got this Mike Williams, you're kind of throwing your hands up in the air going we got a lot of stuff coming at us at the last minute.

BAZALA: Yes.

WRISTON: Rather than wasting a lot of our time are we better off letting the sides come together and see what they can come to in agreement?

DELEISSEGUES: That's a good point.

GIZZI: Plus we're dealing with three documents that have different colors and different markups of different markups, I'd be more comfortable with something this complicated and this important having it all in one concise document.

DELEISSEGUES: The next question, and Jeff usually pounces on this but I get to this time, it isn't really a minor policy change, it looks like we're --

WRISTON: I always pounce on that.

BAZALA: When we started out replacing the 700 gallons per acre per day, yeah, I think that could have, relatively minor, but the other things about reducing the distance and reducing the way it's measured and getting rid of multi-family, those are in staff's opinion more major policy questions. In addition there's a number of comprehensive plan policies, there's like what did we find, eight or ten.

COOK: I found ten.

BAZALA: Yeah, they're saying prohibit additional septic, encourage sewer hookups, so whether you want to consider dropping from 300 to 200 is that going against those policies.

The original code that started out with the 300-foot limit was done in 1995 when the County adopted their first comp plan. When they adopted the comp plan they were looking at those policies, they decided that 300 feet was the appropriate number, so if we were to reduce that the decision-maker should weigh whether that's consistent with the comp plan.

DELEISSEGUES: Well, when we get around to making the motion, we can deal with this one.

WRISTON: I guess what I'm asking is, and maybe that would be the motion --

DELEISSEGUES: Yeah, we'll set it aside.

WRISTON: -- I don't know how much detail we want Jan to go into, I don't know how much longer -- well, do you want to keep --

BAZALA: I don't know. If you guys feel that this is over and above what we should be looking at, I'm not going to disagree with you.

WRISTON: Well, I don't know whether I'm saying it's over, Dick's right, I usually do pounce on that, I bit my tongue tonight quite a bit, but this seems over and above, but also it just seems like a lot of information came in at the last minute and then you're kind of throwing your hands up, which I absolutely don't blame you because this is a very specialized area.

BAZALA: I've done a lot of work on it, the Health Department is basically saying 200 feet is okay with them as far as they're concerned --

WRISTON: Right.

BAZALA: -- but I just I talked to Clark Regional Wastewater and they're not too awfully concerned with some of this stuff, but it's not a minor thing.

WRISTON: No. Science has changed on septic too.

BAZALA: And Aaron notes that.

WRISTON: Yeah, he does note that.

BAZALA: Unfortunately he couldn't be here. This could almost take it's own hearing.

WRISTON: Do you want to deal with it?

BARCA: When it comes to motion time, we'll deal with it.

DELEISSEGUES: Let's move on.

BAZALA: Okay. Let me just finish out the bullet points on this item. Multi-family buildings should qualify for sewer waivers, staff disagrees. So we've gone over the fact that he's proposing to allow multi-family buildings to have sewer waivers and staff disagrees.

The other thing is to reduce the distance to which you need to hook up from 300 feet to 200 feet. Staff's noted that there's comprehensive plan policies that may be inconsistent with that.

Another item is how you measure the distance, that 2 or 300 feet is measured. Currently the County's sewer waiver code is silent on how you measure it, but there is an existing language in Title 24 that says you measure it to the property line.

Staff has been interpreting this as to the property line and Clark Regional Wastewater when they're providing information for distance for sewer they also measure to the property line, so staff would not recommend supporting changing that to distance to the residence because somebody could actually move their house back to avoid hooking up, to go beyond the 200 or 300 feet.

Then define what "prohibitively expensive" means. We agree that that's a good idea to do so we support that. That's that on that item.

Number 29 is to require a property, I'm still on the addendum now because that was changed slightly too, basically require a property owner's signature on land use applications in addition to the applicant's. The DEAB pointed out that in addition to this property owner's signature we should also have the ability to have the property owner's authorized representative sign and that makes total sense.

DELEISSEGUES: Yeah, that makes sense.

BAZALA: Now we'll go back to the main Attachment A for the last couple. So we're on Page 37.

BARCA: Yep.

BAZALA: Page 37.

BARCA: Item 30.

BAZALA: To allow drive-through facilities to be reviewed under a Type I process instead of a Type II process. Currently accessory type drive-up facilities require a Type II review which requires public notice. As we've discussed before Type I reviews do not require public notice, but Type I applications are still subject to the same code requirements as a Type II.

Staff believes that public notice requirement for drive-up facilities accessory to existing uses is a little bit of overkill since most of these facilities will be located in commercial zones so it will just be notifying your commercial neighbor that you're going to put a drive-up. We're trying to streamline processes and costs and that's what we're proposing.

The last item, Number 31, might be a bit of a policy item to chew on as well. This one came from the Board when we proposed these originally and it's to consider increasing the allowable size of activity areas for major rural home businesses.

Currently the code says that you can have a maximum activity area that we discussed before of two percent of a parcel size so the Board thought, well, maybe that was a little too small, but staff throws out the idea that these are home businesses and I think, well, actually the two percent came from the task force that was charged with developing this code, I think there

was the intent to limit it to a relatively small area because these are home businesses, they're not really intended to be commercial.

So note that buildings are not included in the activity area. If you had a five-acre property, you could have a 3,000-square foot shed for your home business and in addition you would have two percent of five acres which would be about 4300 I think square feet. That was the proposal that came from the Board. So what do you think?

DELEISSEGUES: But the way it's worded it just says consider it so we're okay with that.

BAZALA: Yes. At this point we're not about to throw something out, but if you want to go ahead or if you think two percent is a good number stick with that.

DELEISSEGUES: We'll deal with that later.

BAZALA: Yes.

WRISTON: I feel for you. Evan Dust used to have this job a long time ago.

DELEISSEGUES: We'll go to the sign-up sheet. We've kept you waiting a long time, but Jim Bolton or Bollin.

BOLLIN: Good evening. I'll keep this pretty brief. I'm an associate pastor at the Meadow Glade Seventh-Day Adventist Church.

DELEISSEGUES: Did I pronounce your name right?

BOLLIN: I'm Jim Bollin.

DELEISSEGUES: Why don't you give your name and address, please.

BOLLIN: My name is Jim Bollin. Address is 29000 NE 164th Avenue in Battle Ground.

DELEISSEGUES: Thank you.

BOLLIN: I'm here to speak to Item Number 23 just to help bring some clarification as you were questioning the look of this particular free clinic and I think I can bring some light to some of the subject. This is the building that used to be Manor Nursing Home years ago, it was purchased by the church I think about 2000, before I arrived there, but it was purchased for the purpose they were going to make it a community outreach building, which they have.

If you've driven by there on 189th, they've done things like new roof, new windows, really upgraded it as far as new siding, everything, made it look like a very presentable building. This free clinic is housed inside that building. It's totally a 501(c)(3), it qualifies, it's a

nonprofit, it's meeting chronic care for people in the community in North Clark County.

It was interesting tonight hearing the earlier presentation on the health of Clark County and North Clark County is very underserved as far as medical. This is an attempt to try and alleviate some of that pressure on people so it's dealing with chronic care, diabetes, high blood pressure, chronic heart disease, people that need a primary care physician that don't currently have that.

It's not urgent care, it's not 24-hour care, it's not rehab, it's helping people. If they're dealing with diabetes, for example, they do have dieticians there, they have counseling there to help them get that under control.

There's no dispensing or prescribing of narcotics, there's no walk-on traffic, it's all made by appointments, it's just like your typical doctor office. From the outside you would not even know it is happening in there. The parking lot at the church is what is used for those that come either as volunteers that come and serve or those that come and are served.

Right now it's on Tuesday evenings. The anticipation is as more volunteers come onboard and more funds are raised that they would like to increase that, but they never anticipate this being a full, it's not going to ever be a hospital, it's not a building that's going to be added on to. I just thought I'd bring some clarification.

We have dentists in the community of Battle Ground that have said, hey, we'd like to help serve the need as well and so they're looking to come on in order to do that. They have to do some remodeling interior, not to the exterior, to be able to bring water into a particular part of that clinic.

WRISTON: That's great.

DELEISSEGUES: Any questions of Jim? Thank you very much.

BOLLIN: Thank you very much.

DELEISSEGUES: Next Mike Williams.

WILLIAMS: Good evening, Commissioners. Mike Williams for the record, 7503 NE 219th Street. And, yes, I am the one that complicated this matter. I'll make it brief. I'd like to first thank staff, we were notified of the DEAB meeting last week kind of last minute thing.

Mark Collier and I went to the DEAB meeting, said, hey, we see this language about striking the 700 gallons per acre per day, we really like that, there's some other parts of this code that we feel need some work that both the Technical Advisory Committee for the County's on-site wastewater technical advisory committee and Aaron Henderson's support said, yeah, maybe we should go ahead and address a couple of more issues while we're looking at this section

of the code.

I hadn't had much time until this evening to review staff's latest proposal. There has been lots of different things that have occurred just in the last week, different revisions of things, and I will say that staff's current proposal there are some very good changes to what I had written and the DEAB had said they liked.

The whole single-family versus allowing multi-family, my intention there was like you said duplexes, and we've got a lot of small duplexes, I just felt like maybe we should allow things like that to go ahead and be on septic, I'm not looking at large apartment buildings or anything, that doesn't make sense.

DELEISSEGUES: I didn't think so.

WILLIAMS: The 200 feet versus 300 feet, State code is the one that originally referenced 200 feet and it measures it from the nearest sewer to the structure. When it was put into Title 24.17, which is the on-site code, it measures it from the end of the sewer line to the property corner so we've got that difference between State and local code. Then within the local code we have variations between 200 and 300 feet. It's really complicated and we're just looking to simplify it.

What I didn't mention is that I'm here also representing the Technical Advisory Committee, not just myself, and we had a meeting yesterday the Technical Advisory Committee and we said if the Planning Commission would like to keep it at 300 feet, we felt that was reasonable as long as we were able to define what "prohibitively expensive" means. That's never been defined in the code. There's a provision that allows a sewer waiver if it's prohibitively expensive.

We looked to an existing code in the County's on-site code which says if you're repairing a system if you're less than 200 feet to sewer, and again this 200 versus 300, this particular code says 200, if you're less than 200 feet you can go ahead and put in another septic system if the cost of sewer is more than twice the cost of a new septic system.

The septic system has to be conforming, it has to meet all the rules and regulations, you can't be breaking any rules which the on-site code does allow in the rural areas you to get waivers for things if you just cannot meet the standards. At the bottom of Page 2 in your yellow highlighted handout Number 3 there at the very bottom contains the existing language about intervening property, contains natural or manmade obstructions, deep canyons, elevation changes --

HOLLEY: Really. Slow down, please.

WILLIAMS: And then staff is recommending that we after "prohibitively expensive," which is at the top of Page 3, put in parenthesis "as defined by Clark County Code 24.17." My only

problem with that is that it could be read that it has to be a obstruction or a deep canyon or an elevation change that's making that expensive.

My original language, which the DEAB liked, broke this out into a separate item and I would just want to clarify that that I don't think that's the intention is that it would be defined only by those specific topographic type things.

BAZALA: Well, I was wondering what other types of things would cause it to be really expensive?

WILLIAMS: Well, just the shear distance. Public sewer it varies on size of pipe, depth, type of street you're in, but if you talk to Clark Regional says on average about 200 feet, \$200 per foot of main line extension. You do a 200-foot extension and you're \$40,000 just for the main line without any connection fees, system development charges, the lateral extension of the property, engineering. We want to be able to look at the cost based on the distance of pipe, not just the fact that there may be obstructions or other contour issues.

WRISTON: So, Mike, I'm confused, are you suggesting striking that provision and just going with the 200 feet?

WILLIAMS: No. I guess maybe, and again I didn't realize this was different than our language until about 20 minutes ago --

WRISTON: Yeah, understood.

WILLIAMS: -- so this is kind of last minute, but the way I read it currently is almost that the two times the cost rule only applies if you have a deep canyon or an elevation change.

WRISTON: I agree.

WILLIAMS: I don't think that was staff's intent. And again this has been kind of last minute and I wouldn't blame you for putting this off. We discussed it at the Technical Advisory Committee meeting yesterday that we felt like maybe we were biting off more than was appropriate for this.

We didn't feel like it was more than what was appropriate because these are things that have been ongoing issues. We didn't know what your feedback was going to be, though, and if you were going to feel this was too much.

There was just one more thing that we had proposed under the wellhead protection areas, which if you look at the red font handout, it's the last sheet under letter B at the bottom, Municipal Wellhead Protection Areas, and staff didn't include this in their latest proposal.

BAZALA: Yeah, I didn't know how to deal with this one at all. I had no help on this one at all.

WILLIAMS: And the idea here was that we would again be able to use the two times the cost rule. Staff is already allowing that as a policy because they felt like that was the intent of the code; however, it does not say that there. The hope there is just to take something that staff already has an unwritten policy about that they're allowing, that they're using, and just put it in the code. So unless there's any questions I will --

DELEISSEGUES: Any questions of Mike? Thank you very much.

WRISTON: Thanks, Mike.

DELEISSEGUES: Okay, back to Mark Collier.

COLLIER: Hello. Mark Collier, ASD2 Collier Septic Consulting and Design. Address P.O. Box 1476, Brush Prairie, 98606. I thought I'd give a little bit of history. I've been involved with this big kind of nicknamed the sewer guidelines and there was sewer guidelines made and then it became codified. Or a lot of it did. At that time I was supervisor at the Health Department and I went into the private sector in 1988, but all the way along I've been involved with all the writing of it and modifications to it.

The big thing Clark County did in 1972, or it might have been '71, is said no subdivisions can go septic in the urban area any longer and that was really at that time very progressive for large counties. Then it came along in the 1980s on a couple of occasions we actually had bans on septic in the urban area and what was happening was it was subdivisions couldn't go septic but short plats and they were just being denied and then they were being appealed to the County Commissioners and every single appeal that I remember participating in, and I was at the Health Department at the time, was said, okay, we should allow septic systems on a very limited basis.

Also the County Commissioners at the time had real concerns not to dilute the comprehensive plan on it and they finally directed the Health Department and the planning staff to come up with the rules we have today or there's a couple of revisions back that have been modified only slightly since then. But mainly it allows septic on a very limited basis where sewer's not available.

There's areas in the county since I've been around sewers not anywhere close to them really, it hasn't really progressed, it's usually brought in by development and areas that haven't had a lot of development it hasn't gotten there and it was felt that these people should be able to at least do something with the property on a limited basis. So it was mainly limited to the limited short platting and existing lots.

Also a criteria is when they're allowed to do this, there are property owners signing a document that's recorded basically acknowledging the septic system uses are temporary pending public sewer and in the code now it says they're required to hook up within 12 months or if local improvement district comes available, they're mainly saying we're voting for

that, we've got to participate into that.

The numbers that we've talked about in the past on the sewer waivers have been in my opinion extremely low when you look at the entire size of the urban area or the population that it's affected where septic systems have been allowed. In the economic good times I can remember one time when this issue came up the Health Department countered maybe a dozen applications a year, the Planning Department may have some more information on that, but whatever the number is it's very low.

The other thing I'd like to point out is what's really changed since the '70s and it's really evolved into septic systems can treat sewage effluent very well and we're using I consider it Nature's way of treating the sewage. If they're sited properly, you have good site evaluation, good design, good installation, the Health Department's rule is inspections and review the plans that we're meeting requirements.

The other thing is proper operation and maintenance. Clark County has a very good or excellent operation maintenance program on it. When we get a septic request in the urban area, if it's within a municipal wellhead protection area we're required to bump it up to a higher category, up as high as a Level B, there's Level A's, B's, C's and D on it, and in my opinion we're bumping up, we're doing an extra assurance there, but is it really needed because we are providing good treatment anyway and I'm not necessarily opposing that at this point.

The 700 gallons, that was very arbitrary. The first time it came out it had no gallons limit, then it went to 1,000 gallons and frankly it got changed to 700 gallons by some County staff with really no input or very poor notification on it and it's really caused a problem because if somebody has a third of an acre lot, they can design a septic system and meet all the requirements in terms of initial backup areas and all that they couldn't do it or it forced homeowners to what I'd say cheat on number of bedrooms because they couldn't meet the flow requirements for a three bedroom because it was 700 gallons per acre per day and on three bedrooms we design at 360, so they'd build two bedrooms and a bonus room and you knew what was going to happen anyway on that.

The comment about going 300 to 200 feet, I can almost promise you if somebody can't afford at 300 feet, you can't afford at 200 feet because of the cost. So I don't think the 200 feet thing would really change the numbers that much, but when you get that rare case when somebody can't do anything with their property, you meet all the Health Department's, they acknowledge it's temporary pending public sewer, that's a very hard thing for somebody to swallow.

The big thing is I don't think it's really diluting the comprehensive land use plan. A lot of times it's somebody has a rear parcel, they know what the zoning is and they are careful on where they want to place the house on it so they can do further development if possible on it so I think the impact is very minimum on it.

I think Mike did an excellent job on how he addressed some of the inconsistencies in the rules

and I think if we can just get it more consistent to it, it would be better. Before we can do a perk test or turn in the application before we get approval from the Health Department, we have to go through the Type I review with the Planning Department and that process has worked fairly well on that.

To have the review, to acknowledge that we are in the urban area and we want to make sure that there's really no development imminent to be public services happening in there and if that's not the case let's allow very limited type septic use. I don't know if there's any questions or that's kind of the historical background anyway.

DELEISSEGUES: Thank you. I think you've just about convinced me anyway that we can't deal with this tonight, there's so many things to consider. As you say, a lot of the information's come in at the last minute and I'm not sure it's a minor policy change anymore, it sounds pretty major, there's a lot of implications for other consideration.

WRISTON: Yeah. Along those lines can I ask a question though?

DELEISSEGUES: Sure.

WRISTON: When you sit up here on the Planning Commission and look at this stuff, I think a lot of times we tend to think of, I'm not going to speak for everyone else, but I'll tend to think of new homes or new duplexes or new whatever, but this actually has a huge affect on existing residences as well I believe.

I guess what I'm getting at is I had a friend that was searching for a house for a long time and he finally found the perfect house and I think it was a foreclosure or a short sale or something, it was something typical in this economic environment, and it was on septic but they wanted to do an addition.

I think they wanted to add a bedroom or something like that and of course that triggered this flow requirement that you're talking about and then they got into this whole 300-foot deal. It was up on the hill up above Lakeshore and they worked their way out of it, but I remember he called me and it was really frustrating and it affects existing, doesn't it, if you want to make a renovation or if you're doing something?

BAZALA: Yeah, if you want to add a bedroom.

WRISTON: If you want to add a bedroom, you trigger the sewer requirement; right?

BAZALA: Yes. If you're just replacing your failed system my understanding is that the rule is still at 200, that's what County code says.

WRISTON: I think it's important for everyone to understand that that we're not just talking about development and developers and new homes, this is a huge thing for existing homes

and this inventory out there that we're dealing with, this inventory and shadow inventory of foreclosed, and then I don't know, Mark, if you want to comment on that?

COLLIER: Yes. On repairs, this doesn't apply to repairs. On your case of an expansion I can remember a client that I had one time wanted to take an existing house --

HOLLEY: Could you use the microphone, please.

COLLIER: Okay. That I had a client one time that wanted to use an existing house and convert it to an adult care facility.

DELEISSEGUES: Is that microphone even on?

COLLIER: I had a client one time that wanted to use it as an adult care facility and we could design him a system and meet all the requirements and be conforming, but we just couldn't meet the 700 gallon requirement on it.

WRISTON: Right. And/or you have to or they may be within 298 feet or whatever.

COLLIER: Yeah, if you're within 298 feet. The other thing to keep in mind many of the sewer agencies require you don't construct the sewer to the property line, you take it across the frontage of the property too, so that even makes it worse. And usually if I'm just taking it to the line it's 200 feet away it's cost prohibitive too.

WRISTON: This particular friend ran into that, I think again he got out of it.

COLLIER: And it's been frustrating to me --

DELEISSEGUES: Did he get his question answered?

WRISTON: Well, go ahead.

COLLIER: Yeah, it's been frustrating. When we had the gallonage requirement, I knew I could design a good system there, the Health Department knew it, we just couldn't do it.

WRISTON: Yeah, I did and that was a question, I got a call, I didn't know the exact answer.

DELEISSEGUES: Any other questions of Mark? Okay, thank you.

COLLIER: Thank you.

DELEISSEGUES: That's the last name I have on the sign-up sheet. Anyone else in the audience wish to testify? Okay, seeing none, we'll return it. What I would like to do is take these things by group, like 1 through 8 which are supposed to be scrivener's errors and have

a vote on that and then 6 through 14 on clarifications and then 15 to 17 which was supposed to be code interpretations I guess.

BARCA: Mr. Chair, could I make perhaps an alternate proposal by polling the Commission to see if people have problems with staff recommendations on particular items and let's see how many we actually have that are contentious?

DELEISSEGUES: Okay. Well, let's go down 1 through 8, does anybody have any problems with the scrivener errors?

GIZZI: No.

DELEISSEGUES: Okay.

WRISTON: Hang on.

DELEISSEGUES: We'll vote on them all at the same time then.

BARCA: That's what I'm hoping to get to. Perhaps we have to modify --

GIZZI: So I'd make a motion that we table 28 for a later date and then talk about voting on the rest of them as a whole.

DELEISSEGUES: Well, are there any other problems before we get to 28 for some of the rest of them?

BARCA: Let's see if we can do it in a single block.

GIZZI: Sure. I'll withdraw my motion.

DELEISSEGUES: Well, no, that's okay. How about 9 through 14, do we got any problems with any of those?

GIZZI: No.

DELEISSEGUES: 15 through 17, reference updates?

GIZZI: No.

DELEISSEGUES: That's pretty straightforward. Code interpretations, 18 through 20?

GIZZI: No.

DELEISSEGUES: Okay. Then we get to minor policy changes.

WRISTON: Hang on, please. I'm sorry.

QUTUB: I'm having trouble finding this in my --

DELEISSEGUES: It's back there somewhere.

GIZZI: Which?

BARCA: Yeah, it's right behind --

DELEISSEGUES: It's right after this green sheet.

BARCA: -- right behind the green sheet.

DELEISSEGUES: It's right after this.

BARCA: It's right at the very beginning of our process.

WRISTON: Mr. Chair?

DELEISSEGUES: Yes, sir.

WRISTON: You got to give me, unfortunately I didn't, you're kind of whipping through the --

BARCA: You're right there, buddy.

WRISTON: No, I know. You're whipping through the table and I took my notes on the code so I'm flipping through these pages as quick as I can. There was someone brought up something about the maximum average number of trips, I think that was you, Dick, not to put words in your mouth, but you're not worried about that but --

DELEISSEGUES: I just --

WRISTON: Yeah. But are we on code interpretations?

DELEISSEGUES: -- don't know how they're going to deal with that.

WRISTON: Where are we now?

BARCA: I think that's where we stopped was --

DELEISSEGUES: 14 through 15, yeah.

WRISTON: Okay, 14 through 15, thank you. I'm caught up. Thank you.

DELEISSEGUES: Any other problems with that, ten percent or less increase trip generation in the rural center?

GIZZI: No.

DELEISSEGUES: If none, minor policy changes then, 21 through 31.

WRISTON: No. I thought you were at 14 through 15 or something.

DELEISSEGUES: We were.

WRISTON: Okay. But now wait a second.

COOK: He was at Page 14 and 15.

WRISTON: Oh, you're on page, I thought you were on, okay. You're on page, okay, code interpretations.

GIZZI: Now we just moved to code interpretations Item Number 18, 18 through 20.

WRISTON: Okay. But we almost moved to minor policy changes.

GIZZI: We hadn't moved there yet.

WRISTON: We hadn't moved there yet. We suggested "existing" be put in under 19.2.e(4), existing structures, increasing by more than 50 percent just to clarify that, we had a fair amount of discussion. Or not a fair amount, but we had some discussion on that.

DELEISSEGUES: Anything on Item Number 20?

WRISTON: Thank you for that.

BARCA: No.

WRISTON: No.

DELEISSEGUES: Okay. Then we move to minor policy changes Item Number 21, expansion of cemeteries.

BARCA: No.

DELEISSEGUES: 22.

BARCA: No.

QUTUB: No.

DELEISSEGUES: 23, dental offices.

GIZZI: That was modified to be dental and medical; correct?

DELEISSEGUES: I think so.

BARCA: Yes.

GIZZI: No, no issues.

DELEISSEGUES: Okay. 24, commercial uses which allow residential uses.

BARCA: No.

DELEISSEGUES: 25, outdoor storage, outdoor/indoor.

WRISTON: Yeah.

BARCA: With staff to clarify the meaning of "outdoor."

DELEISSEGUES: Yes.

WRISTON: They were to clarify it to allow covered I guess but not on all four sides or something.

BARCA: We'll get them to clarify it.

DELEISSEGUES: Okay?

BARCA: Yep.

DELEISSEGUES: 26.

QUTUB: Excuse me, allow but not require?

WRISTON: Yes, that's correct.

DELEISSEGUES: 26, irrigation systems.

BARCA: No.

DELEISSEGUES: Nothing? 27, flexibility to landscape code.

GIZZI: No.

BARCA: Here it is, Jim.

DELEISSEGUES: Here you go, Jim, 28.

WRISTON: Go, Jim, go.

GIZZI: Well, I couldn't even begin to say what it is that we would be approving so I'd make a motion that we just table Number 28 for a later meeting and that will give staff a chance to get the notes collated and put in the proper order for us.

DELEISSEGUES: We'll add that to the overall motion.

BARCA: So that will be a part of the motion, right.

DELEISSEGUES: 29.

WRISTON: Since he made a motion can I ask for a --

DELEISSEGUES: "Authorized representative" was added to that.

WRISTON: No, on 28, so we as Planning Commission because there were two issues here. There were, one, does it belong in here --

DELEISSEGUES: Right.

WRISTON: -- and, two, if it does belong, then we table it. So is the Planning Commission agreeing it belongs in here?

DELEISSEGUES: Well, I don't think it does.

GIZZI: I don't think it does. I think it needs to be revised and revisited at a later date.

WRISTON: At a later date separately from -- okay.

GIZZI: Correct.

WRISTON: Just not coming back as a --

BARCA: Right.

WRISTON: -- biannual code change or whatever it would be.

BARCA: It would be removed and considered separately.

WRISTON: That's just a clarification. Thank you.

DELEISSEGUES: Okay. 29 we heard that we suggested to add "or authorized representative" instead of the owner.

BARCA: Per the DEAB request, yeah.

DELEISSEGUES: Right. Anything else on 29? 30, drive-through facilities.

GIZZI: No issues.

BARCA: Nope.

DELEISSEGUES: And then last, 31.

BARCA: Yes.

DELEISSEGUES: Go ahead.

BARCA: I have an item on 31. When it comes to the maximum activity area at the bottom end of the lot size two percent ranges between roughly 2,000 to 4,000-square feet and I would like to propose the modification to just make that lot size category just 4,000-square feet giving the high end of the available and not using the two percent number because I think 2,000-square feet is needlessly prohibitive.

DELEISSEGUES: Discussion on that?

WRISTON: Well, I think I like it.

DELEISSEGUES: I think I like it.

USKOSKI: I believe I do too.

DELEISSEGUES: I think I like it.

WRISTON: It came from Ron so I'm not quite sure, but I think I do.

QUTUB: You're saying from the --

BARCA: Striking the --

QUTUB: -- from the 10 to 15 acre 4,000-square feet?

BARCA: No.

QUTUB: All of these are to be 4,000?

BARCA: No. In the lot size criteria the two and a half to five --

QUTUB: Yes.

BARCA: -- striking the two percent parcel size and maximum activity area would be 4,000-square feet because that is the high end value at the five-acre parcel size.

QUTUB: Oh.

DELEISSEGUES: Which is the minimum in the rural area anyway five acres.

GIZZI: So your proposed change only affects two and a half to five acres --

BARCA: Exactly.

GIZZI: -- and you're being more generous in regards to the maximum activity area?

BARCA: Yeah, for the parcels under five acres, that's correct.

DELEISSEGUES: Does someone want to make a motion?

GIZZI: We already have a motion on the floor.

DELEISSEGUES: Oh, no. We're going to incorporate yours into an overall thought. I thought you withdrew it, Jim?

WRISTON: I thought it was just on 28.

GIZZI: Let's finish our notes and we'll just move on.

BARCA: I think that was the last on the notes.

DELEISSEGUES: We're finished.

BARCA: What if we try the motion to accept staff recommendation for the biannual code change items with the exception of the noted withdrawal of Item 28 to be handled separately and for the text changes that were proposed to staff for, what was it, I've got 29 and 31. Were there other text changes?

GIZZI: Yes. We had --

WRISTON: 19.

GIZZI: -- allow covered for Item 25. On 19 we had the addition of existing buildings. On 29 we had authorized signer. And on 31 we had the 4,000-foot square feet.

COOK: 29 is in the addendum.

BARCA: Yes, so it's already covered.

COOK: Yeah, it's covered.

BARCA: Right. So those are the --

DELEISSEGUES: That sounds pretty good.

BARCA: So those are the exceptions.

GIZZI: I'd second that.

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

QUTUB: Is there going to be a time certain for the revisiting of Number 28?

BARCA: I don't want a time certain.

BAZALA: I don't know if something's going to come from the Health Department, possibly. I don't really know if there's any plans on that.

BARCA: I'm not asking for that.

DELEISSEGUES: Any other questions, comments, discussion? If not, roll call, please.

GIZZI: AYE

BARCA: AYE

USKOSKI: AYE

QUTUB: AYE

WRISTON: AYE

DELEISSEGUES: AYE

DELEISSEGUES: That concludes our discussion on the items for tonight.

Is there any old business? New business?

OLD BUSINESS

None.

NEW BUSINESS

None.

COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION

None.

DELEISSEGUES: We're adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

The hearing adjourned at 9:50 P.M. All proceedings of tonite's hearing can be found on the Clark County web page at:

<http://www.clark.wa.gov/planning/commission.html>

Chair

Date

*Minutes Transcribes by:
Cindy Holley, Court Reporter
Sonja Wisner, Administrative Assistant*