

**Development and Engineering Advisory Board Meeting**  
**May 1, 2014**  
**2:30-4:00 p.m.**  
**Public Service Center**

Board members in attendance: Steve Bacon, Ott Gaither, Eric Golemo, Andrew Gunther, Don Hardy, Jamie Howsley, Mike Odren, Terry Wollam, Jeff Wriston

Board members not in attendance:

County staff: Gary Albrecht, Don Benton, Brent Davis, Jane Kleiner, Laurie Lebowsky, David Jardin, Diana Nutt, Ali Safayi, Steve Schulte, Greg Shafer, Holly St. Pierre, Ron Wierenga

**Administrative Actions**

- Introductions
- Welcome new member – Terry Wollam
- DEAB meeting is being recorded and the audio will be posted on the DEAB’s website.
- Review/Adopt minutes – April minutes - there was a motion to approve and adopt. Minutes amended, approved & adopted.
- Review upcoming events
  - BOCC Work Session – Clark County Stormwater Manual & Municipal Code Update – Wednesday, May 14, 11:15 a.m.
  - BOCC Hearing – 1) Population and Employment Allocation; 2) Marijuana-related Facilities – Tuesday, May 27, 10:00 a.m.
  - BOCC Work Session – Clean Water Commission Annual Report Presentation – Wednesday, May 28, 10:30 a.m.
  - PC Work Session – CPZ2014-00003 - NE 10th Avenue, Clark Regional Waste Water District, Washougal UGA Removal, and Arterial Atlas/Fifth Plain Creek Area – Thursday, May 1, 5:30 p.m.
  - PC Hearing – Open Space & Timberland Applications, CPZ2014-00003 - NE 10th Avenue, Clark Regional Waste Water District, and Washougal UGA Removal – Thursday, May 15, 6:30 p.m..
  - DEAB Annual Report to BOCC - Wednesday, June 4<sup>th</sup>, 10:00 a.m.
- Correspondences – None
- DEAB member announcements - None

**Concurrency Ordinance Updates and Q&A**

Laurie Lebowsky from Community Planning presented this topic. Steve Schulte, David Jardin and Gary Albrecht have been working with Laurie on a project to simplify and streamline the concurrency code as well as the capital facilities plan (CFP). Traffic Impact Fee (TIF) rates will decrease when a revised CFP is adopted later this year. (TIF rates were not part of this discussion. They will be addressed later.) *Guiding principles -Concurrency* (slide) was reviewed. One of these is to shape a more predictable program. One option to simplify is automating the monitoring of congestion. We have some projects in collaboration with the state for signal monitoring. *Key elements of the update* (slide) - CFP revision was based on the Office of Finance

Management's (OFM) medium projection of 1.12% population growth this year. This was also adopted by the BOCC recently. Our CFP is a twenty-year planning horizon as required by statewide growth management. The biggest change to concurrency is from the standard of travel speeds and times in the corridors to a volume-to-measurement or a volume-to-capacity (VTC) ratio. This would be a measure of length. In order to ensure safety and capacity is preserved at intersections, specific language in code addresses intersection safety. Ott Gaither asked if VTC is a common industry standard accepted by agencies. Laurie Lebowsky and Steve Schulte explained it is used by City of Vancouver, Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT), Regional Transportation Council (RTC) as well as other jurisdictions. Annually, the RTC relays the congestion monitoring report to the county. Ott Gaither asked if VTC is a lowering or an increase of the standard. Steve Schulte commented this is a completely different measurement tool. For instance, in the old model, delay times in intersections were monitored travel times and travel speeds in corridors for both directions were measured. The most congested direction of travel is used for measurement. Also, lengths of segments between intersections are measured. However, intersection mobility standards or safety net standards—these bare minimums for safety are being carried forward in the code. The VTC ratio is easier to understand for the non-engineer. Each classification of roadway has its own design capacity. This model will make it easier for the county to interface with RTC in long-term modeling. David Jardin explained the county will maintain a model to track current development, in process development, traffic, existing and future conditions. An annual report will be produced. Eric Golemo asked if this meant the level of service (LOS) is tracked plus capacity of corridors or is this LOS significantly different from what is happening now. David Jardin explained that the LOS at intersections will remain unchanged. Instead of monitoring the miles-per-hour threshold, at the beginning of each year, the county will assess the existing volumes and compare them to the capacity that's allowed. These are already included in traffic studies; it's not an extra level of analysis. Eric Golemo asked if this meant there would be less of a chance of mitigation if there is a failing movement at an intersection. Steve Schulte answered that safety standards are not changing—they are national. We are retaining our mobility standards for intersections. What's changing is monitoring corridor travel times, travel speeds minutes and seconds and going to VC ratios. We cannot speculate if one is more demanding than another. There are no differences in traffic studies. Ott Gaither asked if it would be possible to run a model. Steve Schulte said it's possible, however what's happened is a new growth rate, 1.12% has been utilized that is lower than the rate from 2007. Therefore, the CFP is reduced dramatically. The BOCC approves of the VTC ratio and the downsized CFP. This way there will be county funds available to mitigate failures.

CFP: Range of revenue projected is \$510-\$540 million. List of projects for CFP was displayed with maps. Staff will develop criteria for what kind of facility will qualify for funds. The CFP is more fluid and flexible. County funds will be allocated out over time. Steve Schulte explained the Urban Development Road Program is unallocated funds that could be utilized for job creation. 2007 CFP costs were reduced by 30% TIFs will decrease by that same percentage rate. This will be adopted with the Supplemental Budget in November of this year. However, it could be changed based on the Comprehensive Plan update. Next steps: Laurie Lebowsky will present update at June 5<sup>th</sup> DEAB meeting. Will present to PC work session on evening of June 5<sup>th</sup>. The PC Hearing is July 17<sup>th</sup>. BOCC Hearing is August 19<sup>th</sup> – both CFP and Concurrency updates will

be discussed. Concurrency changes are eligible to be adopted at that time. CFP changes will wait for adoption until the supplemental budget November 4<sup>th</sup>. The new CFP will be effective November 4<sup>th</sup>.

Next steps for DEAB: PC would like comments in advance of their June 5<sup>th</sup> meeting. Mike Odren suggested that the board take time before June 5<sup>th</sup> meeting to review the proposed code changes provided by Laurie Lebowsky.

A motion was made by Eric Golemo that due to predictability, simplicity and possible TIF reductions, DEAB supports the changes to the county's transportation program and CFP. It was seconded and approved.

An Amendment to the motion was suggested by Jamie Howsley. Any comments on concurrency code language should be sent to Community Planning staff by May 16<sup>th</sup> to be included in the Planning Commission packets. Motion was seconded and approved.

### **Stormwater Manual Ordinance Updates and Q&A**

Ron Wierenga and Rod Swanson presented updates to the Stormwater manual project. The process has been ongoing for the last 15 months. Several DEAB members participate on the technical and stakeholder advisory committees. The chief task in updating the manual is incorporating the Department of Ecology's minimum requirements. It needs to be equivalent with the state's manual. For example the same BMPs they use as well as the same design standards, etc. The decision was made at the beginning of the project to create an entirely new, rather than updated manual. The draft manual is out for public comment. The comment period ends next week. There are few comments at this time. The draft needs to be finalized by mid-June in order to submit on time to the state for the equivalency determination. After state's evaluation, the county has until July 1, 2015 to adopt it. Therefore, this will not be the only public comment period. Changes will continue through the next year. There will be further work to do in determining how to insert the manual in the engineering and application review process. There will be a lot of external and internal training. Nine minimum requirements that must match the state's manual. There are minor changes to eight of the nine. Requirement #5 is most changed— Onsite stormwater management. This regards using low impact development BMPs to the extent possible on a project. The thresholds are very small and must be considered on virtually every development project. These practices include considering infiltration, disbursement and containing runoff on the site. Larger projects that trigger all the minimum requirements, performance standards can be used or a choice can be made from the list. However, it is a different list than the one used for small projects. The main difference is that permeable pavement has a priority over bio retention. There are infeasibility tests, yes or no questions or specific onsite management questions. The lists are longer. If you're using the performance standard you do not need to use the BMP list in any particular order. There are no economic infeasibility criteria currently. Possibly comments will be submitted on this. The challenge would be to submit a justification for this and have DOE approve it. Some infeasibility criteria are very vague. Two of the other minimum requirements, treatment (pollution removal) and flow control; those will not go away. Requirement #5 makes selection of site even more important.

Jamie Howsley asked about the past practice of groundwater testing being held in abeyance until the winter months. Ron Wierenga responded that we've seen too many failed infiltration facilities to not continue to hold to this standard. It was suggested this could be mitigated at times with county historical data. Also, groundwater elevation maps could be utilized to discover if testing could occur at a different time. The new Stormwater manual will apply to all applications filed after July 1, 2015. Further discussion will be needed about the description of an application. Still figuring out how these requirements apply to contingent vesting at time of pre-application. Work session scheduled with BOCC on May 14<sup>th</sup>. Mike Odren suggested comments regarding vesting, phasing issues and the meaning of an application might be the most pertinent. If you would like to submit comments for the work session please summarize and get to staff by end of next week. If there are more after this week they will be considered, just not for this draft.

### **2015-2016 Priorities**

So far only Ott Gaither and Eric Golemo have submitted ideas.

- 60-day permits
- Plat alteration
- Stormwater
- Permit consolidation
- Updates on fee holiday
- Concurrency
- Final site plan
- Bi-annuals
- Grading, erosion & control inspection fees
- LEAN process
- Staffing levels
- Permit Center wait times
- Technology aspects county could utilize - Skyping, inspections, Permit Center upgrades

Send comments on this to Mike Odren [via email](#) before our next meeting. He will work with Helen to put together to review before next BOCC meeting.

### **Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

Meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

Meeting minutes prepared by: Holly St. Pierre

Reviewed by: Greg Shafer

Adopted date: June 5, 2014