

**Development and Engineering Advisory Board Meeting**  
**January 2, 2014**  
**1:00-3:00 p.m.**  
**Public Service Center**

Board members in attendance: Steve Bacon, Don Hardy, Ott Gaither, Eric Golemo, Andrew Gunther, James Howsley, Mike Odren

Board members not in attendance: Helen Devery

County staff: Gary Albrecht, Pete Capell, Chuck Crider, Brent Davis, Mike Mabrey, Diana Nutt, Ali Safayi, Holly St. Pierre, Steve Schulte, Rod Swanson, Ron Wierenga

**Administrative Actions**

- Introduction of Audience Members
- DEAB meeting is being recorded and it was understood they were being posted to the county's website. Ali Safayi commented that past minutes have not been posted to the county's website, but will look into correcting this for future meetings.
- Review/Adopt Minutes: Minutes from December 2013 were approved and adopted with Ott Gaither and James Howsley abstaining.
- Reviewed Upcoming Events:
  - BOCC Hearing – Traffic Impact Fees Rate Lock Extension – Tuesday, January 7, 6:00 p.m.
  - BOCC Hearing - Biannual Code Update – January 14, 10:00 a.m.
  - BOCC Work Session – Surface Mining Overlay – January 15, 10:00 a.m.
  - PC Work Session – Comp Plan: Issue Papers, Commerce Checklist, & Public Participation Plan – Thursday, January 16, 5:30 p.m.
  - PC Work Session – Comp Plan: Issue Paper-Allocation & County-Wide Planning Policies; I-502 Marijuana Facilities – Thursday, February 6, 5:30 p.m.
- Correspondences – TIF Rate Lock Extensions
- DEAB Member announcements: none

**DEAB Officers – Election of Chair and Vice Chair**

Mike Odren was elected Chair and Andrew Gunther was elected Vice Chair.

**DEAB Vacancies**

Mike Bomar's position is vacant and there is potential for another vacancy. Jeff Wriston and Terry Wollam have expressed interest.

It is possible Mike Bomar's position must be filled by a contractor. Ali will research this. There are also at-large positions. These are flexible and based on the current agenda.

All interested candidates should fill out a letter of intent and submit with a resume to Jennifer Clark.

### **Concurrency and Comp Plan Updates**

Steve Schulte gave the update. Currently, waiting on the BOCC to schedule a worksession or Board Time to discuss staff's work to date.

Comp Plan - The county has selected a population growth rate projection for the upcoming Comp Plan update-which is consistent with the "2035 slower growth scenario" that our team has been using. The BOCC has committed to this as well.

Concurrency – The move towards 90% volume/capacity ratio standard for roadway segments has resulted in considerably fewer capital project needs in the next 20 years. We will work with community to come up with an appropriate theoretical capacity. We currently use corridor traffic speed time standard. We're getting away from measuring delay time in intersections. Capital project needs plus safety, bridge and other projects and allowances for future concurrency needs still results in a reduced 20 year CFP cost. This could also reduce TIF rates as well as provide fewer TIF credits. Also will adopt "safety net" mobility standards for individual intersections. Industry safety standards, such as MUTCD signal warrants, will still be in place.

Question – Clark County's share in the gas tax is roughly only 3%. Why isn't a higher percentage contributed to our roads? Schulte - Commissioners have sent a letter and visited Olympia to communicate our interests. It is hard to carve out local road money. It is slated for state highway projects like 501, 502 and 503.

Question- Do you foresee changes to traffic impact sub areas? Schulte – Staff's preference is to leave districting the same. Changes present challenges to existing TIF credits quoted to developers. At least one Commissioner would like to see one countywide TIF rate.

Question - How soon after meeting with BOCC would you be able to release the new CFP? Once it's discussed at work session, we can release it relatively quickly.

### **Update on Final Plat Process**

Chuck Crider and Dianna Nutt provided an update. They have submitted test documents to the applicant and so far have received no feedback from her. We have finished the first review, but nothing heard back from her. The applicant is very experienced in the process. Chuck and Diana will be back in February to report further.

### **Pete Capell's last day**

Pete Capell's last day at the county is tomorrow. Mike Odren recognized his service at the county and communicated appreciation for his time spent in educating the DEAB.

### **LID Report**

Ron Wierenga gave a PowerPoint presentation regarding the status of Low Impact Development.

In the process of updating development codes and stormwater manual, two committees have been set up – ad hoc and technical advisory. Members of the BOCC have been asked to participate on the TAC. There is also a stakeholders group.

Question – Who issues the NPDES Phase I Municipal Permit to Clark County?

The Department of Ecology issues that to Clark County. They are the delegated authority by the Federal government to implement the Clean Water Act in this state. Our most recent permit was issued in 2012 with an effective date of August 2013.

We started at a high level with our Board to create a vision and mission to update our codes and manuals.

#### Mission

Create stormwater management regulations that comply with state and federal regulations while being flexible and tailored to multiple project types including making low-impact development the approach for stormwater management.

#### Goals

- Our #1 goal is to comply and do whatever we can to make the regulations easy and efficient for builders and applicants.
- The second goal is to meet permit deadlines for updating development codes in our design manual. Need to have a draft design manual and draft development codes to the Department of Ecology by the end of June 2014 for their review and to receive comments and approval. Once approval is received, we have until July 1, 2015 to put codes into effect.
- Another goal is to develop an integrated set of development codes that protect surface and groundwater from stormwater runoff. We're taking a holistic view as to how stormwater codes factor into our current development codes .
- Tailor feasibility requirements . The permit requirements are prescriptive, but we see opportunities to tailor those.
- Create single stormwater manual for our development projects.
- Create a small projects manual for things like single-family residential.
- Streamline application and review processes. May shift some design to earlier in the development process.
- Engage internal and external stakeholders and provide sufficient training and education for staff and public.

#### Components

- Review the entire Title 40 to identify barriers to making LID the primary method we use for managing runoff. We're ahead of the March 2016 deadline.
- Update codes based on barriers identified.

- Stormwater manual rewrite. We currently have a solid draft for each chapter. We will have it ready for public review by mid-March.
- Public outreach

#### Code Barriers to LID

We've created four groups.

- Those that impose or encourage impervious surfaces.
- Create an incompatible design standard.
- Procedural obstacles – those processes that are inefficient
- Encourages removal or discourages restoration of native vegetation

Question – What encourages removal?

Density is a factor. Requiring applicants to have certain portions of land landscaped when completed might encourage removal of native vegetation.

Question – Could there be a form-based code that comes out of this to allow flexibility and allows zoning standards.

We have not identified form-based code as a solution so far.

Comment – This pushes density out to other areas and makes it difficult to meet comp plan goals. Urban growth boundary must increase more quickly. Possibly a feasibility criteria could be if you are in an urban growth boundary there are enough environmental benefits to increasing the density in the area to offset negative impacts.

Plan developments, cluster, or change zoning could address this, but this sometimes runs against community interest.

Sixty barriers of the above four groups were identified. Seventeen were identified as “hard barriers” or those that need to be addressed immediately. There were none in our transportation standard. Most were in parking, landscaping and screening. Several reports have been written on the result of this analysis. We can make them available to you if you haven't seen them. We took three case studies of recent development cases and ran them under the new standard. There were no new barriers we encountered. That report is available as well. Possible solutions to the seventeen hard barriers are:

- Adjusting setback requirements
- Adjusting widths of pavement
- Tweaking landscape requirements
- Parking and loading calculations
- Transportation and circulation to be reviewed later– we're working with Community Planning on this

Design Manual

Reorganized to be similar to the state's but organized in a way that makes sense to us. Divided into four books.

Book 1 – Designer's Manual - six chapters

- o Determining applicable submittal requirements
- o Treatment
- o Flow control
- o Conveyance and offsite analysis
- o Construction and erosion control
- o Administration and finance

Book 2 – Best Management Practices design sheets and standard details.

Book 3 – Pollution Source Control (for business operators) – post construction.

Book 4 – Operations and maintenance – maintenance standard reference for inspections. How-to procedures for stakeholders, such as property management companies and HOAs.

Final code and stormwater program updates will be effective June 30, 2015.

Question – Are all counties on this schedule?

No. Only Phase 1 counties and Clark is a phase 1 county. Phase 2 counties and cities have one year more. Question – Do you have a general schedule or scheduled milestones for people to check in and see?

Yes. We have a detailed task list that changes every 3 days. We're happy to provide that.

**Public Comment**

January 8<sup>th</sup> – Board work session on I-502.

Meeting adjourned at 2:35 p.m.

Meeting minutes prepared by: Holly St. Pierre

Reviewed by: Ali Safayi