

CLARK COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of Public Hearing
Thursday, August 20, 2015

Public Services Center
BOCC Hearing Room
1300 Franklin Street, 6th Floor
Vancouver, Washington
6:30 p.m.

CALL TO ORDER

MORASCH: All right. Well, welcome to the August 20, 2015, Planning Commission hearing. Can we have the roll call, please.

MORASCH: HERE
WRIGHT: HERE
BARCA: HERE
QUIRING: HERE
JOHNSON: HERE
BLUM: HERE
BENDER: HERE

Staff Present: Chris Cook, Prosecuting Attorney; Laurie Lebowsky, Planner III; Gary Albrecht, Planner II; Kathy Schroader, Office Assistant; and Cindy Holley, Court Reporter.

GENERAL & NEW BUSINESS

A. Approval of Agenda for August 20, 2015

MORASCH: All right. Moving on to approval of the agenda, can I get a motion to approve the agenda.

BLUM: Move to approve.

JOHNSON: Second.

MORASCH: All in favor?

EVERYBODY: AYE

MORASCH: Opposed? Motion carries.

B. Approval of Minutes for July 16, 2015

MORASCH: Has everyone had a chance to review the minutes? Are there any comments on the minutes? Hearing none, I'd take a motion to approve the minutes.

BARCA: Motion to approve.

BLUM: Second.

MORASCH: All in favor?

EVERYBODY: AYE

MORASCH: Opposed? Motion carries.

C. Communications from the Public

MORASCH: All right. Now we're at the time on our agenda for communications from the public on items not on our scheduled agenda. Is there anyone in the public that would like to speak to the Planning Commission tonight on a matter that's not on our printed agenda?

Okay. Well, seeing no one, we will go ahead and move on to our first agenda item which is public hearing on the Clark County Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Plan. I think we're ready for the staff report.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS & PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION:

A. CPZ2015-00001: Clark County Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Plan

The Clark County Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Plan (PROS) is the guiding document for the Greater Clark Parks Department regarding provision of parks, recreational facilities, open space, and trails. Per the State of Washington Growth Management Act (GMA) 36.70A requirements, this parks master plan contains the following elements: designation of the general location and extent of land uses including recreation and open space lands; identification of useful lands for recreation, including wildlife habitat, trails, and connection of critical areas; estimation of park and recreation demand for at least a 10-year period; and both a six-year and 20-year capital facilities plan.

The County is adopting this plan now because the Greater Clark Parks Department was created in 2014, so the current parks master plan is no longer applicable. The County must adopt a parks plan to be eligible for grants from the state Recreation and Conservation Office.

Staff Contact: Laurie Lebowsky, Planner III
Email: Laurie.Lebowsky@clark.wa.gov
Phone: (360) 397-2280 Ext.4544

LEBOWSKY: Thank you, Commissioners.

MORASCH: Thank you.

LEBOWSKY: Name is Laurie Lebowsky with Community Planning. I would like to start out tonight, I'm going to have help in presenting the parks master plan to the Planning Commission. To my left is Bill Bjerke. He's the Clark County Parks Manager. To my right is Barbara Anderson. She is a Parks Advisory Board co-chair. And then we have Kelly Puntenev who's the other Parks Advisory Board co-chair. In the audience we have Jean Akers. She's the consultant with Conservation Technix who helped prepare the parks master plan. I would ask anyone who's with the Parks Advisory Board to raise your hand or stand up if you're in the audience.

KEEN: I'm Marsha Keen, and I served on the board.

MORASCH: Welcome.

LEBOWSKY: Okay. Next slide. Commissioners, briefly just want to give you some background on why we're here tonight and have the parks draft parks master plan before you. 2014 Clark County Parks, we separated from Vancouver-Clark Parks Department. So the previous plan, parks plan we had adopted is no longer relevant. And also, we are currently not eligible for State parks grants because we do not have a parks plan.

And if you recall last month, there was an article in the Columbian regarding there was some grant funding that was awarded to different agencies, including the City of Vancouver, Port of Camas/Washougal and Department of Natural Resources. They were for trails projects. It was about \$3 million as I said. The County couldn't apply for that grant funding because we didn't have a parks plan which is required by the State.

In addition to the County parks division that was created last year, we also created the County Parks Advisory Board in 2014, and the Parks Advisory Board is a diverse group of volunteers. They have been instrumental in the development of this parks master plan.

And with that, I will turn over the presentation to Barbara Anderson.

ANDERSON: Next slide, please. On this slide you will see some feedback from the extensive outreach that was done. We had a multifaceted approach to our outreach. There were specific stakeholder meetings with user groups, such as the sports fields, neighborhood alliances, the bike and pedestrian group. We also had a web survey as well as going out to local areas and inviting the general public to come and speak to us.

And through all of these meetings, there were a couple of pretty specific outcomes that repeated themselves time and again, and you'll find that the top three bullets on this slide identify the most frequent comments or perceptions that we heard back from these individuals.

And that is, first and foremost, that despite the economic downturn and the slow build-out of parks, our residents still believe that Clark County is doing a really good job in provisioning parks and recreation services to them. They also have a strong belief that the park system

is a major contributor to the positive economic, environmental and health outcomes of Clark County.

And the one issue that repeated itself as the very highest priority was an interest in seeing our trail system interconnections built and trailheads supported. So you'll see that within our plan, it reflects this high priority that our residents placed on the trails and trail connections.

Now, the public also made a pretty strong voice in what they felt was a need for more amenities and access and connections to facilities. And the one area that we seem to be falling down a little bit that we need to really step up on is doing enhanced communications and outreach. And the reason I say we are falling down is because we're still kind of back in the 20th century.

We need to bring to the new technology to our residents. There would be a wonderful use for an app for your mobile phones to find a park or a specific amenity. We need to take and replicate some of the things that we previously offered but are no longer there, such as the web service that easily locates trails and parks with specific amenities identified. So we've acknowledged that, and that is reflected in our plan as well. And with that, I'm going to turn it over to Kelly.

PUNTENEY: As Barbara mentioned, we had --

ANDERSON: Oh, next slide, please.

PUNTENEY: Oh. As Barbara mentioned, we had the open houses all throughout the county. We had stakeholder interviews. We had the parks board meetings. We had the surveys went out, and we did, I felt, a pretty decent job in outreach for this plan. We heard hundreds of topics within that outreach, and we broke those up into three categories; that was partnerships, connecting the gaps and increasing accessibility.

So within partnerships, we heard a lot of information about wanting to empower volunteers. Of course, that's something we believe strongly in any way. We also are encouraging ourselves to be partners with our other cities within the county and other nonprofit and our business community.

Connecting the gaps, as you know we've been working on trails for years, but we are down to connecting those gaps now and we've got to continue working hard to do that. We've done kind of low-hanging fruit at this point, but we've got to really keep moving on connecting those pieces of the trail.

And then, of course, increasing our access to our park system, as Barbara just mentioned. We definitely need to continue to promote the system and to make sure that the public knows that we are out there and we have these parks. If people aren't aware of them, we're not going to get the kind of support that we need.

So with that, I think I'll turn this over to Bill. If you have any questions at this point, certainly

feel free to ask them.

BJERKE: Good evening, Commissioners. Can we get the master plan elements. Okay. On this next slide, it shows the key master plan elements which is a requirement within the Growth Management Act and as well as Recreation and Conservation Office which is our --

HOLLEY: Please slow down.

MORASCH: You need to slow down.

BJERKE: Oh, I'm sorry.

HOLLEY: I didn't understand anything you said. And, I'm sorry, I can't go that fast.

BJERKE: Okay. No problem. My apologies. I'll slow down a little bit. So as the key master plan elements, it's required with the Growth Management Act as well as the Recreation and Conservation Office, which is our primary State granting agency. And so then also we need to -- the need for assessment for parks, recreation and open space and trails, and so that was completed.

Result of public outreach effort, and Kelly and Barbara both talked about that, the public demand chapter in the plan. And so with the outreach efforts, that was a series of open houses as well as stakeholder meetings. And then we had over -- I think over 1500 comments that came back from our surveys that we conducted, and actually right now we are still taking comments until this plan is finalized.

And then implementation of the plan is also a requirement with recommendations including funding strategies. So how do we get the monies that we need to to carry these goals out? You know, so of course, we're going to be going to the Board of County Councilors and asking for funding this fall, in fact, but we're also reaching out to other ways to come up with our funding which is, you know, real estate excise tax funds. We've got PIF funds in place right now, but we're also going to be seeking grants, and that's the key component of why we're here and producing this master plan is that we want to become grant eligible. So that's another funding source.

Partnering with different groups, private sector, corporations, there's a lot of different areas that we need to explore to try to partner with groups to bring extra revenues in, and, so... And, of course, our capital facilities plan which actually details out what our intentions are for the 6-year high priority period as well as the 20-year long range plan. So it details out what our intentions are for acquisition, for development, for planning strategies, master planning, all that stuff. It's all in there, so...

Okay. Next slide, please. So plan implementation. So the cost of the 6-year capital facilities plan in the urban unincorporated area alone is \$38 million. That's what we've identified. In the regional system, it's \$79 million, and that is over the 6- and 20-year period. And so there's more challenges. There's challenges to this funding strategy, and that is we

need more funding. We really don't have any. We're crawling out of the economic downturn and we're still feeling the pain from that. And so with luck, we will hopefully be able to secure some funding from our Board of County Councilors as we see that funding is coming in at a little higher than expected rate, so we want to get a piece of that.

The Metropolitan Park District was approved by the voters in 2005 by proposition, and that's a junior taxing district. And when the recession occurred a few years ago, the revenue declined pretty significantly. We've been averaging -- well, it started off at 27 cents back in 2006, and then it went down to about 25 cents per thousand. And then when the recession occurred, being at the bottom of the junior taxing district, we were the first ones to be hit and it actually went down into the single digits, and it scared us because that is the primary source for maintaining our parks in the urban unincorporated area.

And the one thing that we've identified in this plan is that we would like to protect that if we could. Of course, that's going to require a vote of the public to make that happen. And so when we do that, it would protect the levy rate at 25 cents, and that's for a period of six years from the time that it's voted or approved. And so in the event that there's another economic downturn, we wouldn't actually be depleted all the way down to potentially zero or the actual -- the levy could actually be wiped out, which is a scary thought. So that was, I think, for our longevity in parks, I think it's pretty obvious that we need to try to do what we can to protect the levy that keeps us going.

Also identified in the plan, when we separated from the City of Vancouver, with Vancouver-Clark Parks, and we formed our own parks division within Clark County as a standalone entity, we had a staff that was basically -- we had enough staff to essentially hold the line, so that was to hold on to what we've got, maintain what we've got, but we didn't necessarily get the staff that we needed to move forward with our planning components.

So when this capital facilities plan goes into effect, we're going to need somebody to actually go out there and do some planning for us. So we actually do need a planner that can focus solely on this plan and all the objectives within it. And we also need a grant writer because that takes an enormous amount of time. So there's two positions there that the parks division used to have back when it was Vancouver-Clark Parks but it no longer has that right now, and so we noticed that that is a key component to our success in the master plan going forward, so...

I think that's it on this one. So I'd like to turn this back over to Laurie.

LEBOWSKY: Okay. I'm going to talk about comments received for SEPA. We had our SEPA comment period, actually received no comments. We last week received a comment from Washington Trails Association via e-mail - that's separate from SEPA - and that was forwarded on to the members of the Planning Commission.

On the slide here you see the timeline. Before I talk about the timeline, however, I do want to say that we also sent a notice to Commerce. Staff from Commerce contacted me and

said they had no comments. As Bill indicated, we are still open to receiving public comments on the plan.

I'm going to go back to the timeline, you see it on the slide. We have a work session with the Board on September 2nd. It goes to a Board hearing on September 15th. The proposal is to adopt the parks plan as a resolution, that makes Clark County Parks grant eligible. The grant applications are due March of 2016. And then the plan is that we would re-adopt the parks plan as a chapter in the 2016 comprehensive plan update as we are required to have a parks element under the Growth Management Act.

I am going to just wrap up my staff report by saying based on the information that you received in your packet and in the staff report and the exhibits, staff is recommending to the Planning Commission that you approve the Clark County Parks Recreation and Open Space Plan. And I'll turn it back over to you. I'm here to answer questions. Bill's here and then we have Barbara and Kelly. Thank you.

MORASCH: All right. Well, thank you all for coming. Does the Planning Commission have any questions for staff at this point?

JOHNSON: Yeah, I do. This is kind of out of the box, Bill. I understand the split between Vancouver and the County. Do they still have their grant writer and planner or did they let them --

BJERKE: Yes. Well, and before the County split, there was, of course, and then with the recession, there was a lot of staff that left, you know. So that whole staff was depleted, but I believe they do still have those folks, yes.

JOHNSON: I was just curious at certain aspects of getting your grant writer because it's coming up fast in 2016.

BJERKE: That's correct. That's why we've been pretty proactive in trying to put in for those two positions this fall, so during the budget re-adopt.

JOHNSON: Thanks.

QUIRING: I guess my question would be about these positions. You're talking about full-time positions for this and not maybe a contract grant writer? I know that they're out there. I would imagine that they, if they do this sort of thing, they know what's available and they could do this on a contract basis rather than being a full-time employee. I understand the planner needs to coordinate all the parks and everything.

BJERKE: Yes.

QUIRING: I just question the grant writer.

BJERKE: That would probably be our Plan B if we do not get the positions. The idea of

having a grant writer and a planner that is on staff is that they get to know our organization, how it works, what the needs are and they can focus in on the priorities based on, you know, the, you know, the comp plan and what the folks want, you know. They learn the culture of where we're at here in Clark County and get to know it fairly well. So it's hard to be a staff person when it comes to, you know, having that background knowledge versus, you know, a contractual person who comes in for a period of time and does it.

QUIRING: Yeah. I'm not talking about coming in for a period of time. I'm talking about a long-term contract person upon whom you call or who would even maybe alert you - the County I should say - about grants available for parks. I've worked with grant writers before. They know what they're doing and what -- so it isn't about knowing the culture of the county. It's about knowing what they're doing in order to write a grant to have it granted to us, so... And I would think that there would be that kind of person available.

BJERKE: Sure. Sure.

QUIRING: And I would suggest it not be Plan B, that you should consider it as a Plan A.

BJERKE: Thank you.

BARCA: I'd like to make a comment. I heard you talk about introducing the master plan into the 2016 comp plan review. I'm definitely all for that. One of the things that I think would be very helpful for everybody is at that time you kind of paint the picture of what the instate for the comp plan and what it looks like for the parks system, recognizing that you have a shortfall even in the 6-year capital facilities plan, that's the reality of funding on the ground.

But I think it's important for the public to understand that you're not just lurching from capital facilities plan to capital facilities plan trying to see what you can go ahead and rustle up in the way of funds. I think it's really important for the organization to be able to paint a picture of what you're going to give the community in the form of the value of the park system built out the way that you would hope that it could be built out.

There's certainly some parks in the greater metropolitan area that, you know, are really good examples of when they're funded correctly and the right mix of facilities are in place, they show how great of an asset they are to the community, and I think it garners greater acceptance and willingness to fund things, but we have to kind of help people with their imagination about what that's supposed to look like.

BJERKE: Yeah. We talked about that as far as improving our marketing skills, if you will, to get ourselves out there, our brand name, and to try to get to, you know, people aware that we are here and that we're doing good things and with the hope that they'll back us and fund us, you know, for these different projects that we have in mind, and so...

That's the one thing is outreach to our funds, and Barbara talked about that a little bit. We need to get up to the times and make sure that we're, you know, our platform is on every

device out there that's easily accessible. And then also we've gotten a lot of comments back from the public about signage. People know that we have parks, but they don't know where they're at and they don't know how to get there. And so we need to make sure our access to our folks to let them know about us and our parks are easily accessible, so I agree.

BARCA: Yeah. And that's all good for today in what we have in the way of facilities, but I'm really talking about trying to create, as you call it, a master plan, show them what it looks like with the build-out comparable to the comp plan.

BJERKE: Right.

BARCA: You've got 20-years worth of growth here. Here's what the park system should look like to accommodate that.

BJERKE: Yes.

JOHNSON: Vision.

BARCA: Yeah, it's a vision. Thank you.

BJERKE: Great. And our levels of service obviously are lacking. We need to bring that up. And if we were to actually diagram what that would look like, if we were meeting our service levels, I think that would impress many folks.

LEBOWSKY: I appreciate your comments, Commissioner Barca, but we'll look at that, but I just also want to emphasize this is a 20-year plan and we do have a mission statement and vision statement and goals to kind of help paint that picture that you're talking about.

BARCA: Maybe you'll look at it again.

PUNTENEY: And maps.

BARCA: Yeah.

LEBOWSKY: And maps. Thank you.

MORASCH: All right. Any other questions for staff at this time? Okay. Hearing none, we are going to open it to the public now. So the first person on the list is Jean Akers. And, yeah, we'll need to make some space up here for public testimony.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

AKERS: I checked the no comment.

MORASCH: No comment?

AKERS: I don't need to make a comment.

MORASCH: No comment. Okay. Great. Well, thank you. And then Ryan Ojerio, did you wish to make a comment? It looks like you checked yes.

OJERIO: Yeah, I did.

MORASCH: All right. Well, come on down to the microphone here, state your name and maybe spell your last name for the court reporter and welcome to the Planning Commission.

OJERIO: Right here?

MORASCH: Yep, that's fine.

OJERIO: Ryan Ojerio, O-j-e-r-i-o. And I wrote in some comments by e-mail and I just came to re-emphasize those comments, but also maybe provide some examples that might be useful for the Commission to hear. First, an introduction of who I am. I'm the regional manager for the Washington Trails Association, and we're a private nonprofit and we're based out of Seattle, but I work out of our Vancouver office right over here in downtown Vancouver.

And our mission is to preserve, enhance, protect and improve trails for hiking and walking throughout the state. And we do that through a mix of collaboration, advocacy, education, engaging the public and getting them out on trails, and then we also do volunteer trail maintenance and construction. And so my role spreads all those different hats.

Last year for Clark County Parks, we did something like 2,400 hours of volunteer maintenance in new trail construction. And this year to date, we've done 1,885 hours of maintenance and mostly construction on the new Vancouver Lake ADA or accessible barrier free trail out there.

And so one of the comments that I put in there is that we really like seeing the fact that they're looking for additional staff support to expand partnerships. And I rely and my volunteers rely on the County park staff to support our program and to provide the leadership and the project specifications and the materials to get our projects done. So without their volunteer coordinator Karen, you know, we'd probably cut those hours in half maybe, or be at like 30 percent because we wouldn't have that catalyst to get things going, but not only the coordination, but the on the ground staff people.

We were over at Vancouver Lake and we're laying down crushed rock because it's going to be a barrier free trail, and one of the Clark County park staff persons, Roger, came out with a tractor, and we had four mechanized wheelbarrows and we'd have to load those with a shovel, and so Roger's there with a front loader and he just goes boom and he dumps it right in the motorized wheelbarrow and it speeds it up. The volunteers feel appreciated there. They're leveraged, you know, four or five times over. And so it's a really good

partnership if we have staff present and that can help out with that.

The other part that I want to emphasize that we really like about the plan is the idea of connectivity and connecting the parks together so that people can get to them without relying on a car. If you go to Lacamas Park, sometimes it's hard to find a place to park, and there's new housing developments going in there and people having the ability to just walk from the school to the park or the neighborhood to a park is really important. So we'd like to see that.

The three things I want to emphasize that are kind of described in the plan but maybe want to elevate them to the top is the idea of providing meeting the demand for soft surface native trails in a natural setting. And that's the number one place that people like to hike and walk, and it is the top priority. The survey -- the survey respondents in this planning process said hiking and walking is the top priority.

And so the connectivity is important to be able to get to those places, but the loops and the quality of the natural setting, the quality of the trail experience is that pearl within that string of pearls of parks and natural areas connected by bikeways and sidewalks. So we don't want to lose track of the pearls and the desire to get everything connected. They both go hand in hand.

The second point I want to emphasize is the idea of a really high quality walking and hiking experience. And if you have a great trail that people want to hike again and again and again, they're going to do it again and again and again. I think if you've gone to a restaurant and you've said, well, that was pretty good, but maybe you're not going to go there again. It's the same thing with trails. You go to a trail and you have a great experience, you tell your friends, you hike it again and again and again. Cape Horn is a great example. It's got a very high level of service for not a lot of trail mileage. There are a lot of trails out there that just -- they weren't designed properly or they're just not very popular and so they're not providing a lot of value for the investment.

And then the third thing that I think is really important to emphasize is the idea of sustainability. And when you think about sustainability in the trail setting, we think about if you take your daughter on a trail, it's going to look the same when she takes her son or daughter on that trail 10, 20, 30 years, however long out. So that trail looks the same. It's not eroded. It doesn't have to be paved with asphalt. It's been designed in a way that that natural setting stays the way that it was.

The other part of that is that a trail that's sustainable is a neglect tolerant. And so we have trails that we've built, that we maintain, that we don't have to do any maintenance on. There's no erosion happening. There's very little ground disturbance happening. The trail's not widening. It looks exactly the same as when we constructed it four years ago, and I expect it will look the same 20 years from now too.

There's other trails, and Round Lake is one good example, where we spent three days this past spring rehabbing the water bars and it was a huge job. Each work party had, I think,

about eight to ten people on it and we spent all day rehabbing the water bars, and we're going to do that again probably next year, if not two years, but every season.

And if you design the trail the first way, you can cut down on the lifecycle maintenance costs. And so whenever we put in a new trail, we're always emphasizing that sustainability. And so when people say, why are building all these new trails? We can't maintain the ones we have. We're building neglect tolerant trails. And then we're going back and we're regrading and rerouting, like at Whipple Creek, to make some of those trails neglect tolerant, cut down on our maintenance costs.

So those are the parts that we'd like to see emphasized in the plan and implemented, and we need staff to do it and grants. So we got the people, the volunteers. We got a great partner. We just need a plan. And that's all I have to say.

MORASCH: All right. Thank you. Does anybody have any questions for Ryan?

BARCA: Thanks.

MORASCH: All right. Well, thank you for coming. And there are no more sign-ups on the sheet. Is there somebody? Milada, would you like to come and talk? You know the drill.

ALLEN: Good evening, Commissioners. I'm Milada Allen, Post Office Box 61552, Vancouver, Washington. And I have been the Felida Neighborhood Association president for about 12 years or so, and the Felida Neighborhood Association has 17,000 people.

Parks are a quality of life. We have about 700 volunteers that volunteer all over the county. They don't care if they get credit for it or not. They volunteer. And because they know that it's very important for all of us, they know it's important for their kids and the future generations of their kids. There are many kids that come to the Felida Park and point to what they had done in the last ten years, including some Boy Scout projects and in-kind volunteer projects as well as in-kind donations, including the picnic shelter and everything else, so they have an ownership of that.

And, of course, because we didn't have a plan for the past two years, there was many, many opportunities for grants, but we could not apply for them. And, of course, when we built the Felida Park in partnership with the City/Clark Parks and Rec, almost a million dollars came from the community. That community effort and value added to that park. So when you come out there, you will see this beautiful gorgeous park that people don't remember that the community had come together and brought it together because there was a plan, because there were opportunities for grants; however, it was extremely time-consuming for us to go chase those grants, and we're volunteers. We don't get paid for this. We're not attorneys. We're not consultants. We don't get paid for it. We don't charge for it.

So it would be wonderful to have a full-time grant writer out there because we do have other parks out there including Sgt. Brad Crawford Park, which is Phase II, and, of course, we do

have the Memorial Arches Fund set up; however, there are other opportunities for us to have ADA accessible areas within parks that there are grants available. And again, it is time-consuming to do the grants, and if you're dealing with somebody on a contract basis, it may be at the last on their priority list.

I was not going to speak, but when I heard that, I thought, well, I better say something. Because the grants that were written by the community for the park, for the public, went directly to the County or directly to the Parks, they don't come to us, and so we cannot afford to pay for the grant writers.

However, we can make this park system so much better if we can go to a county full-time staff and say, hey, listen, there's this grant opportunity. This is what the community thought about. And, for example, in the Cougar Creek Woods Park that we saved from being surplusd not once, not twice, not three times, but four times. If we can have that dialogue, the partnerships between the community and the parks would be that much stronger.

As you saw, there's a shortfall of what is projected to be developed, how much you have available and what the shortfall is. The shortfall is pretty big. And if you had that grant writer, you pay maybe 150k per year, but just that one grant, \$1 million will save you so much more. Plus you're going to have a, quote, unquote, net profit of 750k right off the bat after the salary goes out.

So the Felida Neighborhood Association is 17,000 people as well as our board feel that if you guys want the neighborhood and the community partnerships, make it easier on us so we don't have to go out there and hire a grant writer. You don't have to go at the last minute and go find a grant writer. They'll be available there. And those grants do take a long time.

So if you have somebody there only on a contract basis, you will not be able to capture all of the funding that's out there available for us to make this so much better, to make our parks something we can be all proud of and that we can use and our kids can have healthy choices for the rest of their lives. But 150k or so for one salaried person, I don't know for how much more for overhead, but I calculated about 50 percent overhead, that is such a great investment. And I hope, I hope that you do recommend that they hire that grant writer. The 700 or some volunteers that are out there that are available, you know, to help out, but let's make it easier for them.

And also the when -- backing up a little bit -- when the parks had the divorce from the City, we were afraid they were going to become the stepchildren, and now that we have seen the PAB working together to bring something very quickly to you in order to capture all those opportunities that are out there for the grants and everything else.

So please consider that these folks came from very diverse backgrounds. It was very, very quick and hard approach, yet they all came together. And my kudos to Barbara Anderson and Kelly Puntene, the two co-chairs, they kept it rolling, they kept it on task and I think the document is much better than what I expected it to be just because of the short time that we had, but then also Jean Akers with her experience that she brought into it made it a much

stronger document. So I am really grateful that this has come together. And I do hope that you recommend that this particular plan is adopted for resolution.

I was hoping to see a little bit more allocated to the Cougar Creek Woods Park other than the 5k --

BJERKE: In the works.

ALLEN: -- because they did get reimbursed \$540,000 for acquisition of that from the State. So we thought, well, maybe another half a million would be nice just to start with. But there's -- I think there's so many different components in that particular plan that are very strong components.

There's some things that need to be strengthened, like the surplus problems that we have with the park acquisitions. They go through a lot of public review, yet when we're surplus them, they're done very quickly without input, and I think that the zone change for parks upon acquisition should be a protecting tool. And maybe you can make a recommendation that there's some more, not just the ordinance itself, but also that there are tools developed to protect those parks from being surplus. Thank you very much.

MORASCH: All right. Thank you. Does anyone have any questions for Milada Allen? All right. Thank you. Is there anyone else in the audience that didn't get a chance to sign in that wants to testify?

Okay. We will then close the public hearing and I will turn it over to the Planning Commission for any additional questions of staff. No further questions? All right. Deliberations. Anybody want to talk? Nobody wants to talk. Does somebody want to make a motion?

BARCA: I make a **MOTION** to **approve** based on staff recommendation.

BENDER: **Second.**

MORASCH: The motion's been made and seconded. Is there any discussion on the motion?

WRIGHT: I'll second.

MORASCH: Yeah, it's been seconded.

WRIGHT: Oh, it has. I'm sorry.

MORASCH: Is there any discussion on the motion?

WRIGHT: I had a thought that, you know, there's been some comments that have come in after the text -- can you hear me? Can you hear me now? Okay.

There's been some comments, some good comments that came in tonight, that have come in by e-mail as well, that may or may not be fully reflected in the plan. But I guess in my experience in implementing plans, the implementation is where the rubber meets the road, and you have the biggest issue with getting your funds. Without the funds, it's all just a dream.

And so there's a lot of good comments. I'm sure as you go through the years, things will be implemented as fully as you can when you get your money, and that's the way of the world, unfortunately, is without funds, you don't have a project. So in my experience, I think we can have a lot of confidence in the Parks Department and Bill to deliver the plan and to take comments as they come in over the years that would improve the implementation of the program.

MORASCH: Thank you. You mentioned the e-mail. Were you referring to Ryan Ojerio's e-mail?

WRIGHT: Yes.

MORASCH: I'm trying to say his last name right this time. Was that the e-mail?

WRIGHT: Yeah, I got that here.

MORASCH: All right. Any other discussion?

QUIRING: I guess I just want to comment that in accepting or moving this for approval to the Board that I'm assuming that they see our comments. I wouldn't want to stop the plan from going forward just because I think, just because of my comment about a contract grant writer.

I have worked with grant writers and they would have a priority. It isn't like you hire somebody to write your grants and then they set it over here and leave it till later. They actually would have a priority. And I certainly don't think a grant writer would get 150k. I just think that's just completely unrealistic. And so I'm sure on the scale of the County salaries, it wouldn't be something. So I needed to say that on the record that even if this is approved and a grant writer is hired, I don't suspect that that would be at the rate that a grant writer would be hired, so...

And I guess I want clarification on what we're approving. We're approving this entire book of recommendations?

BARCA: So on Page 3 of 3, the proposed action is to adopt the parks master plan by resolution. So the master plan book is being adopted by us. And it doesn't say anything specifically about what type of personnel shall be hired.

QUIRING: No, it doesn't.

BARCA: Okay. So let's just be clear on that.

MORASCH: All right. Any other discussion? In that case, there's a motion. Can we get a roll call on the motion.

ROLL CALL VOTE

WRIGHT: AYE
BARCA: AYE
QUIRING: AYE
JOHNSON: AYE
BLUM: AYE
BENDER: AYE
MORASCH: AYE

MORASCH: All right. So the motion carries, 7 to 0. I want to thank everyone for coming and their presentations tonight. And we will close that public hearing and move on to our next public hearing which is the shoreline. And is it Gordy or you? All right. Gary, Shoreline Master Plan Limited Amendment. Gary Albrecht. Although I think Gordy's name is on the staff report, so... All right. Whenever you're ready, Gary.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS & PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION, continued

B. SHORELINE MASTER PROGRAM LIMITED AMENDMENT

The Planning Commission will consider a proposal for a limited amendment to the Clark County Shoreline Master Program (SMP). The limited amendment would improve the consistency between the county's shoreline program and the state standards. The amendment would add text to clarify normal maintenance in the list of exemptions, regulate replacement of non-conforming residential structures that are damaged or destroyed, and clarify SMP text to improve implementation.

Staff Contact: Gary Albrecht, AICP
Email: Gary.Albrecht@clark.wa.gov
Phone: (360) 397-2280, Ext. 4318

ALBRECHT: Thank you, Chair Morasch, Planning Commission. Good evening. Gary Albrecht, Clark County Community Planning. Clark County adopted an updated shoreline master program in July 2012. The proposal in front of the Planning Commission is to propose a limited amendment to the shoreline master program that would improve the consistency between the County's shoreline program and the State standards. It includes eight sections of code amendments in Exhibit 1.

And during a Planning Commission work session on August 4th, 2015, the Planning

Commission had a question about the meaning of Clark County Code 40.460.230(B)(2). Staff indicated that this section needed further clarification and other sections of the code might need clarification too.

Staff mentioned that any additional changes would be proposed during the hearing in Exhibit 3. So there are three sections of code amendments in Exhibit 3. So at this time, would you like to look at Exhibit 3? I can pull it up on the screen.

BARCA: Please. Does everybody else have a copy of this update, August 20th?

QUIRING: It was at our desk.

BARCA: It was. I just want to make sure everybody's got a copy.

ALBRECHT: The first change in this one, the 40.460.230, the (B)(2), up at the top, the clarification, "Subject to the provisions of CCC 40.460.250" were added.

And then, Kathy, can you scroll down to the next section. So 40.460.630, Use-Specific Development Regulations (K)(13), this is the language that was added over what was presented to you on August 4th.

And then, Kathy, can you scroll down to the bottom of the page. And as a result of making the change up there, we -- scroll on down -- we made two definition changes in Clark County Code 40.460.800, the definition sections for normal maintenance and normal repair.

I would like to point out that in the original Exhibit 1, there's a reference to Chapter 40.386. So if the PC decides to make a recommendation to approve these limited amendments, and in the adopting ordinance the portion of the code that refers to 40.386 will not become effective until January 8th, 2016. I just needed to say that for the record or for the ordinance.

And then based upon the information and the findings presented in this report and in the supporting documents, staff recommends that the Planning Commission forward to the Board of Clark County Councilors a recommendation of approval for limited amendment to the shoreline master program. And that's all I have.

MORASCH: All right. Thank you, Gary. Any questions for staff?

BARCA: I would like just to take a moment and say thank you for hearing us in the work session and going back and rewording this in a fashion that made it simpler for us to understand what you were trying to get at.

ALBRECHT: You're very welcome.

BARCA: Yeah.

MORASCH: Yeah, appreciate your work on that.

ALBRECHT: It was a huge effort.

MORASCH: Good.

BARCA: All right. We already said thanks. What else do you want?

ALBRECHT: I couldn't have done it without our Prosecuting Attorney Chris Cook and Planning Manager Gordy Euler.

MORASCH: All right. Well, thanks to all of you. There's no one on the sign-in sheet. Is there anyone in the audience that would like to testify on this matter? Seeing no one, then we will go ahead and close the public hearing and turn it over to the Planning Commission for deliberations and/or a motion.

WRIGHT: If I had a question of you, are you comfortable with the words now?

BARCA: Bill, talk into the mic, please.

WRIGHT: Steve, are you comfortable with the language changes that were made in there?

MORASCH: Yes, I think that the language is much more clear now, thanks to their rework on it. The part that I thought was confusing has now been deleted, and so I think it's more clear and better.

WRIGHT: You think so?

MORASCH: Yeah. Any other deliberation or does somebody want to make a motion?

JOHNSON: I make a **MOTION** that we accept the reco- -- excuse me.

QUIRING: I **second** it.

MORASCH: All right. It's been --

JOHNSON: One more time. I would -- let me start again. I'm good at that. I make a **motion** that we **accept** the recommendation of staff with the approval of the limited amendment for the shoreline master plan, to the shoreline master plan.

QUIRING: And now I second it.

MORASCH: It's been moved and seconded to approve the limited amendment to the shoreline master plan as proposed by staff. Is there any discussion on the motion? Hearing none, let's move to the roll call.

ROLL CALL VOTE

WRIGHT: AYE
BARCA: AYE
QUIRING: YES
JOHNSON: AYE
BLUM: AYE
BENDER: AYE
MORASCH: AYE

MORASCH: All right. Well, that motion carried unanimously, so that concludes the hearing on the shoreline master program limited amendment. Thank you, Gary.

ALBRECHT: You're welcome.

OLD BUSINESS

None.

NEW BUSINESS

None.

COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION

None.

ADJOURNMENT

MORASCH: Oh, all right. Well, then with that, I think we are at the end of our agenda, so we are now adjourned. Thank you all for coming.

The record of tonight's hearing, as well as the supporting documents and presentations can be viewed on the Clark County Web Page at: <http://www.clark.wa.gov/planning/PCmeetings.html>.

Proceedings can be viewed on CVTV on the following web page link:

<http://old.cityofvancouver.us/cvtv/cvtvindex.ask?section=25437&catID=13>.

Minutes Transcribed by:

Cindy Holley, Court Reporter/Rider & Associates, Inc.

Sonja Wiser, Administrative Assistant, Clark County Community Planning