

**COUNCIL HEARING FOR
DECEMBER 6, 2024
MINUTES OF PUBLIC HEARING
AFFORDABLE HOUSING CODE AMENDMENTS & 2025-2045 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE**

MEDVIGY: So, we've made the amendments that we're going to make today. Let's plow forward.

BOWERMAN: Chair, may I just state that there are a few empty seats still up in front if anyone wishes to have a chair who's standing.

MEDVIGY: Thank you for that. Treasurer Topper, are you going to lead us?

TOPPER: Good morning, Council, Chair and County Manager. I will not lead this morning, Susan will be leading the presentation, but I will contribute as it goes on and thank you for the opportunity to add this to the agenda today.

ELLINGER: Thank you, Alisha. Hello. My name is Susan Ellinger and I'm a Planner with Community Planning. I'm honored to be joined today by the County Treasurer Alisha Topper. We're here today to discuss the implementation --

MEDVIGY: That microphone is very directional so please speak up.

ELLINGER: Okay. Sorry. We're here today to discuss the implementation of Strategy AH-1 of the Housing Option Study and Action Plan. We're joined by Community Planning Director Oliver Orjiako, Program Manager Jose Alvarez and interim Chief Civil Prosecuting Attorney Chris Cook.

Our agenda for today is to provide a short overview and background of how we got to this point with the housing project, outline the code modifications that we are recommending and discuss our findings and recommendations. Next slide, please.

The Clark County Housing Option Study and Action Plan or HOSAP was adopted in May of 2022. The HOSAP identifies housing challenges and opportunities to encourage development of housing that's affordable to a variety of household incomes. The household -- the HOSAP applies to the unincorporated Vancouver urban growth area which is shown on this slide. This area of the county has urban services to support various types of housing.

Following adoption of HOSAP, the County Council directed staff to begin working on modifications to the code to implement the plan. The first phase of implementation included code changes applicable to middle housing and smaller single-family developments. Code changes to implement Phase 1 were adopted on March 5th, 2024. The second phase of the -- okay.

The second phase of the project focuses on multi-family and regulated affordable housing and is currently in process. The project we are here to discuss with you today pulls a single strategy from the Phase 2 work for implementation now. Do both? Okay. Next slide, please.

The project focuses on HOSAP Strategy AH-1. This strategy aims to expand potential development options for affordable housing projects by allowing them to be located in the commercial and mixed-use zones. The strategy suggests that allowed residential uses should meet certain affordability criteria. Based on the strategy language we developed draft code. Next slide, please.

In the draft code changes, we are proposing to add language to the commercial and mixed-use zones that would allow affordable housing projects with no associated commercial use if certain criteria are met.

Those criteria include the project is located within the Vancouver urban growth area, the applicant submits evidence prior to certificate of occupancy of an executed long-term restrictive covenant. This ensures that the units will remain affordable for a certain number of years and in this case, we're requiring 30 or more years and 100 percent of the units are provided an average of 60 percent or less of area median income or AMI.

As outlined in the HOSAP, AMI is the midpoint of a region's income distribution. Half of the families in the region earn more than the median and half earn less. These income levels are a way to assess housing affordability. Next slide, please.

At the work session with the Planning Commission on November 7th, members raised questions about the amount of commercial and mixed-use property that could be developed with residential uses.

In response staff worked with the County GIS Department to put together data shown on the screen. The tables on this slide and the next slide shows the number of acres and units developed with multi-family projects with no associated commercial use in the commercial and mixed-use zones in both the County and the City of Vancouver jurisdictions.

The Planning Commission asked for information about the City of Vancouver because the City adopted a similar code change in 2019. For the County shown here we only looked at projects that are within the Highway 99 subarea because this is the only place within the county jurisdiction where this is currently permitted.

The table on this slide shows that within the Highway 99 subarea there are 458 total acres zoned commercial and mixed use, 111 of those acres are vacant or underutilized, and 4.45 acres and 73 units have been developed with no associated commercial use. This equates to about 4 percent of vacant and underutilized land.

There are other multi-family projects in the county on commercial and mixed-use parcels including a Vancouver Housing Authority project, but all have some type of commercial component. Next slide, please.

This slide shows a list of multi-family projects on commercial or mixed-use zone parcels with no associated commercial use in the City of Vancouver provided by City staff. The five projects listed on the screen include a total of about 10 acres and 326 units.

As you can see similar to the County there are a relatively low number of projects and acres that have been developed in the City using the exemption since its adoption in 2018 (sic). Next slide, please.

In addition to the review of projects, we wanted to point out some findings that have been made as a part of the work that is being completed for the Comprehensive Plan Update.

As a part of the Vacant Buildable Land work that has been done in the past few years it was recognized that we are beginning to see commercial land being developed with multi-family units because of things such as the City of Vancouver's affordable housing code exemption approved in 2019, the allowance of multi-family development as a permitted use in areas like Highway 99 and the City of Vancouver's CX zone, and as a part of integrated mixed use developments.

Therefore, the model includes an assumption that a portion of commercial lands will be developed with noncommercial uses. This is based on information from the City of Vancouver and development trends that they have experienced. And as we have already begun doing, these assumptions will be monitored and updated to reflect any changes in the development that actually occurs. Next slide, please.

So why are we proposing that this change go forward now? There are a few answers to that question. The first is that Phase 1 code changes required additional revisions and were delayed past the original expected implementation date. Because of that work on Phase 2 was paused while Phase 1 was completed. We're currently working on Phase 2, but we are unsure when it will go forward through the review process.

Depending on the specific provisions that are developed which may include Comprehensive Plan changes, we may need to couple the Phase 2 housing code changes with the 2025 Comprehensive Plan Periodic Update which is not anticipated for completion until December of 2025. I'm now going to have Alisha discuss some of the additional reasons for the timing of this code change.

TOPPER: Thank you, Susan, and again good morning. For the record, I'm Alisha Topper, Clark

County Treasurer, but today I'm honored to be here as a sponsor of this amendment and as a board member of the Vancouver Housing Authority and the Washington State Housing Finance Commission.

The unincorporated Vancouver urban growth area as you know has housing stock that lacks diversity of housing type. With most of the homes being single-family owner occupied, for those that do rent in that area, 44 percent spend more than 30 percent of their income on rent.

The amendment in front of you today would have an immediate impact on addressing the affordable housing crisis that our county is facing. As you know, to make multi-family affordable and to be able to develop it, it takes years from identifying a purchasing land, applying for and receiving public grants, tax credits and to secure private financing.

By the Council's adoption of this amendment today you would be not wasting any more time on getting the much-needed affordable housing stock available to our community members who need it, and this amendment is made in a very deliberate and focused way that absolutely targets the affordable band that we need in our community.

We've heard from many residents that when we build affordable housing, they still can't afford it. This target truly meets that affordability requirement for those that are on fixed income and of lower income. So that is why we need this amendment today and not to wait for the entire second half of this plan's adoption.

ELLINGER: Thank you, Alisha. Thank you, Alisha. I also wanted to note -- oh, sorry, next slide. I also wanted to note that there's another strategy in the HOSAP that considers allowing residential development for all income levels in the commercial and mixed-use zones.

Strategy HO-21 will remain as a part of Phase 2 and will be considered for future code updates. It includes concepts such as reducing the ground floor commercial requirements, allowing for active ground floor uses like community spaces or plazas to meet the commercial requirements and permitting alternative configurations of commercial and residential spaces. Next slide, please. I'm now going to discuss some of the review process for these proposed amendments.

Public involvement for this item included submitting to the Department of Commerce for expedited review on October 30th. Expedited review allows a 14-day review period rather than the standard 60-day review period. Expedited review was denied for the proposal and Commerce staff instead provided comments via e-mail.

You should have received a copy of that e-mail which I will try and summarize, and it is also posted on the project website. In the e-mail Commerce staff outlined that County Council could approve the proposed changes today but they are recommending that you do not take action today and rather take additional time to consider wording changes that would allow

additional affordable housing projects to qualify for the exemption.

They suggest looking at the time frame, level of affordability and percent of affordable units required. The wording of the amendment is currently targeted to lower income projects. County staff suggests that it's Council's authority to determine how they would like to move forward.

In addition to the Department of Commerce review, other public involvement for the project included issuing a SEPA Determination of Non-Significance and publishing it in The Columbian newspaper on November 6th, publishing a legal notice on November 6th for the Planning Commission hearing and publishing a legal notice November 21st for the County Council hearing.

Review by the Technical Housing Code Forum also occurred. This is a group of industry professionals made up from participants of the original Project Advisory Group for the HOSAP, the Development and Engineering Advisory Board and the Planning Commission. The forum holds public meetings and gives feedback regarding the housing code implementation.

The forum has discussed all of the strategies in Phase 2 which includes Strategy AH-1 until it was recently identified for separate implementation. A presentation was also made to the Development and Engineering Advisory Board at their meeting yesterday. Next slide, please.

The Clark County Unified Development Code, Title 40, consolidates all development related regulations, land use, zoning, critical areas and environmental protection code provisions. Title 40 is required to be consistent with the 20-Year Comprehensive Growth Management Plan. Amendments to the code may respond to a substantial change in policy, better implement applicable Comprehensive Plan Policies or reflect changes in federal or state law.

In the Planning Commission recommendation to Council there is a finding that the proposed changes better implement State law including RCW 36.70A.020 and the Comprehensive Plan Framework Plan Policies, Countywide Planning Policies, Housing Element Goals and Policies and the Clark County Code to plan for and accommodate housing affordable to all economic segments of the population. Based on these findings, staff recommends approval of the proposed code changes. Next slide, please.

Regarding the timing of the review process, this project was discussed at Council Time on October 30th. A Planning Commission work session was held on November 7th. A hearing with the Planning Commission was held on November 21st. We presented to the Development and Engineering Advisory Board yesterday. And County Council hearing is today December 6th. Next slide, please. That concludes the formal presentation and we're happy to answer any questions that you may have.

MEDVIGY: Thank you. Let me ask one point of clarification, for this hearing do we have a court reporter, is there a transcription or just for the next hearing? For both.

So just a reminder to everyone once we especially get to public comment, we do have someone reporting and creating a transcript, so we need to have you state your name, and if you have a difficult name, please spell it as well.

So, I just want to make one introductory comment because and it was in The Columbian today on affordable housing, it's a huge challenge and we need every tool that we can possibly utilize and what was in The Columbian today was one of those programs the State had been rolling out, that wasn't producing, it wasn't very effective.

On the other hand, what our Treasurer has brought to us in the past, and especially our mortgage assistance program, it is effective. We have -- we are a leader in Washington State in this area and in part because of the collaboration with our Planning Department and our Treasurer and others and we had, we did have the luxury of the ARPA, but we won't have that in the future.

So going forward I'm hoping that the future Councils will continue to invest in that mortgage assistance program, but these tools can work.

The other last thing I wanted to say as an introduction is, you know, this is art and science as far as zoning, we have had for decades some commercial properties lay dormant, we are a democracy, people have their own property rights, the market kind of has a say in this and so we've had commercial properties that we've needed as much as we want and value commercial property, we need jobs and commerce, we've had to rezone it because it just remained vacant for so long.

So, this has been an impediment in this area, and I look forward to hearing the comments and comments of the fellow Councilors and public, but I think this is a very valuable program that we should pursue and continue to be a leader within Washington State in this area.
So, questions of Council?

BOWERMAN: Yes, Chair.

MEDVIGY: Please.

BOWERMAN: Just a quick one. The DOC recommendation that we stall in making a decision, does that apply to the totality of the housing code amendments or just a portion?

ELLINGER: To those that are proposed for the mixed use and the commercial zone, so just this proposal, not the second hearing but just this proposal, it applies to the whole proposal.

BOWERMAN: The whole housing code proposal that is before us? No?

ELLINGER: No. So just one strategy is before you today. We took that strategy out of Phase 2 so Phase 2 you will see later this year --

BOWERMAN: Right.

ELLINGER: -- sometime later this year, so just this one strategy we're implementing right now or we're proposing for implementation right now and the Department of Commerce comment apply to this whole strategy.

BOWERMAN: So, everything that is before us today is what they were suggesting in this one?

ELLINGER: In this hearing today --

BOWERMAN: Gotcha.

ELLINGER: -- but not the second hearing, just this hearing, it applies to that.

BOWERMAN: Thank you. Appreciate it.

YUNG: Chair.

MEDVIGY: Did you wish to add anything, Oliver? No, okay. Glen, please.

YUNG: From my understanding Commerce's largest concern is whether or not anything will come to fruition through it the way we have it written because of the lofty goal that we have of 60 percent AMI averaged over 100 percent of the units. Do you have AMI figures with you? Probably don't, at 60 percent and 80 percent just for relativity?

TOPPER: I did not bring that chart with me this morning. I can certainly get it to you.

YUNG: It's been some time since I had looked at this issue, but generally speaking 80 AMI because our AMI includes Portland and some other areas, AMI is actually higher than Clark County's AMI.

So, when you look at 80 percent AMI it's very close to market rate and so 60 percent really is required in Clark County in order to actually really have affordability come forward. So, I am supportive of moving forward with this. I think it is the right amount, and we can, if we, if nothing happens from this we can always come back and look at it again.

MEDVIGY: Other questions or did you wish to respond to any of that? Okay. Other questions? Sue.

MARSHALL: Thank you for bringing this forward and it's good to, you know, begin to move into Phase 2 of the housing options. Related to Commerce's concern that this is moving forward in advance of other Phase 2 options that have sounded like they were suggesting should be incorporated into the Comp Plan Update but that there's nothing stopping us from doing that related to taking a more comprehensive look at those affordable housing options?

ORJIAKO: Nothing, Councilors, that stops us from doing that.

MARSHALL: Right. This is just moving one piece of it forward a little bit earlier. And, you know, I can understand targeting 99, there's infrastructure there, there's more infrastructure that's being planned, so it makes good sense.

I am concerned, I would not want to cut short any commercial opportunities there because as I think of like complete communities it would be all of the housing options but that includes walkability, commercial opportunities, jobs and parks, so I think this is an important piece of that whole picture. Thank you.

MEDVIGY: Further questions? Okay. So, and further comments from -- so we'll go into public comment then. And, again, we do have a court reporter somewhere virtually, so please state your name for the record and any of those signed up for this first public hearing.

PFENNING: Tyler Castle.

MEDVIGY: Yeah, so that will be the next hearing.

PFENNING: I'll put your name on the next one. And just to confirm, Travis Glendenning, you didn't want to speak to this one?

GLEDENNING: Correct. No, the next one.

PFENNING: Heidi Cody.

MEDVIGY: Let me -- let me do it this way. Is there anyone in the audience -- okay. I do have one hand up in the back. Why don't you come forward, please and then state your name for the record and make your comment.

HARDY: Good morning. My name is Teresa Hardy and I'm here as a representative for the local Sierra Club.

There has been a question raised by Councilor Yung that I think is important here and in looking at the Housing Action Study of course they came here affordability is the big issue and in looking at the project housing units it looks like we need 17,000, over 17,000 units at the 30 to 50 percent and over 17,000 at the 50 to 80 percent.

Council Bowerman asked before you approved Phase 1 middle housing if that was going to address affordability and at that time Elizabeth Decker made a four-page summary in which she said that the middle housing can expand housing options that are affordable, but it really wouldn't be affordable to anyone making below 80 percent of the AMI.

And then Councilor Yung just asked an important question, if we look at the AMI, and this is a good next step for addressing affordability within the multi-family, but I'm not sure if it has all the language that we may need and hopefully that will come forward within the tech forum.

If you look at 60 percent of the AMI using the Portland Housing Bureau AMI, in order you have to be making \$49,560 a year to make 60 percent of the AMI, and if you take that out to an hourly wage, if you're making \$25 an hour, you're not meeting the 60 percent.

So even though this is addressing affordability, we're not really addressing people making less than \$49,000 a year. In order to -- that's for one person. If you are making 80 percent of the AMI, you have to be making \$66,080 a year.

And then in looking what we're moving forward with this this is 100 percent of the units at 60 percent and it's an average. So will those units come in with a certain number of them say like at 40 percent but how many will be at 70 percent.

And if it's the article in The Columbian, the City moved forward in developing the downtown using that multi-family tax exemption giving all of those developers an 8 year multi-family housing and they put it at 80 percent and what was brought up in the DEAB yesterday was they made no guidelines around what those units would be and those developers made those 20 percent of the units that were going to be affordable studios, 400-square foot studios at \$1200 a month. So, what are the guidelines around this 60 percent, are we --

MEDVIGY: Okay. Thank you. That does conclude your time. And we'll give our panel of experts time to respond to these concerns in a moment. So, anyone else in the audience wish to testify on this hearing? How about online?

PFENNING: We do have one online.

MEDVIGY: Please.

PFENNING: Austin Hicks, you've been requested to be unmuted. Please go ahead with your

comment.

HICKS: Great. Hi. And thank you to the Council and to staff for bringing this forward. My name is Austin Hicks, I am here on behalf of Southport Financial Services which is a affordable housing developer and provider in Washington State, 2800 units under operation and in service all operating under a 30-year deed restricted covenant to guarantee long-term affordability.

Southport was really pleased to recently open the Columbia Gardens project, which is off Mill Plain, 124 units of affordable housing at 60 percent AMI with specifically designed to serve the regions workforce and large families with units of two and three and four bedrooms which is just, you know, hard to find on the market especially within affordable housing, so...

Since, you know, Southport has been developing Columbia Gardens it's been looking aggressively for its next project in Clark County particularly in the region that this code would address, and the struggle is that it's very hard to find developable land with consistent zoning.

And if you do find developable land that, you know, is out of zone, zone compliance, you have to find a seller willing to take an option with you down a potential Comp Plan amendment process which, you know, takes almost an entire calendar year and that has to be a very patient seller because they can easily just sell it to the next offer that comes along and close a lot faster.

So, it's really hard as it stands to find properties that could serve the next, you know, 130, 150, 160, maybe up to 200-unit project and making this change would bring immediate relief to that and I think would have a very quick impact.

So, I wanted to offer those comments on behalf of Southport. I wanted to thank the staff and treasurer and the Commission for all the work that's going in on this. Thank you.

MEDVIGY: I'm sorry, are you raising your hand? Do you wish to make comment? Please.

DELEON: My name is Carmen DeLeon for the record, and I just want to say this is about affordable housing and I've talked about it before and I tried to show this to the mayor, but she does her best to ignore my -- see my picture, this is what I was talking about, this time she looked.

So, this is what I was talking about affordable housing, and it should come automatically in every house because we know every winter a tree branch is going to fall and knock out the whole system and ain't nobody going to have no light, not only that but we can't afford \$600 light bills through the winter every month to keep our homes warm.

I looked for the blueprints and they're saying, okay, we're going to build all these houses, well,

where do I see that they're not mandating a fireplace because come the cold weather we're going to freeze our butts off and a fireplace provides heating, food, light and why isn't that mandated in all of this affordable housing.

You want to make it affordable, let us heat ourselves with wood instead of the, as you see from the City Councilors Office it came stated that the number one revenues for the City are housing, property tax and I think it's sales taxes and third source of revenue for the City is the PUD, that's why they don't want you to have your own form of renewable energy.

And, you know, they're making their cut off you in the winter and it's not funny to put people in the hole every single winter and make them freeze, you can either freeze or you can, you know, pay the bill because that's what it's going to cost you because they're not mandating a warm house in the summer, I mean in the winter.

A warm house in the winter means you should have an accessible fireplace and you want to say affordable housing, I want to be able to afford the heat come winter and I want when the city lights all breakdown and all of these wonderful little tech gears don't have electricity to fund them, then what are you going to do when you don't have your little boxes working, lighting up and you can't recharge them. Don't put all your faith in electronics, they can fail you.

So I'm just saying we should be pushing, you can't build nothing unless it's environmentally friendly, A, to people who can make their own energy by, as you can see it right here, it's the bike and you light up that light bulb, you know, we have a problem with obesity, this is the cure, make your own energy, you know, and guess what, that takes out the middleman, the City, you don't have to pay that light bill anymore.

See why I don't want it, see why they're not pushing it, see why you can go ahead and build 100 houses and who cares about renewable energy, that should be a mandate, and I hope I can speak again later because I didn't even know what I signed up for.

MEDVIGY: Okay. Thank you. Is there anyone else in the room that we missed the first go around? And no one else online; correct?

PFENNING: No. And all of the ones that were signed up for this first one I did move them to the next sheet, it seems like they wanted to testify on the next one.

MEDVIGY: Thank you. Okay. So the first question I have is this is related to the comment on the AMI and what my takeaway was sometimes we don't get it right the first time and you adjust it, this is a long process and this is one of the reasons why we're trying to move quickly on this one to get it in place because it is a long process and if the AMI is not right, certainly that can come up for future adjustment.

But did you have any comment on that from the Treasurer's Office or, Oliver, any comment?

TOPPER: Just to justify, appreciate the public testimony and the comments from the Sierra Club are very warranted. We do identify that we need more subsidized lower income housing and not at the 30 percent to 50 percent and this code amendment will allow for those developments as well with this exception.

My other comment is that it's just really important to your point, Chair, that we at least make an attempt, and I believe the income averaging at 60 percent is a great place to start.

I do personally believe we will see developments likely from nonprofit developers or speciality affordable housing developers and if we don't get it right, I will be back in front of the next Council and asking for an amendment to our amendment.

MEDVIGY: Thank you. Other questions by Council? Any motions by Council?

MARSHALL: Chair.

MEDVIGY: Please.

MARSHALL: I would like to move Ordinance No. 2024-12-16 for approval.

BOWERMAN: Second the motion.

MEDVIGY: Okay. Further discussion? Glen.

YUNG: Yes, of course. Just wanted to thank Austin for chiming in, he was a very big piece of this. Thank them also for the project that they have delivered in Vancouver, amazing, I think it's 74 units at 60 percent AMI and you just don't see that.

So, appreciate them and all they do and all the other individuals and nonprofits and everybody that's trying to make a difference for our affordability crisis that we're experiencing.

MEDVIGY: And I would just add too, you know, our planning staff has worked deciduously on this too and are also an important component of this and socializing the idea personally with all the Council it's a huge way forward, collaboration is where we make our money and I'm trying to get to solutions here. We need solutions and every tool that we can get, and this is one of them, so thank you for bringing this forward.

Any other discussion otherwise we'll have a roll call vote? Hearing none, let's go ahead to the roll call vote.

YUNG: AYE

BELKOT: AYE
MEDVIGY: AYE
BOWERMAN: AYE
MARSHALL: AYE

PFENNING: The ayes have it.

TOPPER: Thank you so much, Council.

MEDVIGY: Thank you. And thank you, Oliver.

ELLINGER: Thank you.

MEDVIGY: It works sometimes as opposed to my laptop, that doesn't seem to work at all. We'll go, we'll roll into the next public hearing, 2025-2045 Comprehensive Plan Update. And, Oliver, are you going to introduce this?

ORJIAKO: Yes, Councilor. Good morning again. For the record Oliver Orjiako, Community Planning Director, and with me this morning is Jose Alvarez who is a Program Manager, and we also have our legal counsel and the County Manager and the Deputy County Manager.

Councilors, as is typically the case, the County Charter it is the County Manager that will be presenting the final Comp Plan proposal as part of this planning effort before the Council for your final adoption, whether it's this Council or future Council but that is what the Charter requires.

What we are going to do this morning is go over what is before you and the recommendation of the Planning Commission after our hearing with the Planning Commission on November 7, that is what is before you. What did the Planning Commission recommend? We will go over that with you.

What we have asked our local jurisdictions to do is when we get to the proposal that they submitted, we will ask them individual cities to provide comment or comment on that proposal that they have submitted.

What I will also say just in the beginning is that County staff have, and I commend, this is not a criticism but an observation, we have worked very collaboratively and cooperatively with our local jurisdictions. We don't tell them what to do. They submit their land use proposal to the County.

There are functions and authorities that the County Council is allowed under Growth Management Act to make, one of them is adoption of the population to plan for, adoption of

the employment to plan for, adoption of the allocation of those population and employment, and, finally, adoption of the final plan, those are the authorities of the County.

It is up to the cities to submit a proposal and it's up to the County in this case, in some cases my staff or my department, to review those plans submitted by the cities and make a recommendation of what is my view about that submittal and that is not to disagree with the cities, it's just the responsibility of the Planning Department to review that and be able to make a recommendation both to the Planning Commission and then Council.

The cities plan are required, but we are not there yet, they are required to submit the associated Capital Facilities Plan to support the plan that they submitted, and the County's also required to submit a Capital Facilities Plan on how to pay for the plan that the Council will be finally adopting.

And I made this remark because of some issues that have come up lately, but I will go into that upon your questions if the Council has questions for staff. So, let's go to the next slide.

So, for today what we will do is go over the progress that we have made to date, go over the proposed land use alternative that the cities have submitted and talk briefly about how some of this site-specific requests that was submitted factored into some of the alternative that have been, that are before you.

In that we will also go over the GMA guidance. The GMA guidance is not new, but it is part of my responsibility to make sure that the plan that we are putting before the Council or the information that we are presenting to our Planning Commission and Council addresses the GMA requirement.

And why do I say that it is my responsibility to prepare a plan through the County Manager and advice from our legal counsel to minimize risk to the County. We will then also go over the State Environmental Policy requirement or study that needs to be conducted because we went out, if you recall, we went out to the public to solicit input as to what issues should we be looking at when we do the DEIS.

Councilor Yung, you participated in one of the open houses at the library, that's part of the process, and then we'll talk briefly about the next steps. Next slide.

Councilors, you have seen this before, this is our general timeline. We have four phases. Here the Phase 1 is the Project Initiation which the Council was aware of, we started that in early 2023 and now we are in the latter part of 2024.

The second phase is Shaping of the Plan which we began in early 20- -- well, from early January to fall of 2024. The first phase is Review & Refinement of the plan and that gets us into the

Draft Environmental Impact Statement, selection of a Preferred plan and with that selection of the Preferred plan we will begin refining the chapters that supports the plan itself.

And then that will lead us into the preparation of the Final Environmental Impact Statement and then the final review of the supporting materials, text, Capital Facilities Plan and also Capital Facilities Financial Plan which is like a 60-year plan on how to pay the first six years of the plan. And then the Adoption phase which is Phase 4 gets us into the adoption phase.

We talked earlier about the requirement to submit our plan to the State for the 60-day review, it is during that adoption phase that we begin that process and also hearing with the Planning Commission and Council and luckily for us we didn't object when the legislature gave us additional time, but we are supportive of that.

The adoption says on or before December 31st, 2025. When we put this together you can see that this on or before December 2025 was added new because of that extension, we were supposed to complete this by June 30th of 2025. Next slide, please.

As I mentioned earlier, this is area where the Council has authority to select the population to plan for and the Council did that from 2025 even though it says 2023 because that was when the Council adopted that, but it is from 2025 through 2045 a population of 718,154, that is a difference of about give or take 200,000 or less of based on adding that number to our existing population where we will be in 2045. You can see there what the new population, I said about 200, but it's actually less than 191,000.

The total job projection up to 2045 is 269,000, that is total job now from at the end of 2045, that information, if you recall, was through the help of ESD and Scott Bailey provided us that information and the Council adopted that, that is a new job number of about 88,100 and the County continued their policy of trying to get us to a job housing balance and that's how you see this one to one ratio.

And this was not limited to the County, it's all inclusive of the County and all the local jurisdictions, so this is, this now forms as the control number that we and the cities are supposed to be working with. Next slide, please.

This slide we are just showing this to Council have seen this before and I believe the public, it might be very difficult to see, but this is the final housing allocation that the Council approved.

I'm not going to go in detail about what this means, but if you have questions, I know you've asked questions before what does PSH mean, but we've provided that definition based on the State statute and language when Council Bowerman asked us that question.

But you can see here that the total housing that we are supposed to be planning for is 103,000

new units and this is all based on the tool that was developed by the Department of Commerce.

And if I may, Councilors, we talked briefly about the Housing Option Study that we are beginning to implement, what I will say to that is that when we started that project it was a foresight based on what we were hearing from the legislature, they were focusing on housing.

When we came to the Council at the time I said let's focus on housing because that's going to be a key issue, and we were having difficulty as we're talking about housing affordability.

The State did not give us any funding to do that work. I find a way in my budget to get that work started and I commend the Council for through the ARPA giving us 200,000 for the implementation of that work, but following that State guidance, this is what the allocation to the various cities in terms of again the State requiring us now unlike before to plan for housing based on various income bands, that's what this represent.

And you can see from we were talking about AMI before, you look at greater than 30 to 50 and all the way through greater than 100 percent you can see the number of housing units that the unincorporated area and all the cities are supposed to plan for, this is the housing allocation that the Council adopted. The next slide is the employment.

I talked about the 88,100, this again is the how each of the city's employment allocation was given and allocated to each of the cities and the Council approved that. After that allocation which the Council is aware took us some time to get done, but after that allocation the cities and the county went away and start working on how to meet that and that is the basis for the land use proposal that they submitted to the County. Next slide.

Now let me briefly talk about the SEPA process. SEPA is State Environmental Policy Act. Every project we do whether it's plan amendment, review of a subdivision, you're required to go through a SEPA process whether you make a determination of nonsignificant or a determination of significance, it's required by State law, and for this type of project we are required to also consider the potential environmental impact of the land use scenarios, if you will. So next slide, please.

Throughout this process we have maintained to the Council that we are required to; we are required to have a No Action Alternative which is our existing plan as it is plus any other changes we want to make.

Now, whether we do so or not, as I mentioned before, the legislature, the first housing bill they pass is this HB 1110 which requires not the County but the Cities of Vancouver, Washougal and Camas, for City of Vancouver to plan up to six-plex, Camas, Washougal up to four, there are certain conditions on whether you're on a transit route or so forth, but that is the law. So, if we were to do a No Action Alternative that has to include meeting the State requirement.

The second alternative will be as you will see some of the cities have submitted not one, but two scenarios. In some cases, they've submitted three scenarios or three land use scenarios, but we will say we cannot study all three, so they've narrowed it down to two in some cases which you will see.

So, the second alternative will include Alternative 1 as submitted by the cities, plus the County unincorporated area and part of the rural part of the County.

Alternative, the third alternative will include that Alternative 2 submitted by the cities and also the County unincorporated and the rural area, that's the three scenarios that we have maintained, we have to study in the Draft EIS and that is what the Planning Commission recommended that you do, plus additional recommendation which we'll get into. Next slide.

Now, we'll go into the map or the land use alternative as submitted by the cities, and I will turn this over to Jose Alvarez our Land Use Program Manager, and if you have questions of me, I will take that before Jose starts.

MARSHALL: Chair, I have a question. So related to the No Action Alternative, would there be an opportunity to have an option that is no expansion of the existing growth boundary, is the inclusion of HB 1110, does that allow for expansion of the growth boundary?

ORJIAKO: No, that's what the No Action means. The requirement for HB 11 just means the cities identifying what type of changes they need to make within the existing urban growth boundary to get to that, meeting that requirement, so the No Action is a no boundary expansion.

MARSHALL: Thank you.

ORJIAKO: You're welcome, Councilor.

MEDVIGY: Well, let me follow up on some of this. Can you just go back to the last slide. So, does this strictly pertain just to the cities or the quandary we're in because of the multiple proposals that the City has given us, is this a blanket statement on the entire process?

Do you understand my question? Are you just focusing this slide on the fact that some of the cities have given us multiple proposals?

ORJIAKO: I will say, yes; however, this is narrowed, if we follow this as laid out, it will be consistent with the recommendation of the Planning Commission that we study three alternatives.

One, they're not asking us because the cities will testify today, some of them have not advanced their tentative scenarios, so this will be leading to their first alternative, and second alternative.

MEDVIGY: So let me continue on this theme. Why did the cities give us, I mean this came up the last time when you briefed us on the multiple proposals from some of the cities, did they do it to give us flexibility to choose one that best fits within our own planners forward moving or was it simply that they couldn't decide which would be better for them or which would be their vision for way of head?

ORJIAKO: Chair, that's a very good question. As you know this is an interactive process, they also in meeting with their planning commission, their constituents, folks that live within the city and they're also responding to the communications that we were having with them, that is part of the, we were only making suggestion, we are not telling them what to do, so that is part of the reason why they submitted multiple scenarios and it's up to the Council to pick what any of this you would like to see advance forward.

The cities can speak to that but based on what they have submitted I think they have narrowed it down to the 1 and 2 scenarios that they have submitted. We are still, I can say that we are still having some conversation, but I think we'll get there with the City of Washougal on a different issue, but this have taken us quite some time to get to where we are today.

MEDVIGY: So last question mixed with a comment as well. We're still beyond the middle that we're still in the process and from my point of view when the Council next year starts to make all the final and gets to the final decisions, they absolutely need as many alternatives as possible and all of this ultimately goes into a Draft EIS, draft, there's still a lot of process involved.

So, the question part of this, and it goes to all the individual requests among others, besides the alternatives that the cities are proposing, how do we move forward giving next year's Council before they have to make all the final decisions the most alternatives that all get evaluated within the Draft EIS to give us flexibility in decision-making?

I mean that's what I want to hand the next Council is the best platform to start making decisions from. We've made some decisions like the population and the jobs, housing allocation, you know, we've had some of those building blocks over the last couple of years, but moving forward, you know, the focus is going to be a comprehensive study by the County and as many alternatives as possible I think is the best way forward before we, to put them into the Draft EIS. So, what are your comments on that?

ORJIAKO: I think that the two scenarios that the cities are propose will be supporting, will give that flexibility to our next Council because studying this doesn't mean, you might hear some

say, yeah, study study gives you some flexibility, but studying it doesn't guarantee you that it's going to be lead to the Preferred, it just provides you information, it informs you on what type of decision is going to be making to get you to the Preferred after you have reviewed the Potential Environmental Impact Statement in any of the scenarios, that is the flexibility that will be provided to you.

If for some reason the Council decide we don't like these alternatives, we want to see something different, I will say hear from the cities and if that's your recommendation we will move forward with that. But the two scenarios in my opinion plus the No Action scenario gives that flexibility.

If on the other hand, the Council, that's why I would like the cities to make a presentation and make their case before you, if for some reason the cities want us to include Alternative 3 and the Council goes along, we will move with that recommendation if that's what the Council wants to do.

MEDVIGY: So, my question, there's too many subparts to it. How about the part on all of the separate requests that have been submitted so far, is that within these alternatives?

Because I would personally want to see every single separate request continue to be considered and evaluated and moved to the Draft EIS. So does this impact those separate proposals? I'm not talking about the cities now.

ALVAREZ: So, Jose Alvarez with Community Planning, for the record. Councilor, some of the site-specific requests are included in the alternatives submitted in the cities, some in the Vancouver UGA.

Based on the alternative that was created by the County, most of the requests to include land within the Vancouver UGA were not included and the proposed changes in the rural area were also not included.

MEDVIGY: So that poses a problem since we suspended the process for those individual requests over a year ago. When does that suspension end? And then because they were told that it would be part of the Comp Plan Update and now, they're being --

ALVAREZ: They were told --

MEDVIGY: So, they were suspended, they couldn't apply and now they're not being included.

ALVAREZ: They were told that they would be included through the lens of creating these alternatives. So, in the case of most of the jurisdictions, the Vancouver UGA in particular, we started with just a very small deficit in housing overall, about 1,000 units. The challenge was

that we didn't have enough units at the sub 80 percent income band level.

So, in order to rectify that it required a severe amount of upzoning to add I think it was about 15,000 units, we started with a base of about 6800 units, and we needed about 21,000.

So, what we looked at was internal to the existing UGA to try to upzone some of those properties. It didn't make a lot of sense to look outside to have on the fringe of the urban growth boundary having higher densities to achieve that, that's why they were not included for the most part.

Those that submitted requests to be upzoned were included and then when we get to it, we'll show some changes into our zoning to try to achieve that balance.

MEDVIGY: Okay. So this probably isn't the time to dig into it especially before comments, but certainly at some point I would like the Council to consider directing staff to look a little differently because most of that upzoning is going to be apartments, which we need, we need everything, but then we're going to get to the point where we're going to have all subsidized housing, we won't have the single-family homes in sufficient numbers and people will be deprived of homeownership, they'll all be pushing to renting.

So, I'm disappointed that the separate proposals did not move forward at this point by staff's intentional actions. Anyway, let's -- other comments?

BOWERMAN: I have a question.

MEDVIGY: Please, Karen Bowerman.

BOWERMAN: In fact, two questions. How many site-specific requests were not included?

ALVAREZ: See if I can --

ORJIAKO: Is it in the slide?

ALVAREZ: It looks like 184.

BOWERMAN: Is that total?

ALVAREZ: Yes.

MEDVIGY: Just to repeat that because it kind of got the volume dropped, that was the total submitted, how many were not included?

ALVAREZ: Those were the numbers of the ones not included.

MEDVIGY: Okay. So, there was a larger number that -- okay.

BOWERMAN: And then my second question is what is before Council today as far as the specific purpose of this public hearing, is it the three bullets that are before us on the monitor now?

ALVAREZ: Yes.

BOWERMAN: Because that does not comport to your last slide which we had the opportunity to look at in advance, that is instead simply the Planning Commission recommendation. So, I'm wondering is this the one then that we should be looking at for today's decisions?

ORJIAKO: It is the, yes, because it is consistent with the recommendation of the Planning Commission plus the other recommendation that the Planning Commission made which was to for the Council to add 10 percent market factor for vacant employment land and 30 percent market factor for on the underutilized employment land, those are the two recommendations that the Planning Commission made to Council. So, this possible alternative that you see here is consistent with the recommendation of the Planning Commission, so that is what is before you.

BOWERMAN: That second part of their recommendation, is that included in what's before us here on the monitor?

ORJIAKO: No, we haven't got into that yet.

BOWERMAN: You're not recommending that; is that correct?

ORJIAKO: We have not got into the full recommendation of the Planning Commission. We will get to that. We haven't got into that.

BOWERMAN: But not today?

MEDVIGY: Well, yeah.

BOWERMAN: Today?

MEDVIGY: No, with our questions we've interrupted their presentation.

BOWERMAN: Yeah. I -- okay. Okay. Well, I saw that as your last slide.

ORJIAKO: The full recommendation of the Planning Commission will be presented to you --

BOWERMAN: Okay. Very good.

ORJIAKO: -- this is just half of it.

BOWERMAN: Very good. And also, you're going to tell us what the County initiated actions comprise?

ORJIAKO: Right, which we have shared with the Council before, you have seen that, May 5th when we had the work session with Council I believe October 9th, we will show you that so you can see --

BOWERMAN: Okay. Very good. Because I've got to say that the Comp Plan is huge and the proposals that are before us now are huge, and I think all of that is probably not included in these bullets so that's why I'm asking.

ORJIAKO: Councilor Bowerman, you will see that when we get to the maps.

BOWERMAN: Very good. Thank you.

ORJIAKO: You will, that's why I'm still in the (inaudible).

MEDVIGY: I was just going to say let's move forward but we'll get to Glen's -- let me just ask what number slide is that just in case we have to say let's go back to that?

ORJIAKO: 8.

MEDVIGY: 8. Thank you. Glen, go ahead.

YUNG: All right. Thank you. Just a couple of questions based on what has been presented so far. So, we are selecting what we will study and if we don't study it, it can't be adopted; is that correct?

ALVAREZ: This is providing the range. So, within this, we don't have to, you don't have to, the Preferred doesn't have to be one of the two alternatives, it could be within that range.

YUNG: Right. Then when we ultimately adopt it, it has to be something that we have studied?

ALVAREZ: Yes.

YUNG: So, anything we don't study can't be considered. Okay. The next question was with the

timing slide I'm trying to understand the 60-day Commerce, I don't know if those were in chronological order, but it, I'm just hoping you'll comment on is Council approving prior to it being submitted to Commerce or is staff sending it to Commerce prior?

ALVAREZ: This has nothing to do with Commerce.

MEDVIGY: I think legal wanted to weigh in.

OTTO: Public hearing, isn't that what we're talking about, the 60 day with Commerce?

ORJIAKO: No. No. We can go to that slide in terms of, and I know my legal counsel wants to say something, what slide is that the general -- go back. Let me -- right here.

Page 4 is the adoption process. We are required through the statute to submit our proposed land use to the State to start the 60-day comment. Like I said earlier, every project we do as a zone change, adoption of plan amendment, we are required to send that to State to begin the 60-day comment.

Often, they will review that and send us acknowledgment that we have reviewed that, what you're doing is okay to move forward. Before we start the hearing with the Planning Commission, Council and before you adopt, that 60-day notice also indicates provides Commerce the timeline as to when the final action will be taken, this is required. It's not related to the first hearing you had, but it's a requirement that we submit for 60-day comment period to Commerce.

YUNG: Okay. Yeah, I understand that. And so maybe I didn't state my question correctly. So, is it going to be that we have chosen the Preferred Alternative as a Council and then that goes to Commerce to look at or are you sending something prior to our decision of the Preferred Alternative?

ORJIAKO: We are not at a stage to send anything yet, it is after the Council have made the Preferred Alternative, yes. And the basis of the Final EIS is that Preferred and the basis of the Capital Facilities Planning work is based on that Preferred.

And when we started the adoption process, those are the information we submit to Commerce including the Draft EIS, the Final EIS, all the work that we have done to lead us to the adoption, that's what we submit. If it comes -- I will tell you having been here, it's like two or three boxes that we send up to the State.

YUNG: Great. Thank you. And then the last question was you had mentioned earlier of it being the cities' responsibility to do the appropriate analysis, you know, that's been the subject of many conversations in the last couple of days with myself and staff, I appreciate the time that

you spent to address that.

Now what I would like to ask you is if there are proposals that are before us for consideration today that do not meet the criteria of State law?

ORJIAKO: Is there a criteria or is there a proposal today that does not meet the State criteria, is that the question?

YUNG: Yes, that the analysis is not sufficient to pass State law?

MEDVIGY: Christine Cook wishes to comment, I think.

ORJIAKO: I will turn it over to our legal counsel before I say anything.

COOK: Thank you, Councilors. Christine Cook, Senior Deputy Prosecuting Attorney. I think that if you would like to discuss a question of whether there is a risk of litigation or risk of liability related to something that you're talking about, that is probably better done in Executive Session than in an open session.

MEDVIGY: But as to Glen's good question, I mean obviously if there are yellow or red flags saying, hey, boy, this is the city proposed this, this won't fly down the road we need to know that before we then go talk about it in Executive Session, but...

COOK: Councilor, I don't and, Mr. Chair, I don't if I am suggesting an Executive Session and scheduling one for the Council to talk, I don't do it in terms of we are going to talk about this action because this action might break the law. What we do is as required by the Open Public Meetings Act, we set forth the subsection of the Open Public Meetings Act that is implicated.

MEDVIGY: Understand. Does that answer your question, Glen?

YUNG: Somewhat. You know, I just feel like that if there are proposals before us today that we don't feel will pass the legal challenge, I think that that is something that we should be discussing beforehand. Anything we vote on today, if it's not legal, it's not really an option before us.

So, from my understanding, you know, I listened to the Planning Commission meeting, we received lots of public comment, many of them were very good, they reference the section of WAC, sections of RCW that indicated that if any resource land was being considered in an urban growth expansion that a countywide study of resource lands needs to be done.

From my understanding none of the cities have completed that and to me it makes it appear as such that many of the proposals that are before us are not going to pass legal challenge.

MARSHALL: Chair, if I could just -- I think at the outset, Oliver, you said provided kind of a frame of the proposal that's moving forward and that you have considered compliance with the Growth Management Act and potential liability to the County in coming up with this recommendation, so I think there's been that level of scrutiny that we can I think I would feel comfortable voting on these.

If we were to include all the site-specific requests, how many, that's thousands and thousands of acres that would be involved, it would not if people are thinking that would accomplish affordable housing, it would not because many of them are in the rural area and are subdividing resource lands.

So, I think it wouldn't be a favor to the new Council to lay out all options for us to consider with many of them just wouldn't be viable really at all, and I don't know if we have the time or resources to do that level of scrutiny really across the entire county.

MEDVIGY: Yeah. So, and just as a general statement, the Growth Management Act and all that we're doing is not focused on no growth. The purpose of the Growth Management Act is to have pragmatic thought and our best decisions on managing the growth that we're envisioning with the population that we expect to come.

So, it's not no growth, it's not let's slow growth, and I know that's incumbent in some of the statements that Councilor Marshall just said and many of the advocates groups that --

MARSHALL: No, because you're doing it inaccurately.

MEDVIGY: Thank you for stepping over me, I did not talk over you. It isn't no growth, it isn't slow growth, it's our best-informed decisions to manage the growth that we're going to experience over the next 20 years.

So, we do need to move forward so we can get to public comment. We have a room full of people who would like to speak and those will be helpful to us too. So, let's get to our last questions, please.

YUNG: One comment. I just want to clarify to Councilor Marshall it is responsible of an applicant to do proper analysis. What I'm suggesting at this point is some of the suggestion from the cities themselves we do not have the proper analysis for.

MARSHALL: Thank you. I agree with that.

MEDVIGY: And did you have one last thing? Okay. Oliver, we'll turn it back to you and Jose to continue.

ORJIAKO: Yeah. I think we'll continue, when we come back to the Council if I have any remarks to make, I think Councilor Yung is raising a good question, I don't disagree. Councilor Chair, you're raising a good question. Councilor Marshall you are. Councilor Bowerman you are.

Let's go through what the cities have submitted and begin to understand why we -- and the Planning Commission made their recommendation that they made to you.

This is very complex, I will say so, but I will reserve my remark until we get there because there are so many issues, it's not just a question of the County needs to do this because I can share with you Councilors that the first time the County, a global look at resource was in '92 leading up to the plan that was adopted in '94.

The Council at the time or the Commissioners at the time appointed a committee, two committees so you know, one for forest and one for ag, it took them more than two years to complete that work and some in the audience know here participated in that, they couldn't agree, that's what led to the Council at the time or the Commissioners at the time, just in terms of background, the Commissioners at the time and staff ended up with ag forest which was also litigated.

So, the way that the WAC is written, yes, it says the County will have to do a comprehensive review but it's very misleading because why is it misleading, if you are asking the question if the resource designation that the County made in '94 no longer viable, I think that's going to be the question.

The way that is written and the land use attorneys here may disagree, you have to start to review your previous designation to be able to justify whether that is still appropriate. That question have come up before, not with this Council, I don't want to go back, but it was during Councilor Madore's time.

We came to the Council at the time, do you want to do it? Our legal counsel was present. After presenting the issues before them they decided not to do it. Another promise was made to the rural folks to begin to do a rural lands review during former Commissioner Betty Sue time. The legal counsel at the time advised the Board at the time resource land should be off the table.

Why? Because the courts and the Growth Board have made a decision and a finding that the resource designation of the County was valid and compliant with the law. Historically we have not been very successful in designating or bringing ag into the urban growth boundary and the land use attorneys here know that.

I will get into more detail on that when you ask questions, but let's finish what the Council or what the cities are recommending.

The only time that we have been successful is through cities, Camas, Ridgefield and La Center annexing those lands before the court and the Growth Board can rule on them. I have shared with the cities and the land use attorneys here know that, that loophole have been closed by the legislature, it's no longer available, they know that.

So, you should be asking why, I think that should be the question, why with the closure of that loophole you can no longer vest, you can no longer annex, why are you putting the County in this position, I think that should be the question of the Council.

I will stop there. The legal counsel have said we can talk in Executive Session to lay out what the implications are. I have reached out to the cities throughout this process. I've said we have worked cooperatively and collaboratively with the cities where we have maintained that if you are considering or going to consider bringing resource land into the urban growth boundary, this burden falls on you, not the County.

And I can come to the Council and say, okay, if that's, if you want to reopen the resource area appoint a council, appoint an advisory committee, give me the resources to do it, they will not finish in two years, I guarantee you that, but that is not staff saying don't do it, it's just a fact. The other fact that we laid out with the Council and previous Board is --

HOLLEY: Oliver, I'm having a hard time hearing you. Can you talk more into your microphone, please.

ORJIAKO: Yes, I am. Maybe the staff might raise that up, but I am. The other implication of that is when you do that study, Council, there are two things that could happen. You can find out that there are more areas you should have designated as resource, and if you fail to do so, you put the County in a legal jeopardy, it will be appealed that you didn't designate those new resource areas.

So, there are many implications of doing this, it's not just say, yeah, go do it. But I will stop there. Let's go over what the cities are proposing, and we can have that conversation going forward.

ALVAREZ: So, I've asked for the cities to review their proposals with you so we can start with Battle Ground.

CRUMMETT: Good morning, County Councilors. Thank you for proceeding with this public hearing and allowing us to testify. In the case of Battle Ground's alternatives, we've submitted two, I guess the No Change Alternative would be --

HOLLEY: Who is speaking, please?

CRUMMETT: Sam Crummett, C-r-u-m-m-e-t-t, I'm the Planning Supervisor with Battle Ground. I'll try to keep this nontechnical because I have all the technical information in the record and try to keep this brief and highlight Battle Ground's priorities.

Alternative 1 which you see right now on this map is a growth alternative the City studies extensively in our Land Use Master Plan. The priority is a jobs expansion area out to and beyond Dollars Corner, that's approximately 450 acres.

We've gone through our reasonable measures exercise to show that we tried to accommodate jobs in the city, we've accommodated those as much as we could and do need to have this expansion. This proposal also includes taking out approximately 330 acres in the Meadow Glade area that's currently inside our existing urban growth boundary. We don't believe that area is feasible for converting into urban areas. And if I can go to the next slide which is our Alternative 2.

Alternative 2 is including all of our site-specific requests in and around Battle Ground. We need to do further analysis on this growth proposal. We need to make sure that some of these site-specific requests particularly to the west make sense to convert to urban development. We would want to make sure those comply with the Growth Management Act.

We believe this Draft EIS process gives us that time to do further analysis, present this before our planning commission and council and next year have a definitive Preferred Alternative that we would like to propose. That's all I have at this time.

MEDVIGY: Go ahead, if you have questions Council. Sue.

MARSHALL: Just related to Meadow Glade, was there public engagement with those residents, were they supportive of coming out of the growth boundary?

CRUMMETT: Generally supportive. There was public engagement that's occurred in 2021, so in the next several months we'd want to do another public participation exercise where they could be heard again and get their comments into the record.

MARSHALL: Thank you.

BOWERMAN: Question. Is Alternative 1 included in 2?

CRUMMETT: Yes, Alternative 1 is included in 2.

BOWERMAN: And you're not ready for Council to make a decision on your alternatives today; would that be correct?

CRUMMETT: That's correct.

BOWERMAN: Okay. Thank you.

CRUMMETT: At this stage in the process, we view this as exploring a range of growth alternatives.

BOWERMAN: Appreciate it.

YUNG: Chair. So, thank you for this conversation. So essentially Alternative 1 is really what you're looking at but you're also wanting to study the expansion request, or not expansion, but the site-specific requests just so you have as much information as possible to make a good --

CRUMMETT: That's correct. The City has put a lot of energy and study into Alternative 1, scrutinize that with the help of consultants, this has went through our planning commission and council several times and it's an adopted plan that we have, correct.

Alternative 2 is really the opportunity where we can explore these individual requests separately and collectively, put together our own criteria, scrutinize that through the growth management standards we have to abide by as well.

YUNG: Okay. And then in Alternative 1 is any of the expansion resource land?

CRUMMETT: Not in Alternative 1. In Alternative 2 we do have one site-specific request that is approximately 30 acres, it does have agricultural zoning, we have put the burden of proof on the applicant to demonstrate compliance with State law and coordinate with Clark County as necessary. We the City of Battle Ground aren't advocating for that at this time.

YUNG: Thank you.

MEDVIGY: Okay. Thank you for your presentation. I think that concludes our questions.

CRUMMETT: Thank you.

MEDVIGY: Who's next up?

ALVAREZ: City of Camas.

PFENNING: And if I could just reiterate real quick. When you're coming up, please state your name and again what city you're from for the court reporter online.

ALVAREZ: He might be online, Alan Peters.

MEDVIGY: And for the sanity of the court reporter, keep a normal baud rate and how quickly or slowly you speak. Our apologies for the quality, sound quality. Is someone here from Camas or are they online? They're online.

PETERS: Good morning, Council. My name is Alan Peters, that's P-e-t-e-r-s, representing Camas. So, you have two alternatives in your packet that you received, these have been developed to support the EIS work that the County's working on and we consider these to sort of be the most extensive growth alternatives possible for Camas.

Like, you know, what Sam Crummett just said with Battle Ground, we're continuing to refine these alternatives through our public process, it's our intent to identify a Preferred Alternative early next year that more closely aligns with our housing and job allocations, but studying both of these alternatives will keep our options open as we continue to work and certainly to select a Preferred Alternative.

So, we're confident that where we eventually land will be covered by inclusion of both Alternative 1 and Alternative 2.

So, this first alternative provides, you know, increases in high density residential to passing near the City's western boundary with Vancouver. This is an area where we have a lot of industrial zoning currently, existing infrastructure and proximity to transit.

This includes just one limited site-specific UGA expansion request that's from the Port of Camas/Washougal, it's about 83 acres of Grove Field, so this area would be targeted specifically for employment lands only and there is no additional expansion into private land or for residential purposes. This, again, was a request by the Port of Camas/Washougal that would support jobs growth in east county.

Alternative 2 basically is exactly the same as Alternative 1, so it includes everything in Alternative 1, but it does add two additional UGA expansions that had been requested by those property owners.

So, the first one there where the cursor is, is what we call The Merritt UGA expansion, it's a 57-acre site in Green Mountain on the north side of Camas. And then the second, The Nevin property off of S.E. 283rd Avenue on the eastern side of Camas is an additional request at 161 acres.

So, you know, that basically sums up what we've submitted to the County. Again, I think Sam did a great job explaining where we are in this and we're in a very similar position here where we're continuing to refine the alternative and consideration of those three expansions through

Alternative 2, does, you know, keep our options open as we further evaluate our needs here in Camas.

MEDVIGY: Questions of Council? Go ahead, Sue.

MARSHALL: Yes, just a quick question. With Alternative 1 and 2 are there resource lands that are included ag or forest?

PETERS: With Alternative 1 there are not. With Alternative 2 those two areas that I just mentioned, so Merritt property is forest and then Nevin is mostly ag, there's maybe five acres that are not.

MARSHALL: Thank you.

YUNG: Just wanted to thank you, Councilor Marshall, that was a question I was going to ask, and I intend to ask to each city the same question. But you received analysis, but it was not a countywide resource land study; correct?

PETERS: Correct. Each request are submitted independent analyses on de-designation.

YUNG: And site-specific?

PETERS: Correct.

YUNG: Thank you.

MEDVIGY: And just to follow along on the theme that Karen asked the previous briefer, Alternative 2 includes Alternative 1 or not?

PETERS: It does include Alternative 1.

MEDVIGY: Thank you. Other questions? I think that, Sue, you had your light on, did you have another one?

MARSHALL: It's doing it.

MEDVIGY: Oh, that just randomly happens. Okay. Thank you very much for your briefing. We'll go to the next city.

ALVAREZ: The City of La Center. Alec is online.

EGURROLA: Good morning, County Councilors. I am Alec Egurrola, A-l-e-c, E-g-u-r-r-o-l-a, I'm a

consulting planner with WSP working with the City of La Center on their Comprehensive Plan Update in these land use alternatives.

As you see here in Alternative 1 all that hatching in the northern portion of the City would be rezoning from low density residential to medium density residential to accommodate for the 80 percent AMI and below housing need. And then the areas around the I-5 Junction out by the casino you see hatched to the north of the Junction Plan and south, those would be properties expanded for jobs.

So, everything in the north there in that red shading is for commercial and then everything in the southwestern area for expansion is for employment or industrial expansion. And then for Alternative 2 is similar to Alternative 1. Can you scroll down please on the screen for Alternative 2. Alternative 2 is similar to Alternative 1 for those expansion requests.

ALVAREZ: They reduced those.

EGURROLA: Out west in La Center they're all the same properties; although, those two properties in the north Junction Plan would be expanded for mixed use instead of commercial and this would be a 50/50 commercial/residential split, and then this reduces the need for rezone within the existing UGA. Thank you.

Oh, another I'd also like to add that La Center City Council reviewed these alternatives and elected that they preferred Alternative 2 of these two alternatives to move forward with. Thank you.

MEDVIGY: Questions from Council?

MARSHALL: Can we take a look at the preferred, their Preferred Alternative, could that, the Alternative 2.

MEDVIGY: I think that is up right now.

MARSHALL: It says Alternative 3 but is it really --

ALVAREZ: Yes. They had three alternatives, they narrowed it to two, we just kept the same numbering.

MARSHALL: Got it. I am curious about the area that's proposed to come in that's in the southwest corner on the other side of the freeway, what's that proposed for and is that agricultural land?

EGURROLA: Councilor, that is proposed for employment or industrial expansion and, yes, it is

ag designated land.

MARSHALL: Thank you.

MEDVIGY: I'm sorry, I wasn't able to hear that. It is presently ag, and you want to go to industrial?

ORJIAKO: That's what they're proposing and the one immediately to the north is also ag and they're proposing that that comes in for a mixed use under this scenario.

MEDVIGY: Thank you.

YUNG: Chair. So just wanted to check, it seems that way, but both of your alternatives at this point include resource land being adopted into the urban growth area?

EGURROLA: Councilor, that is correct.

YUNG: Thank you. And no countywide land resource land study completed?

EGURROLA: Councilor, that has not been done but the property owner and their land use attorney it's, I'll represent that same land use attorney has submitted a de-designation analysis to the County for those properties.

YUNG: Okay. Which is a site-specific study?

EGURROLA: Correct.

YUNG: Thank you.

MEDVIGY: Okay. I think that concludes the individual questions. Thank you for your briefing. We'll go to the next city.

ALVAREZ: The City of Ridgefield.

COLE: Morning, Council. Thank you for the opportunity to present today. I'm Ridgefield Mayor Pro Tem Matt Cole. With me today is Ridgefield's Community Development Director Claire Lust as well.

The City has been successfully implementing it's 2016 Comp Plan creating a full-service community while rapidly growing in a high-quality way that has exceeded housing density targets created for us. So, over this past year Ridgefield has been engaging --

HOLLEY: Whoa, please slow down. I cannot keep up with that.

COLE: Over the past year Ridgefield has been engaging with our residents to create a path forward to our Comp Plan effort envisioning Ridgefield in 2045 staying true to who we are but working to meet the new State planning requirements that we are all facing.

Our city council has reached a consensus on two alternatives to study for our path forward and we're asking that you move both into the County's DEIS.

Our first alternative looks at accommodating growth within our current city limits and the UGA primarily through intensified mixed-use hubs. It includes all owner-initiated site-specific UGA requests, expansion requests adjacent to our UGA that were submitted to the County at your request.

And it is the City's position that there is value in studying all of these adjacent UGA expansion requests that the County asked for through the DEIS process rather than cutting those proponents out of the process without due analysis. Doing so gives the County options coming out of the DEIS.

Now our second alternative looks at accommodating growth within our current city limits and UGA through a combination of intensified mixed-use hubs, other zoning modifications and annexations. It also includes two owner-initiated site-specific requests submitted to the County, the Zimmerly property and the Maul properties.

The City's position is that these proposed UGA expansions are uniquely capable of accommodating our housing and job needs and their area is already characterized for urban growth.

But in addition to that the Zimmerly properties are also a Ridgefield industrial reserve, urban reserve area designated 20 years ago with an overlay and the Maul property is actually a mapping error. If you look at it, it is an island surrounded by the city that can serve our community with a much-needed fire station and senior housing.

We've submitted extensive information to the staff about the City's alternative and analysis of specific properties that I've mentioned showing that they are characterized by urban growth areas, and we believe there is a value in studying the multiple alternatives in the DEIS space.

We ask that you study the City's alternatives in the DEIS to give the county council options as well as reflected in the city council and residents that say in our own future development. And additionally, the City is supportive of a countywide analysis of all ag lands. Thanks for your consideration and we're also happy to answer any questions.

MEDVIGY: So did your council express a view as to which they preferred of the two alternatives?

COLE: Yes. We -- we -- we definitely the second alternative which includes Zimmerly and Maul are definitely essential, but our position is also that the County should consider all site-specific requests that are included.

MEDVIGY: Other questions? Glen, go ahead.

YUNG: The same question. In the expansion request in both of those, are there resource lands?

LUST: Councilor, yes. This is Claire Lust for the record L-u-s-t, Community Development Director with the City of Ridgefield.

And, Councilor Yung, to answer your question, yes, all of the site-specific UGA expansion requests submitted are ag resource lands similar to what you've heard from other jurisdictions.

We requested those property owners and/or their legal counsel submit analysis in support of de-designation which has been submitted to the County and as Councilor Cole mentioned we are supportive of further area-wide analysis as well. Thank you.

YUNG: Thank you.

MEDVIGY: Well, I don't hear any additional questions. Thank you very much for your personal presentation as well.

COLE: Thank you.

MEDVIGY: Thank you.

LUST: Thank you, Council.

PFENNING: Mayor Pro Tem, could we ask that you state your name again, please.

COLE: Yes. Matt Cole.

MEDVIGY: And next.

ALVAREZ: The City of Vancouver.

SNODGRASS: Morning. For the record Bryan Snodgrass for the City of Vancouver. For the

record Bryan Snodgrass for the City of Vancouver.

The City is -- we are doing our own environmental analysis but obviously we're very impacted by the County process and County environmental analysis particularly in the Vancouver UGA.

We are at a similar stage in our process, we have identified two what we call land use possibilities within city limits, they've not been finalized or a council preference established at this point, both aggressively plan for jobs and housing in the City of Vancouver for the next 20 years.

We're planning for about 38,000 new housing units and about 43,000 new jobs, which is a little bit more than we've been allocated, and we're proposing to do so through a different zoning system that consolidates and has far fewer zoning districts and more flexibility within those districts.

Within the Vancouver UGA we're not bringing forward any proposed expansions, we believe that there's ample land within the Vancouver UGA to accommodate the aggressive allocation and growth forecasts that the Council has provided, and as we'll speak to more in our testimony, do not support the proposed, there's a couple of proposed employment expansions in the Vancouver UGA in the alternatives coming from the Planning Commission which we don't support, we'll speak to that in testimony.

I think -- I want to emphasize with all -- with all these changes though I think there also is continuity as I suspect there is in some of the other areas as well. About half of Vancouver's current housing stock is single-family, most of those, not all, most will probably still be around in 20 years.

In terms of the new housing, at least the capacity analysis and what County GIS put together in terms of the materials for this meeting shows that the share of new housing growth, the split between higher density and lower density will be about the same as it's been the last few years for the City.

And then for that matter even in the Vancouver UGA that County analysis shows that more than half of the new, not existing, the new housing growth will be in what that analysis calls low density, lower density housing.

So I think it's easy to, and we do this ourselves, look at some of the changes and think that there will, everything will be changed, some things will, some things will not. So happy to answer any questions.

MEDVIGY: Thank you for providing only one alternative.

YUNG: Chair.

MEDVIGY: Glen, go ahead.

YUNG: I think I need Bryan to stay up here, but, you know, he mentioned some comments about our plan with the Vancouver urban growth area and I had some questions about that, but he also mentioned that he would be testifying later, I just want to make sure we have an opportunity to discuss that.

MEDVIGY: Go ahead.

YUNG: Do you want to do that now or --

MEDVIGY: Well, let's try. Go ahead.

YUNG: So, I would, I just hope that you could summarize your thoughts on our suggestion so far for the employment land that we're looking at adopting in the urban growth area.

SNODGRASS: The two expansions are you speaking to? The concerns there are that those expansions would not even have been needed under the vacant lands analysis that this Council last approved in May.

There were some smaller changes that had been recently made by staff, and we understand the direction of them but - and I don't want to go into the weeds unless you want me to, but essentially don't believe they're technically appropriate.

I think also the sites chosen also are not appropriate for the reasons we said in our letters, they're heavily parcelized, a lot of critical lands, not a lot of market demand at least as evidenced by the site-specific requests, and so if you're going to study those you obviously don't get a chance to study somewhere else.

The -- so I think that's the basis for our concern about those areas. I think also as our letter goes into in some detail, but the, in the existing Vancouver UGA I think probably to comply with several laws, there probably needs to be some, doesn't have to be a lot, but some additional commercial and employment land to the existing, the UGA near to areas which essentially don't have that access to them nearby right now.

YUNG: Thank you.

MEDVIGY: Other questions? Okay. Thank you for that presentation. I'm sorry the mayor had to leave. I did see Sue was seated for the duration. What's next?

ALVAREZ: Let's Vancouver UGA unincorporated area is next, but I just want to finish with the cities, so we'll go to Washougal and then Yacolt.

KNEIPP: Good morning. Councilors, for the record my name is Mitch Kneipp, K-n-e-i-p-p, and I serve as the Community Development Director for the City of Washougal and thank you for the opportunity to present this morning and discuss Washougal's initial plan associated with our update.

Through this process the City of Washougal was allocated 3,735 new residential dwelling units and 2,404 new jobs. Now we have a letter in the record regarding the job allocation noting an error that was just recently discovered which assigned additional jobs to Washougal that shouldn't have been; however, we are working with other jurisdictions to accept those job allocations and this reallocation of jobs will not affect the countywide employment capacity and at the same time it will ensure that Washougal commit or meet our GMA requirements to have 20-year capacity within our UGA.

So looking at our alternatives, and I think the other cities kind of addressed this a little bit, but, Chairman Medvigy, your question about why we have different alternatives and whatnot, there's -- we want to study using this process to have the environmental review done on them and have alternatives to work with to discuss with our council and community as we develop our Preferred Alternative plan.

So as Councilor Yung noted we do have to study it if we want to include it within our preferred plan, so the alternatives allow us the flexibility to plan more appropriately.

So, looking at our initial Alternative 1, this plan it reflects two scenario plans that we adopted in 2016 and are northeast and northwest urban growth areas, there's no changes to the current zoning with inside the city limits.

It does include a 47-acre expansion in the northeast which was a site-specific request by the Washougal School District. It assumes a 50/50 split for residential/employment uses in commercial zones and a 60/40 split for residential/employment within our town center districts and it establishes minimum densities in all of our residential districts as well as the town center. And it accounts for impacts of new legislation including middle housing and accessory dwelling units.

And as noted by County staff, this EIS process has three possible alternatives, No Action, 1 and 2 and so the City we didn't initially have an Alternative 2 plan though we did recently submit one to the County for consideration, it's the same as Alternative 1, the boundary as well as Alternative 1 and it maintains all the same assumptions as Alternative 1, but it does reflect additional community commercial and high density residential within the northeast area.

And so those are our plans that we would like to see move forward. There's no council preference on either one of them. And to answer your questions, there's no resource lands allocated in the expansion, so no other studies were done that were relating to the ag land, so...

I did also want to comment briefly if I could on the Planning Commission recommendation regarding the market factor. We're not really in favor of that at this moment in time, not -- don't have a problem with the concept fundamentally, it's just kind of bad timing.

The applying the market factor for employment land at this stage, we would have to rerun the vacant buildable lands, rerun, you know, new job allocations assigned to each municipality, it would take time and further frustrate our efforts, so... Again, thanks for the opportunity to comment and I'm available for any questions you may have.

MEDVIGY: Thank you. So, are you advocating for Alternative 2 as a council, you know, the Washougal council or do you hold them in equal esteem?

KNEIPP: We hold them in equal esteem as they're just plans for us to study and evaluate and then work on, you know, them together as we work towards a Preferred Alternative.

MEDVIGY: Okay. Other questions? Okay. And I know you anticipated some of our questions so thank you for that. We'll go to the next city.

KNEIPP: Thank you.

ALVAREZ: Town of Yacolt.

DENNIS: Thank you. Thank you, County Councilors, staff, my name is Paul Dennis, D-e-n-n-i-s, I'm with Jackson Civil, we're a contract planner for the Town of Yacolt and several other cities in the state.

I'd like to start off by saying that years ago the County and the Town worked together to deliver a 50-year vision, a 50-year expansion of the town and what we're doing today with our alternative is looking at those 50-year properties and looking at select ones to bring into the 20-year urban growth boundary.

We had about eight specific site requests through the County process, we've included all eight in our one alternative that we're presenting here to the County.

In the north area there are two areas that are kind of hatched and outlined, those are presumed to be residential for our expansion to help meet the residential allocation requirements.

Down in the south area it's right to the west of the blue triangle, there was a single site-specific request at the south, we actually included the property to the north so we have an orderly extension of services and everything, each of these properties do have urban services at their, ready at their site, so the extension of services for this growth can be accommodated.

In terms of the employment side what we're doing is on along the railroad to the east side of it there is a City property and a single property owner there that currently is designated as light industrial. What we're looking to do, and there's some work that's being done with the County on a recreational grant, is preserve that area for future recreational opportunities.

There would be a minor expansion for City services, they need a Public Works yard and so forth, there wouldn't really be any expansion of employment there. The same ownership is on the west side of the railroad in the blue triangle area and that's where we would then take the light industrial jobs that we were planning for to the east, we'd actually just put it to the west. And with that I'll answer any questions.

MEDVIGY: Thank you. Glen, go ahead.

YUNG: Just wanted to ask, is any of the expansion area resource designated?

DENNIS: They are not resource designated and part and parcel because the County did such a great job in the past working with the Town of Yacolt, so we have these urban reserves that are for of our 50-year growth, and this is allowing us to naturally expand into that 50-year horizon.

YUNG: Thank you.

MEDVIGY: Okay. I don't see any other questions. Thank you very much.

BOWERMAN: I just have a comment on your --

MEDVIGY: Oh, I'm sorry.

BOWERMAN: No, that's fine. I just want to say congratulations on your 50-year plan, that's pretty phenomenal.

DENNIS: I'll give the credit to the County, but...

BOWERMAN: All right. Oliver, take it away.

DENNIS: But the collaboration is greatly appreciated.

BOWERMAN: Very nice.

MEDVIGY: Thank you. You wanted to comment, Oliver. Go ahead.

ORJIAKO: The only thing I will say, this is Oliver, is I commend Paul Dennis and the Town of Yacolt, they did hire Community Planning to do that 50-year plan for them and we did that, submitted it to the State, no appeal. We also prepared a 50-year vision plan for them and they're following that.

Secondly, we prepared a sewer plan for the Town which was approved by Department of Ecology. The drawback is just in funding, and we couldn't help them get to that, but eventually they will be successful in having sewer in the Town of Yacolt, but I commend my staff and the Town for giving us the opportunity to put the plan together for them, so thank you, Paul.

MEDVIGY: Thank you. Okay. And I do believe that concludes the city. Oh, one more?

ALVAREZ: Well, that concludes the cities. The last one is the Vancouver --

MEDVIGY: Yeah, concludes the cities. Go ahead.

ALVAREZ: So, as I mentioned earlier the challenge for accommodating the allocation to the Vancouver UGA was not so much the total capacity for residential or employment, more the trying to meet that income band where we had a very large deficit in our property that could serve that sub 80 percent which is mostly multi-family.

Given the work that was done by the Housing Option Study and the changes that were made to the single-family zones earlier this year by Council adopting middle housing, that really increased densities that were allowed in our urban low zones, the R1-5, R1-6 and R1-7.5 that allowed up to 2,000-square foot lots which works out to about 21 and a half units per acre.

This now overlaps with our urban medium density zone that currently ranges from 8 units an acre to 22 units an acre, so the R-12, R-18 and R-22 are overlapped by what's allowed in the R1-5, 6 and 7.5 zones.

So, our proposal was to look at raising the floor for those urban medium zones from R-12, R-18 and R-22 to R-24, R-32 and R-40 and replacing that and increasing that density that way. Those are existing areas that have the urban medium density and that was a way to try to get at that deficit in those lower income targeted zones.

The other thing is that just overall we didn't have enough land zoned for those urban medium and urban high zones, so we looked at adding to those areas where we looked to upzone and there's some areas that, you can see there's the yellow lines where there's existing urban high

capacity and we added a little to the west of that, so those were some of the strategies.

The other focus that we were looking at was trying to concentrate this higher density capacity into the areas that are either served by transit, so along that Highway 99 corridor and the Hazel Dell Avenue corridor and sort of increasing density in those areas.

We also recognized that in our Highway 99 subarea plan that was adopted in 2014 that we've had that area allows for residential development on commercial land outright as we discussed earlier in the earlier hearing.

We hadn't accounted for any residential growth in our model, but we are starting to see some of that as Susan alluded to earlier and so our idea was to account for that, assume that a certain percentage of that commercial land will develop as residential, I think we assumed 25 percent to begin because we've in the 10 years we've had that plan it's only recently that we've seen any residential development happen there.

And then with the expansion of The Vine line that's coming, we anticipate that develop- -- that investment in infrastructure may yield more interest in redeveloping some of the properties along that area.

So within the Highway 99 overlay there are different concentrations of what types of building structures are allowed, some have a three-story limit, some are six, there's no maximum density in those zones so we needed to put some numbers to that and so we tried to follow what's already been adopted, what's existing there and trying to bring the floor, again because the minimums were reflecting that urban medium, so either going to these new zones, the R-24 through R-40 as a new floor for those so we can get an increase in density in those areas.

So that's -- the other area that we looked at were in the in 179th Fairgrounds area is where there was existing. Since the removal of the urban holding that's where most of our vacant and underutilized land is, so we looked at increasing the density in some of those areas to those R-24 and so you'll -- there's a lot of R-24 there.

You'll also notice that our total capacity exceeds what we were allocated, so we anticipate through this process that we may, there may be some shifting or reduction of some of that based on what comes out of the analysis.

So, in making those proposals to account for residential and commercial zones, that 25 percent, that also reduces the amount of acreage that we have available for commercial and employment, so that's what precipitated our expansion areas.

There's two expansion areas, again as to the east of WSU, which is following along, so this red outline we're proposing this expansion of business park land, and this is just south of an area

already in the urban growth boundary that has a similar designation. So, we're trying to locate that sort of in the same areas, we've got the infrastructure in place along 50th and 179th.

And then also following the corridor along N.E. 10th Avenue moving north to get to the 219th Interchange and I think there were three site-specific requests that were requested in that area for employment as well, so we captured that in that expansion. So, the red is commercial to the east and then to the west is business park.

MEDVIGY: Are you ready for questions?

ALVAREZ: Yes.

MEDVIGY: So, and lauding the planning that you did for Yacolt that brought to mind, it's been years since I've had this conversation with you about our urban centers, Hockinson, Amboy and what planning, if any, are we doing --

PFENNING: Microphone.

MEDVIGY: -- what planning are we doing around those urban centers, if any, as part of this program, Comp Plan Update?

ORJIAKO: Councilors, this is Oliver again, the legislature recently passed a bill on what needs to happen to what they call limited area of more intensive development.

I can say, Councilors, that there is still more new bills to come; however, this bill that passed allow for more commercial and mixed use opportunities in those rural centers, in Clark County that's what we call rural centers; however, as the case may be they put in a caveat that you will allow those intensive uses in those rural centers or limited area of more intensive development, the caveat that they put in this new bill limits the County to do that.

What is that caveat? If you are within ten miles of a city or a town you don't have to make those changes, so it puts majority of our rural centers out of that ten-mile radius. We have done the work, we looked at Amboy, we looked at all the rural centers and did a ten-mile radius and they fall within that ten-mile radius.

So, I am through the Association of Washington County's pushing that there be a different change in the legislature to address what could happen in the rural centers, so that's my response.

We've tried this before and my staff will attest to this which, and all the cities, would allow more intensive uses in the rural centers, commercial, mixed use and so forth where it's appropriate, we weren't successful, it's not for the lack of trying to answer your question.

MEDVIGY: Thank you. No, that, thank you for that update. So lastly, we heard through some of the questioning of the cities about a comprehensive countywide resource land study and some of the writings that we had from some of the lawyers out in the community and others were saying that the County hasn't done that, and we really need to do that as part of our planning process. So could you comment on that area, or you both could.

ALVAREZ: So, the requirement in the WAC is, if necessary, to review those resource designations, and Oliver mentioned what the history was for that. The Vancouver UGA what the County controls we're proposing, the expansions that we're proposing do not include any resource lands.

So, the jurisdictions primarily Ridgefield and La Center have proposed areas where resource designations are being proposed to be included in the UGAs. We've -- in -- as Oliver mentioned earlier, the laws have changed, the loopholes have closed, we've communicated with the jurisdictions about the need to do this work.

The question is this is a countywide analysis that's required if the Council -- staff isn't proposing to do this analysis, that would be something that comes at the direction of Council.

MEDVIGY: Okay. Thank you. And I'm sure there's a budgetary request that would follow along with that. Oliver's smiling. Sue, you had a question.

MARSHALL: Yes. You know, having heard the City of Vancouver's comments related to the expansion area and this is their growth boundary and I'm concerned personally about that northern knob extension there because really we're moving as best I can determine the City of Vancouver's growth boundary into what I think more realistically could be the City of Vancouver or the City of Ridgefield or the City of Battle Ground, it's moving really into their territory.

And then additionally -- well, so I wonder at what level of collaboration is done or could there be more collaboration to address the City of Vancouver's concerns in what is being proposed here?

ALVAREZ: So, what we tried to do was essentially look for areas where we could capture that employment on the maps. Certainly, there's opportunities to look more within the existing UGA, there's just some challenges with where that might be located.

We did have discussions with the City, and they suggested some areas and we expressed our concerns with some of those areas. We have along that Highway 99 corridor a lot of commercial designated land, there doesn't seem to be a lot going to the west but it's very difficult to locate commercial land in between there that would actually see development.

There's some existing commercial lands that are partially built, there's storefronts of existence but nothing's been added to that.

So either we need to look at changing some of the assumptions for how, you know, the work from home issue I think might be something that would accommodate some of that employment capacity, but I don't know that there's a lot of areas within the existing UGA that would yield any more employment that we could get from this expansion, but we are certainly open to looking at that, but we didn't see that opportunity in reviewing this.

MARSHALL: If there could be another careful look at that, I'd appreciate that. And then the other concern I have just looking at what's occurred along 179th related to the lifting of the urban holding and the difficulty of the extensive development that's occurring kind of helter-skelter throughout that area without the infrastructure in place and it will be a decade before that infrastructure, that transportation and sewer and everything is fully in place to accommodate the development that's occurring right now.

I think we could easily be in our next Comp Plan Update before that's settled on 179th, so I really question extending further north for the City of Vancouver.

YUNG: Chair.

MEDVIGY: Karen, did you have questions?

BOWERMAN: It was identical.

MEDVIGY: Okay. Glen, please.

YUNG: My questions are very similar as well. What I would say is I want to share my appreciation for you looking into what's actually happening because we can sit here and plan all day and rezone this and rezone that, but what's actually going to happen I think is important to consider.

So, I appreciate that, you know, when you determined that we needed to make those shifts and so we need some more space for employment land, but I do share the concerns about the location.

You know, I feel like at this point I would like to, I don't have any recommendations for how that should or shouldn't change and perhaps we're on the right path and I don't know, but I feel like we don't quite have enough information and I don't know if there's a way that we can just expand this study to consider a little bit more area outside the boundary for locations and maybe work with the City to identify some locations that they may be suggesting so that we can study a little bit more area so we have a little bit more to be able to make a decision on down

the road.

MEDVIGY: Okay. So -- oh, did you want to comment on that or otherwise we need to get to public comment sometime before our lunch break. Did you wish to comment, Jose, or --

ALVAREZ: Yeah. I think we're, yeah, we're open to that. I'm trying to think. I think we need to be a little more specific I guess about what we would look at in terms of areas so that it's adequately addressed in the EIS.

MEDVIGY: So, if that concludes the presentation, you have --

ORJIAKO: It completes the presentation. And I think Jose is correct in answering your question, Councilor Yung. I know City staff are here. I don't think that they're really, really asking for expansion of the urban growth boundary.

What they're really asking is that we take a look at within their existing, they did suggest some sites that we can look at either zoning as commercial or revisiting for example the fact that we have not considered redevelopment opportunities or as Jose indicated looking at the work from home percentage.

So those are areas that they were really among others for us to consider, not necessarily looking at those site-specific requests and expanding the urban growth boundary, I don't think that's where they are. They're looking at what we need to do internally, and other consideration on assumption we have to look, that's a little bit different than what you may be suggesting.

YUNG: Right. So, what I'm suggesting is essentially my understanding of their comments and their letter was that they didn't necessarily agree with how we came to the conclusion for the expansion but if we are going to expand that they had some specific suggestions for where to place that expansion.

ORJIAKO: I totally agree, but it is again a difference of opinion, if you will. We looked at this, we felt that it was necessary and the rationale for that. As you know most of the areas, we looked at initially will tell you that they're environmentally constrained, just looking at our map.

You look at Battle Ground, for example, you wouldn't think anything would develop in Battle Ground if we put up the environmental constrained map. We considered that and there is some utility or opportunity if those area were to come in that they will fully accommodate a job where anticipated, it's just where we believe it's necessary to look at that because again the map that we shared with you south is of WSU that area has opportunity and have access.

You look at N.E. 10th, I'm sure the State will eventually convey N.E. 10th to the County, you

have an investment there already, you have an access not too far away from 319, so it's a logical area to look if we were to consider some areas to expand in the future.

And Councilor Marshall is correct, even if we do expand those areas we don't have infrastructure to those areas at this point, we will put urban holding to it and do the planning and the necessary transportation work to ensure how this area will be further served.

YUNG: Thank you.

MEDVIGY: Okay. Let's move right to comments within the room.

ALVAREZ: We do have a few more slides.

MEDVIGY: Oh, I'm sorry, I thought that concluded the presentation.

ALVAREZ: It seemed like an end point. So, I'll try to go through these quickly and this is the next two charts are just a summary of the expansion requests by the UGA and then the zoning so you can see the number of acres, ag and forest, for the different alternatives that the cities spoke to.

These -- this is a chart of the site-specific requests. I think what, yes, when we talked earlier about the request and I said 189 I think it was parcels, some of them were multiple parcels, so there was about 136 total requests, individual requests that we had received, so... And I don't know if you want to see a map of those requests. Okay.

MEDVIGY: Of the 136 now that we're clarifying numbers how many were not moved forward -- how many did you include in your planning?

ALVAREZ: You can get an idea from this map hopefully. Yeah. So, the red, the red dots were the requests that were received that weren't included in an alternative. The green were the ones that were included. As you can see the jurisdictions part of their proposals, what those requests were.

The City of Battle Ground, the request were directly, were directed directly to the City so we didn't see those and so that's why they're not captured in the map. Yes. And so, the -- I think the -- these two in yellow sort of a partial I think they were requesting residential land, and this is where we looked to expand for employment, that's east of WSU.

And then there's another partial along 119th where there were five or six properties requesting to go from, they were zoned residential and community commercial and they wanted it all to go to general commercial. The area around there was -- so we recommended that the areas that are zoned residential go to community commercial as well.

And all of the commercial in that area has the same community commercial designation and then it abuts to the south Prairie High School and so we just had some concern about what if there was a conflict with what could be allowed in the general commercial so that's why we made that recommendation.

YUNG: Do we have this map that's distinguished between commercial requests and residential?

ALVAREZ: We can probably do that, but the vast majority of the requests were for residential.

YUNG: Residential.

ALVAREZ: Yes. And I think the, let's see, yeah, so this, this green dot was one, there were a couple, so this doesn't reflect that, this doesn't reflect the expansion areas, but these were covered in that expansion to the north that we were proposing for employment in the Vancouver UGA, and those were also for employment. Yes. Any questions on the map?

BOWERMAN: Yes. So, all of the red dots have been denied at this point or have they been evaluated at this point?

ALVAREZ: So, we evaluated in the context of the alternative that we are proposing. So, we weren't proposing any expansions to the Vancouver UGA other than those areas that we showed.

So, a lot of the expansions on the fringe of the UGA were for residential based on the upzoning that we are proposing, there's not a need for additional residential land and so that's why they weren't included to be studied in the alternative.

MEDVIGY: So, follow-on question to that, did that conclude your questions at least for now?

BOWERMAN: Yes.

MEDVIGY: So, where some of these individual requests because I heard the number 22 for surface mining overlay, are any of those moving forward or did you eliminate all those as well?

ALVAREZ: Yes. There were no proposed changes to the rural area, so the surface mining overlay there were requests to de-designate ag land to Rural 10 or Rural 5 or to be included in an urban growth area, and outside of the ones that were included in one of the city's proposals those were not included.

MEDVIGY: So, none of the green dots includes any mining activity?

ALVAREZ: Correct.

MEDVIGY: Okay. Further questions before we get to public comment? Yes, Oliver, you had, or we have one more slide. Okay.

ORJIAKO: There may be one more slide but if not, I just want to say the recommendation of the Planning Commission is to study three scenarios which is the slide 8 that we showed you before, plus a recommendation to Council to add market factor for employment lands, that's their recommendation before you. Before you start hearing from the public, I just want to make that observation that that is the recommendation of the Planning Commission that is before you.

MEDVIGY: Okay. Thank you.

BOWERMAN: And is that your recommendation?

ORJIAKO: My recommendation will be to study the three scenarios, Alt 1 and Alt 2 as the cities recommended plus the County version of the Vancouver UGA. I'm not recommending that you add market factor at this time, no.

Why? The Council and the County has updated the plan, I don't know, maybe this is the fifth or the fourth time, market factor had been used in the past, there's nothing wrong with that, but it's a question of timing.

And two, we have previous Board have used 0, so you have a spectrum from 0 to 50, when it comes to years 50 that was appealed, and we lost on that. So, 0 we have been successful, so if it's 0 I think we'll be fine. I'm not recommending that you apply market factor at this time.

MEDVIGY: Any additional slides? You're good. Okay. So, let's get right to public comment in the room who's signed up.

OTTO: And, Chair, I'll just note in the room it looks like we have 45 people who are signed up for public comment and potentially online as well.

MEDVIGY: So, I've just been asked for a five-minute break. Other Councilors as well? Okay. Positive head nods. We will take a five-minute break to reset before our lunch break.

(Pause in proceedings.)

MEDVIGY: Okay. We are resuming our hearing, and we'll start with public comment. I would just, if you don't understand this, that three minutes per 45 people that have signed up both

online and in this room, we're going to be here a very long time.

I would just ask that if you have submitted written comments and you can rely on that, we would appreciate that, but otherwise we'll go ahead and call the first speaker.

PFENNING: Brian Beeson.

BEESON: Good morning. My name is Brian Beeson. I live in Washougal. I'm here today to ask the Council to deny the request to study the inclusion of the Washougal 47 acres in the UGB. This is kind of a perfect crime, not that I think a crime has been committed, probably an ethics violation but certainly a loophole.

The reason I'm telling you this is because most of the people involved today have either been elected or appointed recently but won't know the hist- -- and won't know the history or are on their way out and won't be here for the next vote. Now granted my next statements are speculation but the lens I'm looking through seems pretty clear so indulge me for a moment.

So, a developer acquires a property that's in current use with a stand of mature trees. As developers do, he wants to build houses, so he tries to get the property into the UGB and get the zone changed. County says, no, it's not contiguous we can't add it to the UGB.

Developer says, well, how about if I do a cluster development and leave a remainder? The County says that fits nicely with our GMA goals, you know, reduce sprawl, protect the environment, enhance natural resources, blah blah blah.

So, developer sells the lots, builds the houses, harvests the timber and replants all within his rights under the cluster development. This is where the loophole opens up.

Developer now tries to get the remainder and the cluster into the UGB, the County says no. Now the developer is strapped with a clear-cut current use property with a wetlands buffer running right down the middle.

Who the heck's going to buy that. You can't build on it, you won't show timber profit for 60 years, you can't take it out of current use without paying a bunch of back taxes, so what's he to do. Sell it to a school district. Of course, they can use their influence to get the UGB changed, and the zoning changed, and they will be strapped with the back taxes once construction starts. It's brilliant.

So, a couple of phone calls to the city, a friend at the city or a school district, whoever, dangle a large property at only twice the market value to see if anybody gets a bite.

School districts smells the bait and without really vetting the property tells the board they are

confident they can get it into the UGB, so pushes the board to approve the purchase. The school board accepts the information they're being fed and votes to buy the land. There it is, fish on.

The developer just shoved the property into a great big loophole and the drawstring is cinched up tight. Developer exhausts all the property value, unloads the burden to the district, the district gets a questionable deal with issues that won't be realized until after the deal is done.

I think more vetting needs to happen and the taxpayer dollars need to be protected. We are being played. And if the school district for the city won't do it, I'm asking the County to help by slow this thing down. Please vote No Action. Thank you.

MEDVIGY: Thank you. Next speaker.

PFENNING: Thomas Strobehn.

PUBLIC: Good afternoon, Councilors. I'm now standing here on behalf of Thomas; he had to leave and I'm with the City of La Center. Our Director is on virtually and she would like to testify. Tracy Coleman.

COLEMAN: Good morning, Council. Can you hear me?

MEDVIGY: Yes, go ahead.

COLEMAN: Thank you very much. I am speaking on behalf of the mayor for the City of La Center. What we wanted to share was in regards to --

PFENNING: Would you state your name.

COLEMAN: Thank you very much. It was Tracy Coleman, Public Works and Planning Director for the City of La Center. Okay to proceed?

PFENNING: Yes.

COLEMAN: Thank you. So, I'm talking on behalf of Mayor Strobehn. We wanted to share that with our proposal Option C was voted and approved by our Scenario C by our city council. The lands that are included in this Option C there's a reason why we chose this option.

Basically, the lands within the west of the City of La Center's UGA are in Cowlitz Trust and that basically limits our land capacity and our expansion opportunities to the west due to the Cowlitz Trust.

We received job numbers from the County and the City has maximized its job density within the existing UGA and we cannot rezone the residential land within the UGA for jobs in order to meet the housing allocation, therefore we must expand for jobs for the County's requirement.

All properties are site-specific requests made by owners that has significant property owner support within the City and council. We received letters from legal counsel for these property owners and they have submitted these letters to the County as well.

The properties that we are asking to come within this UGA are in proximity to the I-5 Interchange and are most economically feasible for our job and land development. Adding these properties to the City's UGA are essential for economic prosperity for the City of La Center. The City again strongly supports Alternative Scenario C.

And then regarding the Planning Commission's recommendation to the Council considering adding market factor for temporary employment land of 10 percent, for vacant land of 30 percent for underutilized land, the City of La Center does not support this recommendation, we are in full agreement with that order.

This would require the County to rerun its Vacant Buildable Lands Model and require that County and all cities to restart this land use alternative process all over again setting us all back significantly in this process. We want to thank, publicly thank Oliver and his team for his coordination and his role in this process.

MEDVIGY: Thank you for that.

COLEMAN: You're welcome.

MEDVIGY: Next speaker.

PFENNING: Terry McLean. I know that some people might have left. Jim Maul.

MAUL: Jim Maul, Ridgefield, Washington. Thank you. Commission, I appreciate your perseverance. I will try to be quick.

The reason for my testimony today is our property, my parents' property that my brother and I now own is one of the properties that was mentioned during the Ridgefield presentation.

It's on -- located along Hillhurst Road. My parents bought the property in the 1960s. My father moved to Ridgefield when he was 9 years old and my mother was born in Ridgefield in a farmhouse in Sarah on Prune Ranch and we moved into, we moved onto the property in approximately 1969, we moved to Ridgefield from Salmon Creek.

I worked on farms beginning about age 11 and until, you know, my freshman, sophomore year in college. I've worked on farms from Vancouver Lower River Road all the way to Ridgefield National Wildlife Refuge and I feel very fortunate about that, and I'm also very appreciative of the County's efforts to preserve farmland. My parents' property has never been farmland, it was a wood lot when they purchased it, they bought it from the original family that homesteaded on that land.

It's a little over 10 acres, between 10 and 14 acres depending upon how you draw the lines, but it has never been used for farmland and it's really not suitable for farmland, and depending upon how you view growth and development, fortunately or unfortunately it's completely surrounded now by urban development and encroachment.

On the west side is our school facilities, it's on the corner, it's actually on the corner of Hillhurst and Carty Road and the property all around it is now in the city limits, has been developed with housing and we feel like it was taken out of the urban growth boundary.

My parents were -- didn't have enough money to challenge that, it would have cost a lot of money for attorneys and that sort of thing, now I'd really appreciate consideration of bringing it into the UGA so we can look at having it provide benefit to the community. Thank you.

MEDVIGY: Thank you.

PFENNING: Larry Wilson.

WILSON: Larry Wilson, Wilson & Associates Architects. I do have a low-tech handout here that I can give it to the staff, so... I think there's just four copies of it, so you go ahead and share.

We represent my client who owns two parcels of property, one a fairly large commercial property just on SR-503 just north of, the address is 9012 around the 90th and it's just north of a mini-storage facility to the south of it.

And then the second parcel he owns is where his offices are located. The County submitted or approved a live/work facility there, but the parcel is 9101 is zoned R1-7.5 and he's looking at adding that or getting a Comp Plan change so that his live/work facility is designated commercial.

And if you look at the next page, A1-2, you see photographs of his live/work facility there. And then the next page, the third page shows the proposal for 24 units plus retail commercial and then the parcel to the north is his live/work facility.

If we are -- if he's -- if the R1-7.5 is converted to commercial, which is essentially is how he's using it now, that would enable him to add additional parking there and get another 8 units to

develop on the south. So, it kind of makes sense to look at that.

And one of the side benefits is that we can eliminate two accesses. Off of, one off of 116th Avenue and one off of SR-503 so that we just have one access for the total development there. So, I think it makes sense to look at this as a Comp Plan change for the R1-7.5 to commercial.

MEDVIGY: Okay. Thank you, sir.

WILSON: Thank you.

PFENNING: Megan Light.

LIGHT: Good morning, Council. My name is Megan Light. I'm here today in opposition to the 48-acre expansion into the Washougal urban growth area of which 38, sorry, 31 acres are a remainder parcel from a cluster subdivision developed by Kysar, LLC.

Kysar has twice tried to get this property into the UGA and twice failed. Currently the City is proposing its inclusion again but this time complicated by an option for the Washougal School District to buy the 31 acres as a potential site, school site.

The Washougal School Board works very hard, and I do appreciate their services' volunteers, but they don't have the time to research every angle on every topic, they are not land use professionals and as a result they are left to trust the people feeding them the information.

On October 22nd there was a resolution presented to the Washougal School Board to exercise their option to buy the 31-acre parcel from Kysar with closing to occur no later than May 1st of '25. After little board discussion it was approved. I don't know what happens behind closed doors, but I find there is some very misleading statements in that resolution.

First, it states that Clark County has demonstrated they are supportive of including the property in the Washougal urban growth boundary and that's just not true. I confirmed yesterday with Clark County Planning Department that no such statement has been made and they have not expressed leaning one way or the other on this expansion at this time.

A second statement reads, the district has completed its due diligence for the property and has determined that there are no significant adverse conditions that would prevent the district from using the property for its intended purpose once it is included in the UGA.

Yet, almost one month after the resolution to purchase was approved by the board, the district then filed a permit for a wetlands review with the County.

And in the third statement, it is reasonably likely that it will be included in the UGA and it, the

purchase, is necessary to prevent the property from being sold to another party. I find that a scare tactic. As it stands the remainder parcel is buildable. There would not be many interested buyers.

So not only did the board not have all the data to make a well-informed decision, the statements they were presented with were misleading. They sound good and I can see how they might cause a well-meaning volunteer to give a thumbs up, but what concerns me if the Washougal School District ends up owning the property but its development hinges on being included in the urban growth area, the Council might feel pressure to approve its inclusion.

Once it gets into the UGA it's fair game for anything and the agreement for the 31-acre remainder parcel is thrown out the window. It's becoming obvious that the school district doesn't really have a plan for a school on this property, but it does see it as an investment and is hoping you will side with them because otherwise, they just spent over a million dollars on a piece of land that they can't do anything with. But to the neighbors near Mt. Norway who had --

MEDVIGY: Okay. Thank you. That does conclude your time. Thank you.

LIGHT: Thank you.

PFENNING: Thomas West.

WEST: Good morning. Name is Thomas West, and I represent the Sky River HOA which is a community of 32 homeowners a stone's throw down the road from the proposed inclusion into the Washougal plan. It's a tail of the woods.

On a plateau along the southwest flow of the wild Washougal River and above the town of its name lies an East Clark County community. The community area was thinned by natives and as hunting ground and later used by farmers; however, many wood plots remain and shelter the homes of our five families.

This woods are life giving in harboring wildlife including fish, barn owls and great horned owls, (inaudible), possum, raccoon, coyote, black bear, bobcat and cougar. Human residents take joy in the rich harmony, and it has become our homes.

This area of small farms, orchards and berry farm's eight years ago a developer acquired the 40-acre mature woods bounded by S.E. 20th and S.E. 342nd Avenue, they wished to clear the woods and create housing. Local residents objected to the proposal and the County Forester allowed the development of an eight-cluster community, that would require the remaining 31 acres to remain as woodland.

Four years later, 2020, the developer quietly obtained a permit from the State Forester, residents awoke on a Saturday morning to the sound of chainsaws and heavy equipment, in a few days the woodland and all its resident animals were gone, leaving only scarred and broken land. The Forester required a replant which was done.

At that time and unknown to the residents the developer executed an option to sell 29 acres to the Washougal School District as a site for a future school, that option expires on December 31st, 2024. In recent months both the school board and the city have advanced proposals relating to the siting of the school possibly or a concentrated housing and commercial development.

Local residents still mourning the loss of the woods are now facing a commercial development in the middle of the plateau that will change the lives of its residents and wildlife. This was done quietly without approaching the rural plateau community. Residents were never informed or involved with any of this plan that directly impacts their lives and homes. It appears that natural forces will not forever alter this community on a plateau, it will be development without conscious. God help us. Thank you.

MEDVIGY: Thank you.

PFENNING: Eric Golemo.

GOLEMO: Good afternoon, Council. My name is Eric Golemo, G-o-l-e-m-o, with SGA Engineering. I also served on the Development Engineering Advisory Board and an advocate for affordable housing.

So, this is a huge decision and it's quite possibly the most important decision you guys are going to make sitting on this as this Council. It will shape our community over the next 20 years. The plan we have in front of us does a good job of complying with House Bill 1220 which is, we've talked about that enough, but it's merely an accounting exercise at this point.

We need a plan that not only meets the State requirements but also actually plans for our future. A lot of this stuff in the boundary that we plan to upzone is not feasible without significant subsidies, that comes from County staff and City staff. They said they have to plan for it, not show that it's actually buildable.

So, we need to make sure that we have a community that maintains our quality of life and -- and the character of our community. The current proposal is not recommending any significant expansion of the urban growth boundary. So, in a 20-year period we're basically saying we need no new single-family homes in our county over 20 years.

What's left is being upzoned within the current boundary. This plan relies pretty much on

higher density alone. We need inventory in all segments, we need move-up housing, creating new opportunities makes additional, makes existing housing stock more affordable.

So, this plan basically forces our future residents into being renters. It takes away that opportunity for appreciation and equity of owning their home and having that opportunity for the future generations. We need a fundamental change in vision and philosophy from our decision-makers giving staff a different direction and guidance.

We need to give future generations a chance at finding a piece of the American dream here in Clark County. That plan needs to include some targeted UGB expansion. The other things that need to happen for that UGB expansion is the ag study. We talked earlier about the ag study that it went to; it was attempted before and went to the Hearings Board, and it was denied so why do it again.

Well, the reason it was denied was because there was no countywide ag study done, that's the requirement to be able to bring these areas into the urban growth boundary, it's a necessary step.

So, what staff says is correct, if we're not planning on bringing anything into the boundary, yeah, we don't need to do an ag study, but that's not the right way to handle it. We do need to plan for our future. This isn't an accounting exercise; this is a planning tool on how to plan for our community over the next 20 years.

So, the other thing too is the site-specific requests, those were promised as part of this plan. They held off on accepting site-specific requests for almost two to three years because they were all going to be considered with this process. Not considering them with this process is basically a broken promise. We need to make sure we look at it and we need that area in our urban growth boundary. Thank you.

MEDVIGY: Thank you. That does conclude your time.

PFENNING: Carmen DeLeon.

MEDVIGY: I don't see her in the room. Next.

PFENNING: Elena Kokta.

KOKTA: Hello. My name is Elena Kokta, and this is my third round for the boundary growth thing. I've done 2008 and 2016 and here I am again. I'm not going to take three minutes.

My main point is that we need to keep some of the natural areas intact, you cannot cover every inch of Clark County in concrete and asphalt. It could possibly contribute to warmer

temperatures that we're having, you know, there's all kinds of factors involved with that.

And where I live up in Washougal this property of concern is on Blair Road and 20th, a couple of people spoke about it too, there are many people that live there on five-acre lots that, you know, they like to be not in the city and I think our willingness to do that or our wishes to live like that should be respected and sometimes I feel they're not really not. This would, this development would make a major effect on us to change our way of life and just don't think it's right. So please consider that. Thank you.

MEDVIGY: Thank you.

PFENNING: Ronda Smith.

MEDVIGY: Don't see her.

PFENNING: Heather Renner.

MEDVIGY: Yeah, go ahead.

PFENNING: William Cox. Rick Tortorello. Sue Tortorello. And mayor is gone. Jean Walker. So, we got a winner.

WALKER: Thank you for giving me this opportunity. My name is Jean Walker. I'm in a membership at Lake Merwin Campers Hideaway also known as LMCH, it is located at 24706 N.E. Columbia Tie Road which is just north of Amboy. My husband and I have three camping tax lots which we use year-round.

LMCH has 1,500 permanent camp sites serving several thousand members, their families and accompanied guests. They have access to this beautifully forested area along with the Lake Merwin. I along with LMCH management and members have not known about the Comprehensive Plan until just recently. The possibility of 356 acres being surface mined right across from our camp is alarming.

Members and their families come to LMCH to relax in a quiet natural setting and to de-stress from their daily busy lives. The comprehensive overlay plan which indicates areas earmarked for surface mining would most likely have a negative effect on our large camp and its members.

The impact of mining has on aquifers, surface water, drinking water which we depend on, noise nuisance from blasting, drilling, ongoing rock crushing, heavy trucks transporting tons of crushed rock along Columbia Tie Road stressing the road conditions, displacement of wildlife and overall effect on the altered environment is a huge concern for all of us there.

Allowing out-of-state corporations to come into our county and strip the land and profit from its resources does not benefit the county or any one of us environmentally. If it's allowed the land will never be returned to the way it originally is.

I'm here today to urge the Council to holdup on a vote on this Comprehensive Plan which involves the environment that is close to our camp. The path to responsibility growth and future businesses need to be compatible with the vision to maintain Clark County especially the Chelatchie Valley as a unique and favorable place to reside comfortably given its proximity to natural resources for all to enjoy and not to destroy. And I thank you for your time.

This is a big concern as you, many of you do not know how large our camp is and how many people are members there and it would be a huge impact. So, thank you for your time. I hope you take that into consideration.

MEDVIGY: Thank you.

PFENNING: Rich Brosius. Bolton Minister.

MINISTER: Council, my name is Bolton Minister. My partner Rich Brosius and I own a piece of property south of 119th Street, we've requested it be brought in. We're surrounded by another property called Troxel property that's also requested to be brought in.

During the last review of this several years ago the Comprehensive Plan it didn't get brought in at that time I think because there's a development to the west of us called West Minister Walk and some of those people didn't want to be brought in.

And at that time, we didn't have any infrastructure to serve our properties, but it's changed now since they rebuilt 119th Street, all the utilities are there and as we speak Aho is building a subdivision adjacent to the Troxel property which will provide the sewer to this property.

So all of the infrastructure is now in and miles to the west and miles to the east of these properties is all in urban service boundaries so it's just a small piece in here, about 36 to 40 acres that could be developed and we'd request that the staff take another look at this and reconsider since we already have all the infrastructure there now to do this and it only makes sense to have the property south of 119th, all of that area brought in. It's kind of a unique little spot there that's kind of been left out. So, we request that they take another look at that. Thank you.

MEDVIGY: Sir, before you go, what was your name again?

MINISTER: Bolton Minister, B-o-l-t-o-n, M-i-n-i-s-t-e-r is the last name.

MEDVIGY: Thank you.

MINISTER: Thank you.

PFENNING: Robin Lown or Lown. Cassandra Marks. Sorry. Cassandra Marks. And what do you think that says?

MESSINGER: Roy Matson.

PFENNING: Roy Matson. Paul and Susan Cotterill.

COTTERILL: It's Cotterill and I said no under comments.

PFENNING: Okay. Yeah, I ask anyway just because sometimes people say no but they mean yes.

COTTERILL: Okay. Thank you.

PFENNING: And Steve Horenstein.

HORENSTEIN: Thank you. Good morning, Councilors. For the record my name is Steve Horenstein, H-o-r-e-n-s-t-e-i-n. Well, we submitted a couple of lawyers (sic) from a collection of land use lawyers in Clark County and I want to be very brief in summarizing what we said.

First of all, as a matter of legal defensibility for this plan, and we all want that, it's necessary to add a land use alternative in the DIS that incorporates the site-specific requests filed by March 15th of this year pursuant to a notice given by County staff on January 31st of this year.

Commissioner, Councilor Medvigy, you were right on point in noticing folks and I'd go a little one step further than you did by telling you that if you look carefully at that notice, it says as an alternative to the GMA annual reviews you mentioned it says inclusion in the DEIS. We put the entire county on notice that we would consider that.

I'm not -- I don't find any authority in GMA for staff to unilaterally just and perhaps arbitrarily get rid of 184 of those submittals, it doesn't work like that, it's not fair, it's not due process and it doesn't comply with the County's notice.

Secondly, we would ask staff to follow the dictates of GMA and the WACs and conduct the countywide natural resources study, ag and forest land, it's required, there's just no question about it. The word in the WAC is the County must do it, must is the operative word here.

Going a step further than that however you've got cities, staff has asked cities to submit their

alternatives and most of them still have two and some of those have requests for UGA expansions around the edges of the curved boundary but that include, but that are still designated ag land. How can you even consider those if you don't study them. And it is to be a countywide request.

Those are the two things that I think will preclude the Hearing Board from sending this matter back just on some very basic GMA stuff here. It's a hard enough process as it is, let's follow the rules that are clear and available for us to follow. Thank you.

MEDVIGY: Thank you.

PFENNING: Ketayun Keown. Bill Zimmerman. And Shamus Bair.

BAIR: I'll keep it as brief as possible. Sorry, I'm a little tall. Good afternoon, Council, my name is Shamus Bair from Washougal, Washington.

My wife and I purchased the property last year that shares the western border of the 31-acre proposed expansion for the Washougal School District. We are new to this area and I'm still educating myself on all that has occurred to date with this property, but our biggest concern is the impact on the habitat conservation and wetland designated zoned areas which are currently on our property plat that run through the middle of this 31-acre proposed expansion area along through the middle of our property onto the properties to the west and then onto the Washougal River.

As far as I understand, this parcel has been designated natural forest by both the State of Washington and Clark County. Furthermore, my wife and I spent a significant amount of time and financial investment to remove invasive plant species by replacing with native plant species in and around the designated habitat area on our five-acre property and has been designated a certified wildlife habitat by the National Wildlife Federation.

I urge the Council to reconsider allowing this parcel to be purchased, included in the Washougal city limits and rezoned which will negatively affect our and our neighbors' properties and the protected nature. Thank you.

MEDVIGY: Thank you.

PFENNING: Houston Aho.

AHO: Good afternoon. Houston Aho, A-h-o is the last name. I'm with Aho Construction.

We urge the county to explore a wider DIS analysis to be done. There's a current land shortage in the county of all developable lands. I know the HOSAP options are beneficial but without

additional land the increase in density is likely to cause inflated land cost directly increasing home prices and reducing home affordability for ownership.

The other item I'd like to talk about is the striking omission of not including a large chunk of public area that has had a significant urban development in it and has future urban development in it planned and that's the Hockinson Community Park and the adjacent school site.

I know the school is out right now for a \$50 million bond plus the Hockinson Community Park is the only community park that's developed in Clark County that is not included in the urban growth boundary. Community parks are part of the urban park system.

Its inclusion outside seems to be somewhat of an oddity and with the large amount of investment I know I think Hockinson bond is for \$87 million, \$50 million of that is to go to the elementary school so you have a large urban development that's being planned for an area that's kind of being overlooked for the expansion. With that I thank you for your time and appreciate it.

MEDVIGY: Thank you. So, Council, it's 12:30, I propose that we take our lunch break for an hour. What are your druthers?

YUNG: Chair, I would prefer that we finish public testimony before we break. I understand it's asking a lot of us but, you know, they've been sitting here for hours, we've already seen many people have to leave, I would appreciate it if we'd give them the opportunity to finish.

MEDVIGY: Okay. We have two for an hour break.

MARSHALL: I would, I wonder how many people if you could raise your hand are still interested in testifying?

MEDVIGY: And we still have online as well. Michelle, what do you wish to do? You're already eating, no fair.

BELKOT: I can wait, or I can do either or.

MEDVIGY: Okay. We're going to recess for an hour and take our noon lunch.

(Pause in proceedings.)

MEDVIGY: We are once again in session after our noon recess, so hope everyone had a little bit of a break, it's a beautiful day outside. We're in public comment at this point. We'll call the next in the room speaker.

PFENNING: James Brunberg.

BRUNBERG: Would you pass this paper around. Thank you. My name is Jim Brunberg, B-r-u-n-b-e-r-g.

And what I'm here to talk about is the property that's been included in the growth boundary for Washougal, Washington and it's in the papers that you have, it's marked as the yellow, the yellow square and that property is being talked about by several other speakers, I'm going to just talk about the property itself.

The property itself is on a downhill slope going towards the river which you can see on that illustration that's there. The property also has two streams on it that combine into forming one stream which by County regulations should preclude the development of or placement of structures within 120-feet surrounding the stream.

This land is really not useful for school development which is what Clark County is saying that it's going to be used for. It's not useful because the land is downsloping, because it has water on it and also the land is also extremely irregular in its contour. It's pleasant to walk over if you like to walk up and down hills, it's not a place for putting a school.

Our concern is that this is a designation that's been placed on property that will subsequently be sold for development. The land there is right at the dead-end of 20th Street which is the property line that goes immediately above it.

The streets are not broad enough for school buses to get through, they're narrowed, they're largely gravel streets north of it. The land does not have any sewer capability on it, there's no nothing that could be done except putting septic systems in, this in no way connects to the Washougal District and it would be extremely difficult to do it because everything would need to be pumped uphill.

It's our concept that this land really needs to remain in its cluster designation which is what the County provided to it with this land of forestation being adjacent to those eight little, small one-acre units that you can see there.

We're trying to work with the City but in their proposal here they have entirely not involved any one of us that live in that area in their proposal. We were totally stunned by the presence of this plan of Washougal to include this into their expansion district.

MEDVIGY: Thank you, sir, for your comments. And if you don't recognize him that's Matt Little in the back here, he's going to be your new district councilor.

BRUNBERG: (Inaudible) more about this. This is ridiculous.

BOWERMAN: But thank you for the map, that's very helpful.

PFENNING: Anne McEnerny-Ogle.

MCENERNY-OGLE: Thank you, Councilors, for the opportunity to testify. I'm Anne McEnerny-Ogle, Mayor for the City of Vancouver.

This complex process is at a critical point, we're about to enter into the last year to adopt our new 20-Year Comprehensive Plan as required by State law and there's still very, a number of steps that we still need to take.

The Council has made progress in the last two years, congratulations, you adopted an aggressive countywide jobs forecast higher than what the cities wanted, and an aggressive countywide jobs forecast based on an aspirational jobs per household goal.

You allocated the countywide forecasts to individual jurisdictions. You approved the most recent version of the VBLM growth capacity model over this past May and you published an EIS scoping notice saying how much growth we were planning for.

So, it's time to do an Environmental Impact Analysis of different alternatives for implementing the choices that you've made. Instead, some want to use the EIS to go back and completely redo those choices.

Proposals have been submitted to include a DEIS alternative that adds 25-square miles to the Vancouver UGA or another alternative that includes every single site-specific request to expand UGAs submitted by property owners, even those requests that are located far from existing UGA boundaries which would require also bringing in numerous intervening properties just to connect to those far-out requests.

The County has been listing and mapping each site-specific property request on the website for some time, we don't need to include each one in the DEIS to know that taking them all would blow up the growth forecasts that you have already adopted and published in the EIS scoping notice.

There isn't time to republish the notices and redo forecasts if we want to successfully complete your work on time next year. There also isn't a policy reason to do so given the aggressive forecasts we are all currently using.

Bryan Snodgrass of Vancouver will also speak to you today about the Draft EIS alternative issues specific to Vancouver UGA and the VBLM employment assumptions. So please consider

Vancouver's testimony, all relevant State requirements and relative countywide planning policies in your decision. Thank you very much.

MEDVIGY: Thank you, Mayor.

PFENNING: Tyler Castle.

CASTLE: Tyler Castle, Vancouver, Washington, Whipple Creek Park Restoration Committee. I am here, I want to thank Councilors Yung and Marshall for listening to me on this in the past.

Planner Alvarez is well aware of this particular thing that I'm going to bring up because I had some time with him at one of the early planning meetings and this is applicable to growth, it's applicable to SEPA and it's in regards to park impact fees and our tool that we use to plan for growth is we receive money from park impact fees for to build new parks and expand existing parks.

The problem is that tool was conceived in 1994, and the ten park district's boundaries have not been updated in 30 years. This allows for subdivisions to be built right on the border of park districts and parks that are outside of that not being allowed to be funded for that growth.

Again, Whipple Creek Regional Park is a perfect example, thousands of houses have been built in the last four years along 179th Street in the Fairgrounds neighborhood and millions of dollars have been collected for PIFs, again they -- we -- they -- you need six houses or more to pay a TIF, a transportation, a SIF, a school and a PIF, parks, those are designed for growth.

Whipple Creek Regional Park is actually outside District 10, and this is, so take a subdivision right on the corner a quarter a mile away, 340 houses at North Haven paid \$1.4 million in Park Impact Fees, that money has to stay in District 10 even though Whipple is their recreational asset.

Many, many, many SEPA permits have been filed in the Fairgrounds/179th Street area that have stated Whipple Creek Regional Park as their recreational asset. They have paid Park Impact Fees in the millions, that money has to stay in that district to account for growth in that district.

I'm pleading with people to be, this can has been kicked down the road before, expand the park district boundaries. This tool is designed to take care of growth, when we build houses and pay for future parks, the district boundaries have not been moved or changed since 1994.

The county's grown since 1994 and it's going to grow again and it's pretty easy for anybody to Google Park Impact Fees, Clark County, it's a nice three page document, I encourage the public to look at it and hopefully that's going to be a part of the discussion for the future so we stay

concurrent because I do believe there are some serious concurrency issues with the State on funding and building new parks. Thank you.

MEDVIGY: Thank you.

PFENNING: Jackie Lane.

LANE: Good afternoon, Council. I'll keep this short. I want to echo the testimony of others that ag and forest land need to be retained and protected and there's no justification for much expansion of the urban growth areas.

I urge Council to ignore the request by the Planning Commission to reopen the Vacant Buildable Lands Model to add market factor for commercial land. The VBLM was approved some time ago, a lot of work and expertise went into making it accurate, there's no justification for second guessing it now.

The building industry was well represented and the Planning Commission had two work sessions on VBLM in 2023, so it had ample time to raise any issues then. I was at their last meeting, there was no information put forth at that meeting to justify their request to modify the VBLM at this late date, so I ask you to please leave that alone. Thank you very much.

MEDVIGY: Thank you.

PFENNING: Heidi Cody.

CODY: Hello. Thank you for this opportunity to testify. My name is Heidi Cody, C-o-d-y, I'm with Alliance for Community Engagement which is a coalition of 12 environmental climate and social justice groups in Southwest Washington, we call ourselves ACE.

ACE asks that Clark County Council postpone decisions about land use alternatives until new County Council members are on-boarded. Land use zoning changes will have significant impacts on climate and community health and safety. The new Clark County Council members will be best positioned to adopt these decisions that will profoundly affect our future.

While County staff has done excellent work coordinating public input through surveys, public events and the citizen advisory and environmental justice groups, land use alternatives are a crucial point for diverse community participation. Community groups need more time to weigh in on the alternatives for a wider range of voices and ideas to be heard.

ACE is asking you for three more months to coordinate input with the groups funded by Washington Department of Commerce to participate including offering an additional alternative for consideration. Washington law requires early and continuous public

participation in developing comprehensive land use plans.

Clark County's own 2025 public participation plan says community planning wants to prioritize engagement with community members who have historically been left out of public planning processes.

Multiple organizations including several local BIPOC lead community-based organizations and Washington Conservation Action have been granted or subgranted funds from the Washington Department of Commerce to help with comprehensive planning at Clark County. Clearly, Commerce is interested in input from these groups.

ACE whose participation in comprehensive planning is supported by a Commerce grant to Washington Conservation Action requests additional time to suggest at least one land use alternative detailing our recommendations and coordination with other local organizations that have received funding from Commerce.

Please do not adopt alternatives that conflict with climate goals. The land use alternative decision is an opportunity for Clark County to come into alignment with Washington State's climate goals, not set us back. ACE strongly urges Council not adopt land use alternatives submitted to the County that dramatically conflict with these climate goals.

Expanding the urban growth boundary by 18,000 acres are including every request be included in the UGA and every point in between is unacceptable. Thank you for your consideration.

MEDVIGY: Thank you.

PFENNING: Curtis Ambrose. George Schumaker. David Peel.

MEDVIGY: Anyone else in the room raise their hand.

PFENNING: Noelle.

MEDVIGY: Okay. We still have four, five. Okay.

LOVERN: Good afternoon. I'm Noelle Lovern, last name L-o-v-e-r-n, and I'm with the Building Industry Association of Clark County, we represent 750 member businesses and about 12,000 employees. I appreciate the opportunity to comment today.

One thing that I think is paramount is that we take this consideration further seriously, and I know that staff has done a lot of work, I know we've all been here many, many hours. We really want -- need as many solutions as possible, we're here pulling every lever to make sure this is a plan that works.

And so, we did submit a map in the, to the Planning Commission, that map was not necessarily asserting that we needed to bring in square miles of land, I think that we are still deciding how much that is. And so, what we do know is we need all the tools we can possibly get in our toolbox to address this issue.

So, we're urging a few things, that all the site-specific requests be considered and that a resource land study be done as we believe that is in accordance with law. Also, I want to address the idea of the actual study.

We did, Northwest Partners did some personal research, we have found a consultant that says that they can do that in five months and that's a credible local consultant, so...

And just in closing, our community deserves a plan that addresses each landowner site-specific request, is a proactive and actionable plan and legally defensible. Our organization members and coalition that we belong to have engaged in this process and provide feedback and documentation for our requests. It is of great concern that we rarely see the feedback integrated in a meaningful way in some of the work that's being done.

While this body is responsible for planning and accommodating our vision for the Comp Plan, our members are the ones that develop and build that and as such feel that our input as well as the entire community and all of those landowners are important to the process. I will mention that I submitted Northwest Partners comment letter along with some comments from the BIA so would like all of those considered as well. Thank you.

MEDVIGY: Thank you.

PFENNING: Elizabeth Ford. Heidi Zimmerman. Alondra. Christofer Robison.

ABREGO: Did you say Alondra?

PFENNING: Alondra.

ABREGO: Good afternoon, Councilmen. My name is Alondra Abrego-Viveros, I am the Community Engagement and Policy Organizer for Southwest Washington Equity Coalition, a nonprofit that advocates for equitable policy developments to support communities of color across the region.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak this afternoon about an issue that will shape the future of our community, the Comprehensive Plan proposed land use alternatives for the DEIS. I come before you not in opposition but in the spirit of collaboration urging us all to consider what is at stake and the voices that must be honored in the process.

You may know that Washington State Department of Commerce has invested more than a half a million dollars in culturally diverse nonprofits in the county specifically to support community engagement with the Comp Plan. We work to coordinate and organize with five other organizations that were funded by Commerce which collectively represent nearly 20 percent of Clark County residents.

Before I get into why you should reconsider your decision about land use alternatives, I wanted to recognize the effort of the county planners and staff that have put forward to collaborate with SWEC and the other organizations that were funded by the Department of Commerce.

They have engaged with us regularly since our work in September and have helped us gain a deeper understanding of the Comprehensive Plan and then offered their time and expertise to educate us by breaking down the complexities of the plan and accessible language for our community.

As we know land use decisions have far reaching consequences. They define the character of our neighborhoods, determine the accessibility of resources and ultimately impact the wellbeing of every resident. These decisions are even more critical in Southwest Washington where communities of color have been historically marginalized.

The Southwest Washington Equity Coalition, other community-based organizations have already expressed willingness to engage in the process, but we need more time. As I mentioned, Commerce has funded our organizations to help us engage in the community and the process, but we were not able to begin our work until October, by then most of the work to develop land use alternatives have been completed; thus, excluding our organizations and communities from explicit engagement.

We need more time to collaborate with staff and bring forth solutions that reflect the needs of our community. This is not just about land use, it's about equity, inclusion and ensuring that the most affected by these decisions are not left out of the conversation.

With newly elected Council members set to take their seats we have an opportunity to begin this conversation with leaders who reflect their diversity of voices within our community organization and in a meaningful way. To move forward now before they are seated risks undermining the trust of the very people we aim to serve.

MEDVIGY: Okay. Thank you. That concludes your time. Next, please.

PFENNING: Christofer Robinson. Robison, excuse me. Ken Malone. Valerie.

MEDVIGY: Stepping forward.

PFENNING: Kathleen Jackson. Oh, is it Valerie?

USKOSKI: Yeah.

PFENNING: I was going to just, I won't demolish your last name, I'm so sorry.

MEDVIGY: You may need to spell that one for the court reporter.

USKOSKI: Valerie Uskoski, U-s-k-o-s-k-i. I'm with the HUA Consulting and I actually represent two landowners that have individual requests in.

The first one we actually heard from Mr. Minister earlier and I represent the Troxel property that surrounds his, so we are in urban reserve, and we've requested to have the urban reserved lifted and come into the urban growth boundary for development.

So, I just want to put that out there that we would definitely like our individual requests to be considered, it hasn't been included thus far in any of the alternatives.

The second property owner is Larwick out in the Battle Ground area, we are zoned AG-20, we are surrounded by R-5 on at least two of the five, we have road frontage on the other and I don't recall what's on the south side of the road.

Their property, we had applied in 2019 for an annual review to reclassify from AG-20 down to R-5 to be consistent with the surrounding properties along with our topography being up to 80 percent slopes with the rock outcropping but it's just not feasible or viable as farmland in any way.

So at the time in 2019 we were rejected for the annual review and a refund was issued to our clients and we were told that we'd need to wait for the Comp Plan Update with a countywide ag resource assessment, so we are here today reiterating that we would like to be considered for a rezone and really push the County that we do need to look at these resource countywide surveys.

MEDVIGY: Thank you.

USKOSKI: Thank you.

PFENNING: Kathleen Jackson. Ann Foster.

GOODY: Good afternoon. I'm Mary Goody and I'm here to read a statement on behalf of Ann Foster. I am speaking for friends of Clark County.

We are a nonprofit organization representing our thousands of supporters. We work collaboratively with the community partners and policymakers to keep Clark County a beautiful and healthy place to live, work and play for future generations. Over the past two days Friends of Clark County has submitted seven sets of comments all for the public record in support of our request this morning.

Three minutes is not enough time to give visibility to the references, documents, maps and statutes that support our requests, so let me summarize what we are asking.

First, we propose a broader vision of the county which recognizes the value of the agricultural lands in play in the existing alternatives under consideration. People have always been there to produce food for our community, but the playing field is not level and has tilted extraordinarily towards random unplanned sprawling development.

And to that end the Council should reject the inclusion of specific ag lands of long-term significance into any UGAs. The County should also reject any other SSRs proposing conversion of AG-20 or forest lands that are located outside of proposed UGAs. And the Council should reject any attempt to convert rural lands that abut or surround ag or forest outside of proposed UGAs. And the Council should reject any attempts to convert rural lands that abut or surround ag or forest lands because they are essential to protecting the area.

Thirdly, a DIS alternative should include an existing boundaries alternative. This has been proposed by the City of Vancouver and also by Futurewise. At least one alternative should accommodate the selected population and employment projects within the existing urban growth areas and not convert natural resource lands to other uses.

Fourthly, we ask that none of the SSRs for surface mining overlays be included. None of these sites should be approved unless or until a full and complete countywide study of aggregate availability is completed as was done in 2016 as part of the Comp Plan Update.

Current legal precedence combined with the GMA statutory scheme and the WAC rules regarding designation and de-designation of agricultural lands are clear that de-designation is unlawful.

MEDVIGY: Okay. Thank you. That concludes your time.

GOODY: Thank you.

PFENNING: Scott Golphenee.

GOLPHENEE: Thank you for this opportunity and my great concern when it comes to the slope

stability of Clark County. A slope stability report was established in 1975 as a request from the Clark County Council to Allen Fiksdal. This set of concerns and report specifically relates to the Chelatchie Prairie.

It states right there on this map; in fact, this report was established as forming a lot of RCW and policy when it comes to Clark County. Chelatchie Prairie is right in a Level 2 concern that Robert Fiksdal, Allen Fiksdal, I apologize, Allen Fiksdal had stated is a slope concern and I'm going back to the Oso landslide.

If we could have stopped that, would we have, I would have, and I'm wondering if I'm here today to say, hey, can we put a stop on this surface mining overlay until more research is done based upon the findings that Allen Fiksdal had made 30 years, 40, 50 years ago, this may have a lasting impact.

The train tracks that are traveling down along the Moulton Falls area, there's not a lot, it's all mountainous and it shows that in the maps of Allen Fiksdal. So, my request and I believe a lot of people are voicing the same concerns of the, not just the environmental impact, but the human impact when it comes to surface mining overlay without the proper study of the impacts. Thank you for listening.

MEDVIGY: Thank you. Thank you for being patient all day. Who's next?

PFENNING: Nick Kuzmenko.

KUZMENKO: Your Honor, thank you. My name is Nick Kuzmenko, with all respect I speak to you today and thank you for all the work that you guys do and, Council, that you guys provided.

I bought a piece of property that's 20 acres and later found out that it's in an urban growth boundary zone and I know that that area is already a real expensive area and for families my size and my generation it is very expensive to afford such lots and right now it's being even trying to be zoned, right now it's R-5 and it's moving to Urban Reserve 10 or UR-10.

And I know that it is becoming more and more unaffordable for our generations to buy lots like this, and I propose that you guys think about where the lot size can be so that it can be more affordable.

I know there's a big push in doing farming or agricultural type of development in those areas, but we understand that having, you know, those lots in, be in financially productive or to sustain small even homestead on small properties like this it is very difficult for us.

So, I think talking to my community and my neighbors that are already sitting on even smaller parcels, I have like one acres, one and a half acres, three, four, five acres around me and all

those people they understand that sustaining those taxes and sustaining, you know, those lots are difficult sometimes.

But if you change the zoning into bigger lots or where people with bigger parcels they can subdivide and provide more affordable housing to young families. It makes it very difficult for young families to move into those suburban areas of the county.

Also, it sits right on the 72nd Avenue, the area I'm talking about is the growth boundary into from north of 139th and south of 179th. The, you know, both south and north of it is commercialized and industrialized and there's a lot of heavy traffic that's moving on that road.

So, we would ask that you consider also the areas where the commercialized can be among those fast-moving roads as families don't necessarily enjoy living by fast moving roads and if it can become commercialized so the residential is moved a little further out from those roads, we'd definitely also appreciate it.

So, if the fast-moving roads can be commercialized and the areas, that area can be smaller in the acreage where it can be provide affordable housing, we would definitely appreciate it. Thank you.

MEDVIGY: Thank you.

PFENNING: Carmen DeLeon.

DELEON: Hello. My name is Carmen DeLeon. I live here in Vancouver; I go by Mellow also. And I kind of got confused with everything I signed up for so hopefully this you're talking about development, and I don't see anything in the development on preserving our bees and our trees and nature in general.

This is all just urban development, urban development and nothing to embrace our wildlife and I've seen counties and cities, actually countries that have made roads that are friendly to wild animals and buildings that are friendly to birds and bees.

And you can actually make it so that these people have to grow stuff in the city because I've already talked to you guys about how it in the summer when it's going to be 100 degrees, if we had enough plants in the city it would go 20 degrees lower, you know, and that everybody's going to have their air-conditioning blow out at the same time and then what are you going to do, have a bunch of dead bodies, you know.

So there has to be a place where they can go and cool off in the city for free and that includes, okay, urban development with trees that are friendly to bees and to butterflies before they all go extinct.

I've talked about these committees and so they say that we've talked to the public, okay, like I've said before, they've gone online, just like the City, they delete whatever they don't like. I've gone on the Vancouver City government and posted things about the mayor, and they delete them, no problem.

So when they come to you and say, oh, we put it online and everybody agreed it's all a big joke because they came online and they deleted all the negative comments and you're talking about a whopping 20,000 people and, you know, you've got 500,000 people in the county, so I mean it's a small fraction either way, it's pretty much a joke your little Internet page that you like to delete things on.

So, I mean if you really want to hear from the public, you can't count on The Columbian either. The Columbian newspaper I went and knocked on the door, they told me their circulation is 40,000. 40,000 but we're half a million. So that falls short also.

So, if you really want to hear from the public, I was glad to see it full earlier, but I guess everybody left, but I mean if more of the public would do something we wouldn't have this mess, you know. And unfortunately, I'm almost out of time here, but let me see if I can get one more thing in here. No, I guess not. I'll see you at the breaking of the ground at Kiggins at 3:00, Mayor.

MEDVIGY: Okay. Thank you. Are there any other comments within the room that we may have missed?

PFENNING: I don't have anybody else signed up.

MEDVIGY: How about online?

PFENNING: I do have about five online.

MEDVIGY: Please.

SNODGRASS: I think I had signed up.

PFENNING: I'm sorry?

SNODGRASS: I said sorry, I think I had signed up on the sheet.

PFENNING: Oh, go right ahead. That's not the right -- sorry. Bryan Snodgrass.

SNODGRASS: Thank you. I'll be brief because some of what I was going to speak of I think the

interchange I had with Councilor Yung we spoke of earlier when describing the Vancouver plan.

In terms of process I think that one of the things that this decision is about is how much whether to go back on past decisions and so speaking to the, you've heard about that in terms of growth forecasts and how some of the proposals would effectively blow those up and also arguably require renoticing of the EIS and perhaps even redoing of this hearing. So, folks who were interested in alternative choices would know what the -- what -- how much growth was being planned for because that was already specified.

In terms of the vacant lands model, no model's going to be perfect, there's obviously been a lot of discussion about this over the years, and the last say that this Council who makes the final decisions would have had was in May and so since then there's a couple of now piecemeal changes coming forward that kind of concern us that both what the Planning Commission proposed and also I think what staff did regarding the mixed use in Vancouver that don't seem technically sound but I think also more importantly ignore bigger problems in the employment side of the model.

Most of the committee that looked at the vacant lands, most of their work was on appropriately on the housing side. They -- it's kind of probably fair to say they ran out of time on the employment. So, there's still a number of employment assumptions that are I think somewhat unresolved.

Jose alluded to the issue of work at home, where the current assumption is far less than the data according to the Washington Employment Security Department economist to saying the data is now. There are other assumptions, there's no assumption, there's only an assumption that redevelopment for jobs will occur on government properties but on private properties it's assumed not to occur.

There is -- there doesn't appear to be any accounting for mixed use buildings where pieces of land can accommodate both employment and housing in a single building, that's obviously going to happen a lot more in say downtown Vancouver than say the Vancouver UGA, but it will happen to some extent, right now the model doesn't capture that.

So, if we were to reopen the model from what this Council decided back in May we need to address some of those issues and absent of that we think it's probably a lot better and safer to go back to what this Council approved back in May and that's what we would recommend or to have a good look at some of those employment assumptions. That's all I have for you.

MEDVIGY: Thank you. All right. So, I think that we'll go online now.

PFENNING: Ezra Hammer, you've been requested to be unmuted, please state your name for the record and go ahead with your comment.

MEDVIGY: Okay. Let's go to the next one.

PFENNING: Cassandra Marks, you've now been requested to unmute. Go ahead with your comment please after stating your name for the record.

MARKS: Hello. Thank you. My name is Cassandra Marks, last name M-a-r-k-s. I am a resident of Ward Road. I agree that homes need to be built but I also agree with the City of Vancouver's assessment that no new land needs to be added into the UGA.

I am here to object to Aho Construction's petition to annex Parcel 207543000 owned by Kunze Farm Investment Co, Inc. In this proposal the petitioner Aho Construction is asking for 76 acres to be moved from AG-20 to R1-5, which allows for a minimum of 5,000-square foot lots, that's allowing a potential for 500 to 600 homes.

Current capacity projections on Page 20 of the Buildable Lands Report this would add 2.66 people per house and two cars per home adding 1,000 to 1200 automobiles on this roadway.

For anyone who drives this road it is insane, and I wonder every time I drive past Davis and Ward intersection whether I'm going to be the next car in a serious accident. The solution is right now that Davis and Ward intersection is getting a roundabout next summer.

Per key findings on Page 3 of Appendix C, the unincorporated Vancouver UGA housing inventory analysis, most people in the study area are commuting 45 plus minutes or more for employment and the jobs available per home is also negative 1.5 which supports the thought that most people are commuting to Portland to go to work. This puts extreme burden on roadways adding two cars per household and no public transportation, but there's more than just traffic issues.

The next concern is that of the schools. Hockinson School District is already heavy overburdened, so the school district unanimously put an \$87 million bond in for special vote on February 2025, but that still needs to be passed and think about building a new elementary school and that won't even be ready to help the community for years.

So, the 76 acres worth of homes added to the UGA will put even more pressure on the school and just keep thinking that the Si Ellen Farms neighborhood is still building and currently adding to the population of the Hockinson School District right now.

But not only are there issues with the traffic and the schools but taking away from ag land is taking money out of our community. For every one percent of Clark County's consumption of free veggies and meat bought by local farmers markets, the region retains an extra 5 million in the local economy.

In this petition Aho Construction states that per USDA standards that the land is no longer suitable to grow for human consumption. As someone who has lived on Ward Road for the past five years and as a farmer myself all I have seen is them hay the field in September and till it once which impacts the lands' ability to grow food for human consumption.

Many of the farmers in this room from earlier could take that land, convert it back to land that can produce food for human consumption, so the current owners have not been appropriately caring for it to make this claim. The Pacific Northwest is an ideal climate and a prime spot for farming, and I hope that you maintain the urban growth boundary out here on Ward Road the way it is.

MEDVIGY: Thank you.

PFENNING: Ezra Hammer, we've sent you a request to unmute yourself now. You should be able to hit your unmute button on your laptop or computer, please go ahead and unmute yourself and go ahead with your comment.

Okay. We're going to go move on to the next person. Jude, we've sent you a request to unmute yourself. Please state your first and last name for the record and go ahead with your comment. Jude, I can see that you're unmuted, can you state your first and last name for the record and go ahead with your comment.

MEDVIGY: Okay. Moving on.

PFENNING: I'll go to the next one. Justin Burger, we've sent you a request to unmute yourself. If you can please unmute yourself and go ahead with your comment.

BURGER: Afternoon, Council members. My name is Justin Burger. I'm a farmer operating Burger Family Farms in Clark County with three generations of Burgers. Our farm and our home is just outside of the City of Yacolt.

First, I'd like to thank the Council for their work recently to define and approve a new ag committee which will once staffed provide needed voices from farmers during discussions just like this one.

I'm here today to urge you to reject the rezoning and annexation proposal that will forever alter our county's landscape and destroy irreplaceable agricultural land. Every acre of farmland paved over for housing and jobs is an acre of food production lost, not just today, but for all future generations. These lands are not just dirt, they're a foundation of our food system and our local economy. Once farmland is gone it is gone forever, and it will never return.

We often hear that we need more housing and jobs, but let's be clear, urban sprawl isn't about solving those needs, it's about serving land speculators and developers at the expense of our green spaces and agricultural heritage.

Vacant Buildable Land Models already show that we have enough land within existing urban growth areas to meet these needs. Expanding urban boundaries isn't about necessity, it's about greed. This Council has a choice, you can either protect farmers and the critical lands we steward, or you can push us out.

The more farmland we lose, the less viable it is to become a farmer, not just for those of us working land but also for small farmers across the county who rely on agricultural community for shared resources, market and support. Rezoning also fragments our remaining farms driving up land costs through speculation and weakens the fabric of our agricultural community.

How can farmers invest in high value sustainable crops if they don't know whether or not their land will remain agricultural next year or the year after? What is the point of an urban growth boundary and zoning if we expand it at every opportunity?

Addressing Yacolt's request specifically. In addition to the points, I've already raised, it is important to note that Yacolt has experienced significant growth in recent years, with many new homes recently built and occupied or plans to be soon to be occupied. Despite this growth there remains a substantial amount of vacant land within the town's current boundary.

Moreover, Yacolt's remote location more than 20 miles from essential services like grocery stores, jobs, medical facilities and reliable internet creates heavy reliance on daily road travel. This traffic is burdensome, and it places onto roads that were never designed to handle such levels, further straining infrastructure and quality of life.

Finally, the property Windsor Engineering requested for annexation into Yacolt were provided to the County well after the due date the County set and it is even mentioned in Windsor's request. I thank you again for your time and urge you to reject these annexations.

MEDVIGY: Thank you. How many others show online?

PFENNING: We have about four more. Don Steinke, we've went ahead and unmuted you or requested, sent a request to unmute you. Please go ahead with your comment. Don, if you could unmute yourself, go ahead with your comment. I think he's on.

STEINKE: My name is --

MEDVIGY: Okay. Oh, there he is. Go ahead.

STEINKE: Hello everyone. My name is Don Steinke, and I live in Chair Medvigy's district. I appreciate that the GMA requires protecting resource lands and increasing housing affordability as a top priority.

Additional requirements were added to the GMA last year. That additional requirement requires us to reduce emissions and per capita miles traveled in single-occupancy vehicles, that's been entirely missing except for Heidi in this conversation.

Also missing is wildlife habitat protection. It has been shown and in study after study that the more dense a community is the lower the emissions are and the greater community and economic vibrancy.

Before we moved to Clark County in 1968, I had secured a teaching job in Camas and my wife got a job at the hospital on 34th and Main. We looked for a place to live near the hospital because we could not afford two cars. We found a place so that Alona could walk on a sidewalk to the hospital for work or to Safeway for food.

Neighborhoods like that minimize emissions and the expense of road building, but most neighborhoods don't enable that, not in Vancouver and not in urban Clark County. Most people given the choice would rather have a 5-minute commute than a 40-minute commute.

Until 2023 we had artificial constraints on housing supply in the urban areas which drove up the price of housing and forced people to live farther out, but in the recent biennium our legislature passed five housing reforms which make housing more affordable in urban areas.

If more people lived near transit, more transit gets used and more transit improvements will be justified, that means more affordability. A family of four could get by with just one car instead of two or a young urban professional unmarried could ditch a car all together and use transit and a bike and not only does that leave more income for people to do other things, it reduces emissions and motor vehicle trips. If there is more housing near job centers, it reduces the motor vehicle trips and emissions as well.

I encourage you to minimize expansions of the urban growth area and promote density and humanity-rich neighborhoods instead. Thank you very much.

MEDVIGY: Thank you. Next.

PFENNING: Caller, we've sent you a request to unmute. Please go ahead and state your name for the record and go ahead with your comment.

GOHEEN-ELBON: This is Kimberlee Goheen-Elbon, life citizen of Clark County, Washington and

a patriot. It's our duty and right to speak to our elected officials. I want to say as I serve the public that the people that are on the phone that want to speak must push star 6 to unmute. The clerk should also mention that to unmute caller and please press star 6 because I'm sure they're sitting there wanting to speak.

I want to also speak under the Comp Plan and everything I say will be under that, that as I have served the public for the last two years, it took me quite a few months to have them even print the star 3 for callers to raise their hand, this Council is not transparent to the public and it's wonderful to see everybody there.

So, I'll give one big example as I've studied them for two years that they went underminingly from Battle Ground's council to use the railroad and I put it together to mine Chelatchie, so that's in the past, but I want to let everybody know that this Council is not transparent. However, they did take an oath to do the will of the people, and the people are speaking up right now, do not pass this Comp Plan.

So, again, my prayers are answered as the public has become aware of this Comp Plan and what the Council has been doing these past four years while the public is healing and was thrown into a pandemic of chaos, illegal mandate and the literal raping of our land by developers who are encouraged to move here and continue overpopulation, pollution, under the Comp Plan.

So when you follow that Comp Plan, and I'm going to give you reasons why, the GMA and other means they follow to use hard earned tax dollars from when they build that better bumble and the American Rescue Plan which I label as the American Rescrew plan as again it's using hard earned tax dollars to follow Agenda 21-2030 which is a must read.

That is the crux of it all, the Comp Plan follows that agenda and I'm going to tell you why in a bit here, as that Clark County's largest city Vancouver is a sanctuary city and as Portland and Olympia and Seattle and over 400 cities across America are members of the United Nations and put forth comp plans that are not following our constitution. It is a deep, deep swamp.

Our elected officials must do what the will of the people and have not these past four years. This public hearing must hold our government accountable for past and future governance.

Our public must look at all county and city council meetings each week now and be active and do what our forefathers warned us to do when the government thinks they control us, we are the people and we control them and we must continue that as Vancouver is a sanctuary city, they are harboring --

MEDVIGY: Thank you. That -- please. Thank you. Sometimes that clock just goes really slow. Anyone else online?

PFENNING: LeAnne Bremer, we've sent you a request to unmute, please go ahead and state your name for the record and go ahead with your comment.

BREMER: Yes. Hello. My name is LeAnne Bremer, B-r-e-m-e-r. Good afternoon, Chair, Council members and staff. Just two quick points that have already been somewhat addressed earlier, in the earlier testimony.

First, the County must allow the public to propose amendments to the Comp Plan under GMA and when this is done is typically through the annual review application process.

On the site-specific request issue the County did two things. First, it suspended annual review applications while it was going through this periodic update. Secondly, it invited site-specific request applications to be submitted.

And I want to latch onto something that Mr. Horenstein had earlier testified to. There was a notice sent out by the County in January that invited people to submit site-specific applications during this update process, and I want to quote verbatim one sentence from that notice and it says, site-specific requests must be submitted by March 15th, 2024, to be included in one of the alternatives to be studied in the DEIS, that's pretty unequivocal, to be included in one of the alternatives to be studied in the DEIS, that was represented to folks who are submitting site-specific applications and they relied on that representation and that's in place of an annual review application process.

And we're not saying that all those requests have to be approved, but they have to be studied to some degree in the EIS. I apologize for my voice; I'm battling a cold. And I'm not talking about pages of analysis for each request, it's just the EIS must include some sort of analysis of them as the County said it would do.

Secondly, on the natural resources land designations, those are not intended to be perpetual. GMA has a very specific requirement that all counties -- am I out of time?

PFENNING: Almost.

BREMER: Okay. -- that all counties and cities must review and update their natural resources lands and critical areas designations, and they must also review their UGAs and to do those reviews they are mandated to do the countywide natural resources land study. So, thank you for your time.

MEDVIGY: Thank you.

PFENNING: We're going to try Jude one more time and that's the last one that we have. Jude,

we've sent you a request to unmute. On your laptop you should or on your computer you should see that it's unmuted.

It looks like you've unmuted yourself, if you could state your first and last name for the record and go ahead with your comment.

MEDVIGY: Okay. Anyone else online? Okay. That con- -- oh, I'm sorry. Okay. I think that concludes public comment.

MARSHALL: I think someone's having trouble getting on.

MEDVIGY: No doubt. I've had trouble getting on myself half the time.

PFENNING: Ezra Hammer, we sent you a request to unmute. If you can unmute yourself and state your full name for the record and go ahead with your comment.

MEDVIGY: Okay. That concludes public comment. Let's go ahead and put slide 8 up. So, what I'm hopeful is that we can have substantive discussion and actually make some decisions here today.

I will just start with my thoughts on, so slide 8, I have a real concern with what we've heard, there are some that came today in person but others that have submitted online for specific requests over -- and I've kind of lost track of how long the annual reviews have actually remained suspended, but I'm really concerned about that process.

So, all these people made these requests and there was over 100 of them and pretty perfunctory they're not considered, and they weren't able to submit under the annual request, I know it's a huge workload for you, I know it, and this is not the forum for us to just approve the ones that came to speak today. Strategically we need a different process for those. So, and there's been a number of requests to include that in the DEIS to move it forward.

Whatever we decide today is not a final decision, whether it's an SMO or a private person trying to get a different zone, whatever we do today does not approve it, it just moves it forward and it gives the next Council the opportunity, the widest opportunity to have some flexibility on some of these individual requests that I think just got pushed to the side, and I'm not saying you did it arbitrarily or capriciously, the process is just not a good one.

I mean, we have entertained those annual requests before, we have entertained individual rezoning requests, we haven't done it in basically two years now, so all these private property owners have been deprived of their ability to have their request considered. So, I would really support that.

I also just generally want to say that I don't support throwing a hand grenade on the process and opening up the VBLM, we've heard that from a number of people including the cities, other planners.

I mean there's so much work that goes behind it and we went through that angst with the VBLM and then with the cities themselves, we went back and forth over the years to get, as to sharpen our pencil as much as we could on that data. I do not support opening that up. You're on a very tight timeline, you have limited capacity, we just can't go backwards on some of these issues.

And I also, the last thing I will say is I generally agree with the requests that we've heard from a number of people that there does need to be a countywide natural resources land study and we heard some explanation as to why it may not be mandated because of what's happening with only within the urban growth boundary now, but I think it, you know, put the burden on the individual cities to accomplish that for the entirety of the county, that's not going to work.

So, anyway, that's all I wanted to say. We have -- okay. That's not slide 8. What happened to slide 8? Is this the one you want? Is this the slide you want up, Oliver, for us to discuss making some decisions here? I thought it was slide 8.

OTTO: Yeah, I believe it's slide 8, but...

MEDVIGY: Whoops, we just had it. There we go. Okay. I'll turn the mic over to whoever wants to speak next. I see Sue has her finger on the button.

MARSHALL: I have a process suggestion, and I know the Planning Commission lumped the VBLM and the environmental study together but maybe we could just make a decision on the whether or not to reopen the VBLM and get that off the table and then move on from there.

YUNG: Yeah, I agree. And, in fact, the three issues that you brought up I think are at the core of the discussion here and I think we should just tackle them one at a time those three issues.

BELKOT: I agree.

BOWERMAN: Agree.

MEDVIGY: Okay. Well, let's start with a motion.

BOWERMAN: Okay. I'm always happy to make a motion. So, I will move, and this is kind of a complex multifaceted one, that we have a study done of the ag and forest lands.

And I'm going to move that we combine Alternatives 2 or Bullet 2 and Bullet 3 because several

cities want to have two actions going forward and so that seems like an appropriate thing to do with evaluation and responsiveness to all site-specific requests and all city or other jurisdictional requests and of course the integration of HB 1110 into the evaluation that goes forward.

MEDVIGY: Well, that was kind of an omnibus of a --

BOWERMAN: No. No. Complex, not omnibus.

MEDVIGY: Well, I think it may be better if we do break it down as Councilor Marshall said.

BOWERMAN: Well, I'll say then, would you like it broken down?

MEDVIGY: So why don't we focus on the VBLM.

BOWERMAN: That's not up there.

MEDVIGY: We can make a motion up here.

MARSHALL: If I can move forward so we'll get to all of those things. I move that we don't reopen the VBLM.

MEDVIGY: I'll second it. Further discussion?

YUNG: Chair.

MEDVIGY: Yes, please.

YUNG: I just wanted to say that, you know, that this process was done before three of us even sat on this Council, it was done a long time ago. Quite frankly I agree with the notion from the Planning Commission I think there should have been a market factor involved.

I think it's something that somehow got missed, I wasn't involved in that process so I don't know how it happened, but I do agree that it will really mess things up in the schedule, so I'm not supportive of opening that again.

MEDVIGY: Further discussion? All those in favor of not opening up the VBLM, please say aye.

YUNG: AYE

BELKOT: AYE

MEDVIGY: AYE

BOWERMAN: AYE

MARSHALL: AYE

MEDVIGY: Any opposed? Hearing none, that motion carries. Okay. Let me make one other comment about, and I don't know if it's more efficient or not, I mean the cities that did ask for basically presented a second option universally it included the first option.

And so now I'm thinking that we could help narrow the work, maybe not, but I'm hoping it could narrow the work if we just focused on either on the cities that gave us multiple alternatives that we just go with focusing on their second alternative because we're just moving it forward to be studied in the Draft EIS and then you can always pare it back to their Alternate 1 which is included within their Alternate 2 in every case that I think we discussed today.

Okay. I'm getting perplexed looks, so forget that one if that's not going to help. Okay. Second motion.

BOWERMAN: Oh, you're, are you ready?

MEDVIGY: Please.

BOWERMAN: So, the first thing that I started with was that we have the study of ag and forest lands.

MEDVIGY: Basically, a countywide comprehensive study that will probably need a consultant and probably need a budget item later in the year and that would fall to the next Council to approve or not, but I agree with it entirely. I will second that motion. Further discussion?

MARSHALL: I would like to discuss that a little bit.

MEDVIGY: Please.

MARSHALL: I would be interested since we've already adopted our budget for next year what the cost might be and the timeline because, Oliver, you had said it would take two years I think and that was just looking at the agricultural land; is that correct?

ORJIAKO: Councilors, thank you, that's correct. I give that two year as an example of when the County first looked at the resource lands countywide and the complexity of that is why it took that long.

And like I said, resource wasn't all limited to just ag, it was ag and forest. There was also a mineral land task force, so there were all three individual task forces that comprised looking at resource.

So, if this is limited to ag, I believe in my opinion if the Council so choose you need to appoint a task force that will look at this question. In terms of budget, I really don't know what the budget will be. We can put the price tag I will say between 2 to 300,000 if we are asking a consultant to do this work and also have that be moderated or facilitated.

I don't know whether WSU extension, ag extension, can do this type of work, I don't know, we could inquire. I heard is it Noelle saying that they've already lined up a consultant that could do this work, I don't know how that is going to work, but we can certainly put out an RFP request for a proposal and see what we get. I doubt we put a price tag on that request for proposal or we don't include a price tag and see what comes in.

Timing is going to be an issue because right now what I'm looking at is for the Draft EIS because of the delay that we have had in receiving the proposals from the City, and I'm not casting blame, we were supposed to according to my calendar and our calendar, we were supposed to publish the DEIS in February, that is in the next two months, everyone is behind.

So, if we were to commence this study, I don't know whether it will be within that same timeline, or we are now looking at publishing the DEIS sometime in June. If we publish it in June, we are required by law to allow for 30-day comment period which puts us into July. By the time we get into the Final EIS, it may put us into October.

I don't know whether this study can be completed within that timeline, that is all I can offer the Council now. I need to do more work with my staff to come up with what the budget will be and what the timeline will be.

MEDVIGY: Thank you, Oliver. Further questions?

MARSHALL: I am aware there are other counties that have gone through this process, I think Pierce County, and I know looking at the folks who are advocating for this, and I can see some value in doing this for sure, but the assumption may be that less land would be identified as agricultural land, but as I understand with Pierce County more land was identified that should have been agricultural land, so I don't know what process they went through, what the ramifications of that have been when more land was identified as needing to be agricultural.

ORJIAKO: My understanding is that I don't think that they adopted that, that is the County, Thurston County, and they were challenged, and it puts them out into, out of compliance and I think they may have come into compliance by recognizing those new ag designated property.

My concern just broadly speaking is that it's going to raise a lot of questions because some areas that you may identify as should have been designated as ag, they already have a home on it and just literally applying ag on them because it was overlooked, naturally you're going to get an opposition from those property owners, that's natural.

I -- I can't speak enough about that, but that is part of the reason. If we identify, and this is not to scare anyone but that's just the fact, if you identify more resource land and you ignore to recognize that, you run into a risk if you're challenged so that's one.

You may also get opposition from the affected property owners, that is something the sitting Council will have to deal with, and I'll leave it at that. I don't know if our legal counsel have anything to add.

YUNG: Chair.

MEDVIGY: Nodding her head no. Go ahead.

YUNG: I would just say that, you know, I've been complaining from the beginning of this process that it's not really planning, it's more reacting.

This is a tool that would really give us the opportunity to do real planning, you know, when we really understand the nature of the lands out there, you know, determining where we want to direct our growth, where we don't want to, those areas that we really want to preserve as good important resources. I'm very supportive of moving forward with this.

I do have some anecdotal information that Jefferson County, which population is only 33,000, paid \$40,000 for theirs, so, you know, it's going to cost a few dollars. I don't know how large geographically they are because I would imagine that's a larger impact than population.

MEDVIGY: Further discussion? Councilor, Marshall.

MARSHALL: Good point. I think this might not satisfy those who are advocating for this, but if we're wanting to be planful I think there are resources that we could tap into, WSU and the conservation district.

I know there was some work that was done several years ago related to providing input and guidance to conservation easements, agricultural conservation easements and heat mapping.

So that I think that we can in a more informal way identify those areas where there's still larger farms that are actively farming and, you know, there is such a thing as ag production districts, but it would be short of what some are advocating for, but I think could accomplish being more planful in protecting those resources.

MEDVIGY: Thank you.

YUNG: Chair, one last other comment.

MEDVIGY: Yes, please.

YUNG: When, you know, when I was looking through the Planning Commission public comments the first I actually read this was a request from Friends of Clark County, you know, how often do we see Friends of Clark County and members of the building industry agreeing on something, I think it's something the community really wants and I think it's valid and we should move forward.

MEDVIGY: Thank you for pointing that out.

BOWERMAN: And then the consultation, let's not forget the new ag advisory committee.

MEDVIGY: Further discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor please say aye.

YUNG: AYE

BELKOT: AYE

MEDVIGY: AYE

BOWERMAN: AYE

MEDVIGY: Any opposed?

MARSHALL: NO

MEDVIGY: Okay. The ayes have it.

BOWERMAN: Would you like the next motion?

HOLLEY: I'm sorry, who said no?

MARSHALL: Councilor Marshall.

MEDVIGY: So, yes, please proceed.

BOWERMAN: If there are no objections to combining Bullet 2 and Bullet 3 that makes sense to me for the reason I mentioned before in that there are several cities that want their Actions 1 and Actions 2 both considered and both gone forward upon.

So, in that spirit I would move that we proceed with Alternative 2 and 3 with evaluation and responsiveness included on all site-specific requests and all city or other jurisdictional requests and of course incorporate of HB 1110.

MEDVIGY: Okay. Back to complex again, but I like this one. I'll go ahead and second it. Further discussion?

YUNG: Chair.

MEDVIGY: Please.

YUNG: You know there's going to be discussion from Councilor Yung. I would just, you know, I would prefer to table this motion and tackle site-specific requests before we do this because this is really, this is right here, the meat of telling, giving direction on what we're going to study, I still would like to hit that site-specific request issue first.

MEDVIGY: I'll withdrawal my second. Let's -- and that would have been my preference too, but you made the motion.

BOWERMAN: I said no problem. Just let's take that out and take the rest of the motion and then --

MEDVIGY: So, if we could restate that then it would be to add, add a land use alternative in the DEIS that incorporates all site-specific requests and because the original cutoff date was March 15th, I think that's why the lawyers had focused on that language as of March 15th, 2024. Is there a second?

BELKOT: I'll second.

MEDVIGY: Okay. Now further discussion?

YUNG: What exactly is the motion, was it to include all of the site-specific requests?

MEDVIGY: Yes. That was my --

BOWERMAN: And that would be for evaluation and responsiveness; correct?

MEDVIGY: Yes, to move forward in the process.

MARSHALL: Chair, I have a question.

MEDVIGY: Please.

MARSHALL: Oliver, to what degree have each of those site-specific requests been that haven't been included with the cities' requests, to what degree have they been considered?

MEDVIGY: The colorator moved either green or red dots on the map and then we have some people in the audience that were one of those red dots and we heard from a number of them today.

ALVAREZ: So, let's see, some of the, see if I can share the summary that we --

MEDVIGY: Are you looking for a slide to show us?

ALVAREZ: So, this is the summary of why we excluded some of these, partly it's due that we weren't looking at surface mining overlay, some for the resource designations, you've made the motion you want to look at that so it seems you would want to include those.

There were a couple of properties that were considered by Council previously 2017 and 2019, the same site applied for a request to amend from business park to residential, the Council rejected that twice, it makes sense for that to move forward since you've already stated that, we can include that. So, this is just sort of the summary of those, the rationale for those changes.

OTTO: Then, Jose, in response to Councilor Marshall, then have all of the site-specific requests been reviewed and I understand that the ones that were in the cities' jurisdictions, they were sent to the cities for review, so they have been reviewed?

ALVAREZ: Yes. Another example is, is there a request for Camas for the airport, one of the properties, the City didn't submit, like it went further east than they wanted to go, so I'm not sure what you would want us to do with that, if the City's not including a request that they've already curtailed.

ORJIAKO: And if I may, Councilors, yes, this is a very shortened summary of the rationale why some of the site-specific requests was not included and I'm not going to rehash the papers that staff sent out.

One approach that the Council can take in terms of the site-specific request is that you have the, go back to slide 8, in this slide we, as I stated before, by the State Environmental Policy Act we have to have a No Action Alternative, a standalone No Action Alternative.

We have cities that have submitted two proposals, that's where they are, two. They have narrowed, some submitted three, they've all narrowed it down to two. What the Council can say is proceed with the city requested Action 1 and the County Initiated Action and the County Initiated Action should include all the site-specific requests, you can do that.

Similarly, that will be the same thing for City Action or requested Action Alternative 2 and County Initiated Action which will also include, the only thing that changes is the City Option 2,

but the County Initiated Action will include all of the site-specific requests if you want to do it that way, that will be the same three scenarios to study.

MEDVIGY: And my point to that as far as efficiency and making the choice a little easier, not that it doesn't expand your work greatly to include all these site-specifics, but the reaction, the Action 2 by each of the cities includes Action 1, I mean they're Alternate 1 is included.

ALVAREZ: That's correct. They're looking to see what the impact is relative to the other. So, we could include the County's site-specific requests in both or just one as long as it gets studied.

MEDVIGY: And I very much, you know, this is not criticism, I mean and I very much appreciated this slide that showed that you did have very rationale criteria that turned that green dot to a red dot; however, I would like to give the future Council as many options as possible and also give those personal property owners that we heard from today and all others kind of a second look.

So, I would want to include, and I guess I'm, what I'm hearing from you, Oliver, is to include all these separate site-specific requests could be in adopting any one of these other than No Action, it would be adopting the second or third bullet --

ORJIAKO: Yes.

MEDVIGY: -- with that specific language?

ALVAREZ: Correct.

MEDVIGY: Okay. Further discussion?

MARSHALL: I was just confused by that. So the motion was for all of the site-specific was to be included but 1 and 2 are not all of the site-specific requests and I think I would if the cities are interested in seeing the comparison within the EIS between Bullet 2 and Bullet 3 I would like to be able to provide that opportunity for them because what we'll see coming back is comparison of each of these bullet points, each of the options; correct?

ALVAREZ: Yes. So, like I think the City requested Actions 2 include all the site-specific requests for within its jurisdiction and then the County Initiated Actions would include all the site-specific requests specific to the County, right.

MEDVIGY: That would be the additional ones outside of the cities?

ALVAREZ: Outside of the city limits. So, then that would incapsulate all of the site-specific

requests.

BOWERMAN: It does?

ALVAREZ: Yeah.

BOWERMAN: For sure? Okay. Then that's fine; right?

MEDVIGY: So, I'll take a friendly amendment to my motion. I think the more focus we can give the cities as well is helpful. Is there a friendly motion? Otherwise, what I would focus on is City Requested Action 2 and the County Initiated Actions to include all the separate site that have been submitted by March 15th, 2024.

YUNG: Chair, just a quick comment. I honestly have no real appetite at studying some of these ones that are just, that just have no sense with their plan as a whole.

I will say however that it's always easy to see things in hindsight but just, you know, listening to one public comment, you know, the language is used to be included in. In hindsight it would have been better to have said to be considered for inclusion into.

So I do -- I do understand why this got confusing and why some had assumed that it would be studied as part of the Environmental Impact Study, so I guess what I would say is I would begrudgingly support including them to be studied and I think it's important to notate too that we can study everything, it doesn't mean we're adopting it at all.

BOWERMAN: That's right.

MEDVIGY: So is there a second to my own amendment that would focus on Bullet 3 but add the site-specific requests that were submitted prior to March, on or before March 15th, 2024.

BOWERMAN: I'll second that. And I have a question. For the cities that have submitted only one action, are they bumping theirs down to be called Number 2 in order to have it considered?

And I'm not sure about the City of Vancouver because there was an indication that they were studying two alternatives but may send forward just one, I don't know, so perhaps they'll be included too.

ALVAREZ: This would not affect the cities two alternatives. If they have submitted two and I think it would just be the Town of Yacolt that submitted one, so there wouldn't be any impact based on this motion, if there were to be three alternatives studied.

BOWERMAN: I'm not sure about Vancouver because they said that they're just, the mayor

mentioned that she was looking at two possibilities to be developed but I'm not sure how many are to be sent forward.

ALVAREZ: And the City is doing their own environmental analysis, so...

BOWERMAN: Yeah. So, anyway, I would hope that they're included in that motion, but I don't know if they are. And then Washougal and Yacolt; right?

ALVAREZ: Yes, there would be no change to what was --

BOWERMAN: And they have just one as I understand it. So, are they included in this thing looking at Action 2?

ALVAREZ: The proposal is to allow for each jurisdiction to have two, they each have two that they're proposing with the exception of Yacolt that only has one.

BOWERMAN: And maybe Washougal?

ALVAREZ: Washougal is creating their second.

BOWERMAN: They're going to have it, but they don't now?

ALVAREZ: They're in the process, they've established a second, the same geography as their first just the zoning within that second one hasn't been --

BOWERMAN: So, nobody's going to be excluded --

ALVAREZ: Correct.

BOWERMAN: -- at all --

ALVAREZ: Correct.

BOWERMAN: -- if we vote for Action 2? Okay. So, I'm satisfied.

MEDVIGY: So, Christine Cook I think had some input.

COOK: Yeah. Councilor Bowerman, I think that the City of Vancouver is doing its own environmental analysis so as to their proposals we are not analyzing them; is that correct?

ALVAREZ: We're -- we need to include sort of the expansion.

COOK: We need to include the UGA.

ALVAREZ: Right. But we are not analyzing, correct. That's correct.

MEDVIGY: Further discussion?

MARSHALL: Chair.

MEDVIGY: Councilor Marshall.

MARSHALL: Still have some clarifying questions. And so, I wonder what additional review you envision and also wonder what the impact will be in terms of your time commitment and the schedule that we have to meet?

ORJIAKO: I believe that if we get a recommendation from Council today, we will forward that to our environmental consultant. Areas where we may have uncertainty is the study, a countywide study of the resource land, that's the area that I have concern in terms of timing and how that may impact the work we have going forward, how long that will take, but a decision today we can forward those alternative to be studied to our consultant.

MARSHALL: Would that add additional cost to our consultant services?

ALVAREZ: I don't know at this point. We would have to have that discussion.

MARSHALL: And what would the total acreage additionally be if, you know, I guess maybe I'm getting it confused with what the BIA has requested because they requested 18,000 acres, is this somewhere short of 18,000 acres?

ALVAREZ: Yes.

ORJIAKO: Right. And remember we are not considering that map that they submitted, that is not before you.

MARSHALL: Thank you.

YUNG: Chair.

MEDVIGY: Yes, Glen, please.

YUNG: I'd like to clarify the motion. So, there's Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 from each of the cities, is the motion that we are studying both of those alternatives or only one?

MEDVIGY: My motion was just Actions 2 and then with the additional site-specific on the County Initiated Action.

YUNG: One alternative from each of the cities?

MEDVIGY: Yeah. The one, and we kind of went through that, it won't impact those cities that have only provided one alternative.

YUNG: That's not my understanding.

ALVAREZ: So if you, I think what you want to do is move forward with -- well, do you want to have both of the cities alternatives considered and the site-specific requests, we move forward with the way it's laid out and under the third bullet under County Initiated Actions that would include all other site-specific requests, that would encompass everything, the two city proposals and the No Action.

MEDVIGY: And I think that gets back to what you were proposing originally --

BOWERMAN: That would do it.

MEDVIGY: -- with Bullet 2, Bullet 3 and the site-specific requests, and that this discussion's good, we come around just as long as we're all on the same page and, you know, it may especially like with Washougal and the school and the comments we heard about that further analysis may either say, hey, this is inappropriate or, hey, this is really appropriate despite the local opposition to it.

So, I think further looking at all of them is a good way to do it and hopefully our consultant will just suck it up without asking for a change order on their funding.

MARSHALL: Chair.

MEDVIGY: Go ahead.

MARSHALL: I believe there is an amendment to the original motion which is to include all of the site-specific, so perhaps we need to vote on that first and then go back to the amended motion.

COOK: You could also withdraw the motion and wipe the slate clean and come up with a new clarifying --

MEDVIGY: So, I'm going to withdraw the motion and the second if that's okay and we'll go back to our Councilor that will restate the complex motion.

BOWERMAN: Well, it would be that I move approval of the city requested Actions 2 and County Initiated Actions including all site-specific requests.

BELKOT: I second.

YUNG: Chair.

MEDVIGY: Please, Glen.

YUNG: So, there are two cities that have submitted two different alternatives, and both of those alternatives include resource land. So, we have -- we've instructed to go ahead with a resource study, but we don't know if that's going to be complete on time and I would suggest that on the advice of our attorney that we do meet in Executive Session for a few minutes to discuss what the ramifications of that would be.

BOWERMAN: Comment? Our consultant can be given a time frame. They need to be given a time frame before they're hired to do that particular job and if they don't follow through, they wouldn't be paid and they know it, that's my thought having been a consultant.

MEDVIGY: So, we already have an Executive Session that we'll get to afterwards. I would just say this, the cities are still on the hook as part of this planning process if they're trying to convert resource lands to do their due diligence on that; correct, Oliver, Jose?

ORJIAKO: Maybe ask the city to do that and you have the testimony, they're now asking the County to do so, and the Council have already voted to do a countywide resource, so that's what we are going to do.

By the County doing a countywide resource look, it will include I believe the site that the cities have already included in their proposal to us. There are concerns that I have, and it will be difficult for me to just say, yes, that's appropriate. If you're going to go into Executive Session I can chat with my legal counsel and provide my thoughts on that, Councilors.

YUNG: Chair, you know, to me the concern is more that if those, if it doesn't, if it's not able to be done, we don't know, I mean the resource study may even determine that that can't be done, we don't know the outcome of that.

But my question is what is Plan B because if they're dependent on supporting their growth with those parcels, those lands that are designated currently and you cannot de-designate them, then there is a shortage of land to accommodate the growth for that city, that's the concern that I have.

MEDVIGY: I think it's a valid concern. I just think the process will pan out and in a couple of

months you'll see where you're at with the consultant and the cities and you can have an Executive Session then if need be.

YUNG: So, would, you know, if that were to happen, we would need another alternative from the cities, correct, and how would that work because it wouldn't be in the study? That's where it gets tricky.

ORJIAKO: If that's the outcome, that's true, you're right, Councilor Yung, yes, that will be what would happen. I wish that there is Plan B from the cities; in other words, what would that Plan B be that they look to elsewhere to expand, that will be their Plan B, but we don't have Plan B.

YUNG: So, I don't know if we can -- I mean, I know we're working with Washougal, they're looking at giving us a second alternative, I don't know if we can communicate to those cities bring us another alternative just in case because I don't want to end up in a situation where their suggested alternative is not possible.

MEDVIGY: Okay. So good discussion and I'm sure this discussion will carry over to Washougal through the planners. Are we ready to take a vote on the last motion and the one and only one that's on the table right now?

BOWERMAN: Yes.

MEDVIGY: Okay. All those in favor please say aye.

YUNG: AYE

BELKOT: AYE

MEDVIGY: AYE

BOWERMAN: AYE

MEDVIGY: All those opposed?

MARSHALL: NO

MEDVIGY: Okay. I think the ayes have it.

HOLLEY: Okay. One more time who said no?

MARSHALL: Oh, sorry. Councilor Marshall.

MEDVIGY: Thank you. So, do you need anything else today otherwise we still have the Executive Session? I didn't know if we needed to announce whether there's possible action and how long the Executive Session will take.

OTTO: I think all you'll need is five minutes, but you might want ten just to be safe and you do have, there's no after action and you do have one contract amendment on your agenda today.

MEDVIGY: Right, I do, I still have that in front of me. But did you say five minutes?

OTTO: I think we can do it in five minutes. We can just go in the conference room right here.

MEDVIGY: Okay. So, and I can't remember how long -- thank you, Oliver, and team.