



Clark County Planning Commission

Karl Johnson, Chair
Bryan Halbert, Vice Chair
Steve Morasch
Eldon Wogen
Jack Harroun
Jeremy Baker
Mark Bergthold

CLARK COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 7, 2024 MINUTES OF PUBLIC HEARING

Public Service Center
Council Hearing Room, 6th Floor
1300 Franklin Street
Vancouver, WA
6:30 p.m.

CALL TO ORDER

Planning Commission Rules of Procedure

JOHNSON: Okay. Good evening, Planning Commissioners, members of the public and staff members. I would like to call this hybrid public hearing to order for Thursday, November 7, 2024. My name is Karl Johnson and I'm the Chairman of the Clark County Planning Commission.

The role of the Planning Commission is to review and analyze comprehensive plan amendments, zoning changes and other land use related issues. We follow a public process including holding hearings during which the public has an opportunity to provide additional perspectives and information.

In legislative matters, the role of the Planning Commission is advisory. The County Council will hold separate hearings, consider our recommendations and make a final determination.

Planning Commission rules and procedure. The Planning Commission will conduct a public hearing tonight and take testimony. All public comments received before tonight's hearing have been sent to the PC members and entered into the public record.

County staff will present first and then the Planning Commission can ask questions. Next, we will invite the applicant to speak, if there is one, then members of the public who wish to provide testimony.

When we get to the public comment portion of our agenda, we will provide more information on how to participate both virtually and in person. However, if you are in person tonight and wish to provide comment on the hearing agenda item, please sign up in the sheets in the back of the room.

During public testimony you will have three minutes to speak, and remarks should be directed to the

Planning Commission only. Please do not repeat testimony that has already been provided.

At the conclusion of the public testimony, staff and the applicant may respond to the comments and the public portion of the hearing will then be closed. The Planning Commission will then deliberate and make recommendations to the County Council.

For both virtual and in-person members of the Planning Commission and staff, please ensure that your microphones are muted unless you are speaking. Planning Commission members, when you make a motion or second a motion, please state your name for the court reporter.

At this time do any members of the Planning Commission have any conflicts related to tonight's hearing? Hearing none, Jeff, can we get a roll call, please.

ROLL CALL VOTE

HALBERT: HERE
BERGTHOLD: HERE
MORASCH: ABSENT
WOGEN: HERE
HARROUN: HERE
BAKER: HERE
JOHNSON: HERE

Staff Present: Oliver Orjiako, Community Planning Director; Christine Cook, Senior Deputy Prosecuting Attorney; Jose Alvarez, Program Manager II; Bart Catching, Planner III; Susan Ellinger, Planner III; Jeffrey Delapena, Program Assistant; and Cindy Holley, Court Reporter (Virtual).

GENERAL & NEW BUSINESS

A. Approval of Agenda for November 7, 2024

JOHNSON: Can I get a motion for approval and agenda of the minutes for November 7, 2024.

BERGTHOLD: I'll make a motion to accept the minutes and approve for October.

JOHNSON: Can I get a second.

WOGEN: I'm sorry, where are we? We're approving doing the minutes for October 17th.

JOHNSON: We're voting for our agenda.

BERGTHOLD: I'm sorry.

WOGEN: So, I think Mark needs to redo his.

BERGTHOLD: Right. I make a **motion** to approve the agenda for tonight November 7th.

WOGEN: This is Eldon, I **second**.

JOHNSON: Jeff, can we get a roll call.

ROLL CALL VOTE

HALBERT: AYE

BERGTHOLD: AYE

WOGEN: AYE

HARROUN: AYE

BAKER: AYE

JOHNSON: AYE

DELAPENA: 6/0.

B. Approval of Minutes for October 17, 2024

JOHNSON: The outcome is 6/0. Can I get a motion and approval for the minutes of October 17th, 2024.

BAKER: This is Jeremy Baker. I make a **motion** to approve the minutes of October 17th, 2024.

JOHNSON: May I get a second.

WOGEN: This is Eldon, I **second**.

JOHNSON: Jeff, can we get a roll call, please.

ROLL CALL VOTE

HALBERT: ABSTAIN

BERGTHOLD: APPROVE. AYE

WOGEN: APPROVE

HARROUN: AYE

BAKER: AYE

JOHNSON: AYE

DELAPENA: 5/0 with 1 abstention.

JOHNSON: Outcome is 1 abstention, 5 to approve.

Communications from the Public

JOHNSON: Moving on, if there is any communication from the public that is not on the agenda tonight, is there any? Okay. With that said, Jeff, can you give your instructions, please.

DELAPENA: For attendees using their computer or Webex application, if you would like to speak, please use the raised-hand icon. For attendees using the telephone, audio only option, press star 3 on your number, phone's number panel to raise your hand.

For those in person that would like to provide comment, please raise your hand. Once acknowledged, you may come to the microphone towards the front of the room. Public comments are limited to three minutes per person in order to accommodate all speakers.

Again, this portion of tonight's hearing is only for items not listed on tonight's agenda. We will begin with those in the hearing room who would like to make a general comment. Please raise your hand and the Chair will call on you to come up front to the microphone. Please provide your first and last name for the court reporter.

JOHNSON: Seeing none.

DELAPENA: We will now call on those people on Webex or the phone that have raised their hand.

ELLINGER: We do have one person online. Jude, I'm going to unmute you or I'm going to request to unmute you.

WAIT: Hello? Can you hear me? Echo.

ELLINGER: Jude, we are unable to hear you. If you have two devices operating at the same time you can have feedback, and it sounds like you're having feedback. Can you turn off the sound on one or one of your devices. I'm sorry we are unable to hear you.

JOHNSON: Let's move on. If we get her on later just catch her at the backside if that's okay. Reminders to the public, if you are providing public testimony in person, please sign up on the sign-up sheet in the back of the room. If you're joining remotely, instructions will be provided at the appropriate time.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEM

2025-2045 Comprehensive Plan Update: Clark County is in the process of updating the 2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan (Comprehensive Plan). In addition, the cities of Battle Ground, Camas, La Center, Ridgefield, Washougal, Woodland, and Yacolt are also updating their

comprehensive plans. The land use alternatives proposed for those cities and the county in their updated comprehensive plans will be evaluated as part of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) as required by RCW 43.21C.030(2)(c). The City of Vancouver is preparing separate environmental documentation for its plan update.

Staff Contact: Jose Alvarez, Program Manager, jose.alvarez@clark.wa.gov, 564-397-4898

JOHNSON: With that said, we'll start out with tonight's agenda with the Comprehensive Plan Update, SEPA and Land Use Alternative staff presentation. Jose Alvarez, Program Manager. That would be you, my friend.

ALVAREZ: Oliver's going to start.

ORJIAKO: Good evening, Planning Commission members, the Chair and PC members. For the record Oliver Orjiako, Community Planning Director. With me this evening is Program Manager Jose Alvarez and our legal counsel acting Chief Civil Prosecuting Attorney Ms. Chris Cook.

PC members we are here to take public testimony and ask the Planning Commission to make a recommendation to Council on proposed alternatives for the environmental review needed to update the County's Comprehensive Growth Management Plan. Here is our presentation or discussion overview. Let's go to the next slide.

So we'll start with the update as to where we are to date, followed by proposed land use alternative, some of the site-specific requests as an input into the alternatives, provide a general overview of the GMA guidance on how to go about sizing of urban growth boundary and other related WAC and RCW, followed by an overview of the SEPA alternatives for the Draft Environmental Impact Statement and then we'll talk briefly about the next steps.

In our staff report before I continue, we provided a staff report dated November 7th. In that staff report we provided the Planning Commission and the public background relating to the development of the alternatives and then on Page 2 we just have a discussion of proposed alternative, Alternative 1, No Action; Alternative 2, Cities Alternative; and then Alternative 3, Cities Alternative 2.

We also provided you a table of the proposed UGA expansions and I won't go into details about which UGA, how many acres of ag or forest land or rural lands and so forth, that is well outlined in the staff report. If we can go to the next slide, Jose.

So, this is a general periodic update. The Planning Commission have seen this, this is the general guideline or schedule that we are following for the 2025 to 2045 plan update. You can see in the first column to the left we started this project early 2023 and, you know, concluding that phase early 2024.

We started with the public participation plan and scope of work which the Council which came to this body and the Council approved that. Then the Council and again the selection of the population projection to plan for came to this body and eventually multiple hearings before the Council and they

finally adopted a population for us to plan for which we'll get into later. And then we had countywide policies and population allocation to each of the UGAs.

Some of you will recall how many meetings and discussions we had with you and the recommendation you made to Council for what allocation the Council should adopt. We then move to shaping of the plan which is where we really are.

I will say that, you know, those that are in the audience and those that are listening online or that are online we are a little bit behind and I will talk to that as we move on, but we did hire in Phase 2, shaping of the plan, we hired an environmental consultant to help us with the environmental analysis as we move forward.

We did ask property owners based on the resolution that the Council adopted suspending the annual reviews that and during the discussion with Council they asked that we allow property owners to submit site-specific requests.

We have had discussions with the Planning Commission and the public not necessarily on what to do with the site-specific request but at least sharing with the public the site-specific requests received by mapping them, showing where they are and letting the public see what are being requested. We then went out and did a scoping of the EIS work.

I think some of the Planning Commission members attended one or two open houses that we had in Battle Ground and the City of Vancouver and also at Ridgefield High School. Following that scoping which was published I believe it was May 15th and we provided the Planning Commission with the summary of the scoping notice and also provided that to our Council, I won't go into detail, that information is available on our website.

So we are now at the box that is squared there, review and selection of the Growth Alternative for the Draft Environmental Impact Study and we are internally looking at the plan elements and looking at Title 40.

I will say that the legislature passed a series of new bills that will require us to amend Title 40 and particularly as it relates to housing, some of that work we have already started and - but we are beginning to identify changes that needs to be made to our plan element.

We are not at a point where we can begin work on our Capital Facilities Plan, that work will come later. In Phase 3, which we are calling review and refinement of the plan, we will get into that in fall of 2024, and this is what I'm saying that we are a little bit behind, and into some of 2025 starting with the draft of the Environmental Impact Statement for review.

That review and series of meetings will lead us to the selection of the Preferred Alternative and the Preferred Alternative will form the basis for the Final Environmental Impact Statement that needs to happen in the Preferred Plan and that will also enable staff to firmly provide the necessary changes to

each of the plan element.

I will also say that the legislature also passed a climate bill which is now Goal 15, if you will, and staff for the first time we are required now to have a climate bill and there is going to be requirements that what our land use address the climate bill requirements. And with the issuance of the Final Environmental Statement will now be able to complete review and update to the necessary plan element or chapters.

In addition to adding the climate bill and then doing a detailed work depending on what the preferred plan look like, a detailed analysis of how we're going to pay for whatever the preferred plan entails.

The last phase here, the adoption phase, which we are looking at starting in summer of 2025 and then late 2025, that will start the clock for our 60-day requirement submittal to Department of Commerce for our review and our hearing with the Planning Commission and Council and then the adoption of the plan.

We were given six months extension by the legislature, and when I say we are behind, we are really behind on where we should be, but I don't think we'll be given any additional time, our plan needs to be effective on or before December 31st, 2025. Let's go to the next slide.

Planning Commissioners, as I mentioned earlier, this slide here you have seen it before is for the interest of the public as well, this chart shows the adopted population and we'll get to the next slide, adopted population and employment projection that you saw and the Council adopted for us to provide us guidance or be the control number that we have to be very aware of.

You can see here that the NDA 2045 population projection is 718,154, we are not really planning for that number, we are planning for the difference which gets us to the new population growth of about 190,754 and the NDA 2045 employment projection is 269,000.

Again, you subtract the base, the 2023 from that number, it gets you to the new job numbers of 88,100 and with the Planning Commission and Council this is a policy target that the Council have chosen to provide a one-to-one ratio in terms of job/housing balance.

And the only thing I can say is that this adopted population and employment projection form the basis for the allocation that County staff and with the cooperation of the cities engaged in until the final allocation was approved by our Council.

So, the next slide shows you the adopted housing allocation by each of our local jurisdictions starting with Battle Ground all the way through the Town of Yacolt, you can see what the numbers there shows in terms of the total number of housing unit we are supposed to be planning for.

I won't bore you with the details, but this gets to the HAPT tool that the Department of Commerce provided that not only Clark County but all the counties planning under GMA are supposed to use in

coming up with the housing unit to plan for and for the first time this is what I may call very intentional.

The legislature when they passed the House Bill 1220 requires counties and cities to plan for housing for the first time by various income bands, so that is a requirement, it is intentional, we have to plan for a variety of housing type not just one single-family type, if you will.

So you look at this you can see that by various income band you have the number of housing unit we have to provide, some are market rate based, some are not, but you can see the numbers by each of the various local jurisdiction. This is adopted so we are obliged to meet that allocation.

The next slide is the employment allocation, again by various jurisdiction. You can see on the first column based on our land capacity what number we are showing is currently available and you can see the distribution there by each of the various cities and what was allocated for them.

As you move from left to right you can see we know that the COVID have changed everything just like when we had 9/11. There are recognition that folks are still working from home and you can see that in terms of the number of job that will not require acreage, if you will, and then some construction field we're showing the percent there and what that number entails.

And then the government sector, we have had this conversation before, you can see how many folks that will be in the government sector that doesn't require acreage, if you will, but you can see again the rural allocation in terms of job about 4400 plus and you add all those numbers it still gets you to the 88,100 that we are supposed to be planning for.

But the point here is that this is the Adopted Employment Allocation and the Housing Allocation to each of the jurisdictions and when we get to discussion about the land use submittal, we'll discuss that more. Next slide, please.

Now this is the SEPA process, again when we did the scoping this is not a surprise, I will encourage anyone watching or go to our website and take a look and review our Issue Paper Number 6 and various scoping notice that we issued, the work session we had with Planning Commission and the last one we had with Council which was October 9th.

We have maintained that we are suggesting that the possible alternative be a No Action Alternative which is of course required and that No Action Alternative which will be the existing plan with a recognition that without doing anything we still have to comply for majority of the cities in Clark County. I believe the City of Camas, Washougal and Vancouver need to comply with House Bill 1110, so with that consideration that has to be included in the No Action Alternative.

And the second alternative we are calling City-Requested Action. Some of the cities, and Jose will get into that later, have submitted more than one alternative, so if that's the case we are calling City Alternative or Requested Action 1 with County-initiated action.

And the third alternative will be any city that submitted 2, that will be the second with County-initiated action, that's why and how we have presented this possible land use scenarios to study in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

Nothing have changed but in our scoping and communication with what the Planning Commission and Council throughout the plan update process.

Now I will turn it over to Jose Alvarez to get into the land use alternatives and additional slide that he may go over. If you have questions for me before Jose continues, I would like to take those; if not, I will turn this over to Jose. Thank you very much and I'm here to answer questions as the hearing continues.

JOHNSON: Are there any questions for Oliver? Seeing none, go ahead, Jose.

ALVAREZ: Good evening, Councilors, Commissioners. As we go over the land use alternative maps I just wanted to ask if the jurisdictions could come up and speak to their specific alternatives.

As Oliver mentioned there are a variety of alternatives, two jurisdictions have provided 3 alternatives, we have asked the jurisdictions to narrow those to 2. The City of La Center has complied with that, they're proposing 2 of their alternatives and they can speak to that, and the City of Ridgefield was going to have discussion with their council today, so we'll hear what came out of that. So, I would start with the City of Battle Ground. He's actually in the room.

CRUMMETT: Are we on? Thank you. Sam Crummett, City of Battle Ground, C-r-u-m-m-e-t-t. Thank you for the opportunity to comment. During your work session there was a single map showed for the City of Battle Ground and what occurred there was some city-specific requests and then there is some private landowner requests.

In the letter that I submitted in the record today we'd like to separate just the City request and keep all the site-specific requests separately. In 2021 the City completed a land use master plan study and what resulted in that was we realized we were short on jobs so the highlight of our City request is a 450-acre expansion out to Dollars Corner, this would be solely for job growth.

In that study we also realized that our urban growth boundary is sized correctly for residential, so at this time we're not requesting additional residential. That said, we will be running our land capacity analysis and determine if we are in fact short for residential, we may come back and consider some of these other site-specific requests, and we'll also need to do additional work to comply with House Bill 1220 which is going to be planning for all income brackets in our community.

So that's essentially all I have at this point in time. We have some work to do but our Preferred Alternative is going to start with the work we completed in our land use master plan study and then kind of build off of that and determine where we're at in a few months. Any questions?

Questions from the Planning Commission

WOKEN: So, this is Eldon. So, you are proposing an expansion of the UGA for Battle Ground?

CRUMMETT: That's correct. Yes. We are currently -- our city boundary on the west side is along 92nd Avenue, essentially that kind of little arm you see on the map would extend out past, a little past Dollars Corner which is kind of that red commercial area, we would anticipate bringing that in for future job growth.

Currently we are short on our jobs to housing balance so we're trying to make that right, have a community that has a sufficient amount of jobs so that our residents don't have to travel to other places for work.

WOKEN: So, this is Eldon again. Just one more question. Are there any site-specific requests then that are incorporated into your map here?

CRUMMETT: There are a few in Alternative 1 besides the major 450-acre expansion. I should also note that the Meadow Glade area we are proposing to remove, that's the crosshatched section in the southwest corner of the City.

We see this area as being hard to convert to urban development, but there are a few other site-specific requests in Alternative 1 that we've identified and submitted to County staff.

But Alternative 2 is going to be the request that have come in more recently from property owners that we haven't yet analyzed yet to determine if those should be brought in, but we'd like to keep all those options in play as we do further analysis moving toward our Preferred Alternative.

JOHNSON: Any other questions? Jose.

ALVAREZ: Okay.

JOHNSON: Go ahead, sir.

HALBERT: Well, Jose, I think -- oh, Bryan Halbert, sorry, thank you, Jose. I think Sam said they were bringing in, proposed to bring in 400 acres but the report shows closer to 764 acres?

ALVAREZ: I think --

CRUMMETT: That was for the combined Alternatives 2 and 1. We're actually kind of separating those out to look at those differently.

HALBERT: Okay. Okay. So --

ALVAREZ: Most of their site-specific requests are on the north and east side and those outlined in red, and the Land Use Master Plan is mostly the changes on the west side and the reduction of the UGA.

HALBERT: Oh, okay. So, all of those combined would be the 764 acres. Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Sam.

JOHNSON: Thank you.

ORJIAKO: And, Commissioner Halbert, if according to what Sam is saying, this is Oliver Orjiako, if they have not yet made a decision on those site-specific requests that are the periphery on the east side and a little bit on this southeast, if they eliminate that they will only be considering the expansion to the Dollars Corner area and the removal of the area in the Meadow Glade area, that's what I heard from Sam, but no firm decision yet, they may be leaning to us that alternative.

ALVAREZ: Okay. Next is Camas, they have 2 alternatives, and I think Alan is online.

PETERS: Yeah, I'm here. Good evening. My name is Alan Peters, that's P-e-t-e-r-s, with the City of Camas. So we've submitted two alternatives to you and I'd first like to note that both of these alternatives continue to be refined through the public process.

What we have before you tonight has been developed to support the County's Draft EIS and represent what we would consider to be the most extensive growth alternative as possible for us; however, I will say it is our intent to identify a Preferred Alternative early next year that will match or at least very closely match our housing allocation and jobs allocation, so just wanted to kind of start off with that.

I think you'll see in our narrative that; you know, we have with these alternatives currently a little bit of a jobs deficit and pretty significant surpluses for housing capacity.

So this first alternative provides significant increases with high-density residential near the City's western boundary with the City of Vancouver, so this is in areas with existing infrastructure and proximity to jobs and transit, so a lot of that density is achieved through upzoning as well as conversion of existing employment lands to jobs and, sorry, of existing employment lands to high-density residential.

This alternative does include one site-specific UGA expansion request, it's an expansion of about 84 acres in the North Shore Subarea that would bring the Port of Camas/Washougal's growth field into our urban growth boundary. I did note, you know, our jobs deficit, this would support that, we would assign it a mixed employment zone.

Want to make clear that this expansion into the Fern Prairie area includes only Port property for jobs, it does not include any residential or privately owned property. So that's Alternative 1.

And then the second Alternative 2 is exactly the same as the first with the exception that this includes two additional site-specific requests. So, this reflects all three site-specific UGA requests that we've received.

The first one is what we're calling The Merritt expansion, and this is a 57-acre site within the Green Mountain area on the north side of Camas, it's mostly surrounded by the existing Green Mountain Development which is a residential subdivision.

And then the second expansion is on our eastern boundary near where we touch Washougal, this is 160 acres near S.E. Nourse Road and S.E. 283rd Avenue. So together assuming a high-density designation, these areas would have capacity for approximately 4800 residential units, so, you know, we've included these.

At this point again I think our focus is on looking for lands for jobs so, you know, we don't know whether or not these would contribute to that in some way and whether or not they'd be in the Final Preferred Alternative.

But, again, we're aware that both of these alternatives significantly exceed our housing allocations and so we're working to refine those and fully expect to have an alternative that's preferred that more closely aligns with the City's growth allocation for both jobs and housing, but we're still in that public process and hope in the next couple of months to weigh in somewhere with our advisory committee, this Planning Commission and ultimately our City Council.

ALVAREZ: Questions?

JOHNSON: Questions for Camas?

BAKER: Yeah, I have a question. This is Commissioner Baker. So, Alan, thank you for that analysis. So I just want, I'm looking for a little bit more clarification on you specifically talked quite a bit about the job deficit and then on the land to the west closer to Vancouver you were talking about offsetting some employment lands with residential lands, I think that's what you said, so if you could go into further detail on the impact on like how much of that because then you also said that you exceed on residential land and so I'm just trying to get the rationale to why we're in a job deficit and then we're trying to convert employment land to residential land and when we're in excess of that already.

PETERS: Right. So, with the current VBLM we're very near the allocations with our current capacity, but what we lack in Camas is zoning to meet the requirements of HB 1220 and so most of our capacity for residential is in single-family currently.

So this is a pretty dramatic change for Camas and including higher density zoning and so the areas that we've determined would, you know, be most likely to provide projects in those necessary price ranges we believe would be on the west side of town, again where we have existing infrastructure, where we have available land and have received site-specific requests for conversions from property owners in

that area.

So one of the other strategies we've used to offset those impacts because you got, you know, create the jobs issue is we're looking to change our industrial zoned areas to a mixed employment designation, so that industrial zoning tends to create products that, you know, have a lower jobs yield and so a mixed employment zone would really about double the capacity per acre, so that's one of the things we're looking to do there.

And then, you know, again we continue to refine the map and we're identifying additional areas that we can zone commercial within residential areas, so there's going to be I think conversions both ways. And then another strategy is leaning into mixed use a little bit more, so we get the benefit of both jobs and higher density, but the basic answer is this is, you know, what we're trying to do here specifically is achieve the affordability targets of 1220.

BAKER: Okay. Thank you. And so to piggyback off of that, you just mentioned that you're rezoning or repurposing the industrial lands that you already have set aside, is there a reason -- we're like -- because I work in the industrial sector, I maintain industrial like paper mills and, you know, heavy, heavy industrial sector and so I see industrial as a boon to municipalities, to counties and whatnot, and so I want to understand why we're trying to reduce the industrial use or is it just because it's underutilized and maybe give us more options, can you explain that a little further, please.

PETERS: So some of the site-specific requests that we've got in are on areas that are either underutilized or undeveloped and have some constraints that would make them more suitable for higher-density residential, but we're not really trying to minimize or reduce the industrial lands.

So with that mixed employment zone we would maintain the ability to have all those types of industrial jobs but it does present an opportunity for a different employment mix say a combination of, you know, warehousing with some office staff on-site and so just adding a little bit of flexibility into those areas to provide opportunity for more jobs.

BAKER: Okay. Thank you.

JOHNSON: Any other questions for Camas? Okay. Jose.

ALVAREZ: I need to -- I just need to switch over to another presentation. I noticed there was one under the list of maps is missing so I'll include that now. La Center I think Alec. Is Alec online?

EGURROLA: Yes. Yeah. I'm Alec Egurrola, E-g-u-r-r-o-l-a, and I'm with WSP and working as the consultant planner of La Center and the Comprehensive Plan Update process including these land use alternatives.

So as Jose mentioned La Center had three alternatives submitted to the County but with city, city council input and city staff we decided to narrow down to two alternatives.

So, we had a scenario, we had three scenarios that we're calling them, a Scenario A, B and C and here's Alternative 1, 2 and 3 and ultimately, we narrowed it down to Alternatives 1 and 3.

So, the first one here would be Alternative 1, La Center after looking at capacity for housing, specifically for affordable housing, housing 80 percent area median income and under, there was a 203-unit deficit with current capacity, so to accommodate that with Scenario 1 we'd be looking at rezoning within the existing city limits and within the existing UGA.

So, you see in the northern parts of La Center all those areas in orange with the slashes there would be low, currently low density zoned lands zoned, rezoned to medium-density residential to accommodate that capacity deficit for affordable housing.

And then for employment there's currently a just under 200 jobs deficit to accommodate the housing or our jobs allocation for La Center. So if you look out by the Junction Plan out by I-5 where La Center Road meets I-5, this is all for urban growth area expansion, and to the north that would be expansion for commercial land at 20 jobs per acre and then to the south and southeast it would be for light industrial at 9 jobs per acre except for one small parcel on the east side of I-5, that would be expanded for commercial at 20 jobs per acre.

Again, these are all for potentially requests for jobs specifically and I'd also like to add these are site-specific requests as well included in the expansion.

And then going into Alternative 3 or our second alternative we're presenting tonight, this is pretty much the same for housing. Most of the housing deficit would be accommodated by rezones within the existing UGA north of La Center so there's a few properties there shown with that cursor.

And then instead out in the Junction Plan area, that north Junction area, instead of strictly commercial zoning we would be implementing a mixed use zone with a 50/50 split for jobs land at 20 jobs per acre for commercial and then the other remaining 50 percent of land that's developable out here would be for residential at 12 units per acre, and then to the southeast those remain the same as Alternative 1 for expansion for light industrial and commercial.

So, the main difference from Alternative 3 from Alternative 1 is less rezone within the existing UGA and then expanding further north Junction Plan for mixed use instead of strictly commercial use. Any questions?

JOHNSON: Questions? No questions. Thank you.

EGURROLA: Thank you.

ALVAREZ: Okay. Next, we have the City of Ridgefield.

LUST: Thank you, Jose. Good evening, Planning Commission. I'd like to thank you for the opportunity to present tonight and also to thank County staff for facilitating our participation in the County's Draft EIS process, this has been a really, a really valuable process with collaboration that's really, really appreciated.

So as Jose mentioned at the start of this meeting or the start of this presentation, Ridgefield did develop three land use alternatives, we had a study session with our city council this afternoon to try and get some more refined direction on two preferred alternatives for this analysis and our council does appear to be coalescing around Alternatives 2 and 3 moving forward, but all three are --

HOLLEY: Can you let me know who you are, please.

LUST: This is Claire Lust.

HOLLEY: I need your name.

LUST: I understand. This is Claire Lust, L-u-s-t, City of Ridgefield. Thank you. Sorry to miss that. Back to the alternatives, as I mentioned our city council did express this afternoon that they're generally more supportive of Alternative 2 and 3.

All three are before you in this presentation this evening so I will briefly cover Alternative 1 as well just so the Planning Commission can understand our process.

So Alternative 1 within the existing UGA is mainly focused on keeping existing land use patterns intact with sort of a general uplift in zoning across the UGA but particularly focused on increasing density in medium density and downtown areas plus the addition of a new high-density zone.

Outside of the existing UGA Alternative 1 does look at all of the site-specific property owner initiated UGA expansion requests that are adjacent to the existing UGA, so these are site-specific requests that property owners submitted to the County through their process and this alternative does include all of those adjacent to our UGA for study.

Alternative 2 similar to Alternative 1 does include all of those adjacent site-specific UGA expansion requests. Within the UGA the strategy to accommodate growth is a little different than Alternative 1 in that it focuses more on intensifying mixed-use hubs at strategic areas across the UGA including near the I-5 Junction, intensifying mixed uses downtown and near the Pioneer and Royal commercial area near the center of the city.

Alternative 3, council directed staff to come up with a third alternative that looked at some of the different strategies in 1 and 2 and combine them a bit and I will say that a large part of our conversation with council this afternoon getting towards two alternatives was around this idea of mixed use hubs and creating opportunity for housing near services which is why they ultimately expressed a preference for Alternative 2 and 3.

So, like Alternative 2, Alternative 3 does look at some of those mixed-use hubs within the existing UGA to focus growth, to accommodate our job and housing needs, and rather than looking at all of the adjacent UGA expansion requests, Alternative 3 focuses on two of those site-specific requests.

One of them where the cursor is – is the – what we refer to as the northern industrial area, it's currently under an urban reserve overlay, it's about 200 acres surrounded on three sides by urban growth. The property owner and their legal counsel did submit an ag de-designation analysis to the City and County for these properties and staff has included this as a employment light industrial based zone with a mixed use overlay in our land use analysis and find that it is well suited to address some of our job and housing needs particularly the large deficit and capacity for affordable housing that Ridgefield's facing.

The second site-specific request included in Alternative 3 which unfortunately isn't showing on this version of the map, but it is where the cursor is located, it's an island in the UGA, this is about an 11-acre property that was actually in 2007 brought into Ridgefield's UGA along with several adjacent properties, that was appealed.

In the meantime, those adjacent properties were annexed into the City, this one was missed by error of the City, so it was dropped out again in 2008, so we are requesting that that this be re-included in the UGA as it is an island surrounded completely by urban growth and the owner of that property is present and provided some supporting data as well.

So that is what I have to present on the three alternatives. Again, Alternative 2 and 3 are the ones we'd like to focus on moving forward both include that mixed use hub strategy for accommodating growth. Alternative 2 includes all adjacent site-specific requests.

We believe there's value in analyzing all of those in the DEIS process. Alternative 3 includes two specific UGA expansion requests that the City believes are particularly well suited to accommodate growth in areas already characterized by that urban growth. Thank you.

JOHNSON: Any questions for the City of Ridgefield? Seeing none, okay.

ALVAREZ: Okay. Moving on to the City of Vancouver, they had two alternatives.

JOHNSON: Don't forget to state your name.

SNODGRASS: It's Bryan Snodgrass with the City of Vancouver, S-n-o-d-g-r-a-s-s, and I would echo what I think you heard from Claire Lust in terms of appreciation of being able to be before you tonight and the collaboration from County staff.

The City of Vancouver has two, we call them land use possibilities, but two alternatives before you. We've -- some of the analysis has been run on what we call Possibility B which is probably the more

intensive of those, but I think under either analysis, either of those possibilities the City is aggressively planning for and recognizing the affordable housing crisis but also I think the jobs that we need to go with that.

So, we're actually planning for 38,000 new housing units and 43,000 about new jobs, so a little bit more than we've been allocated. We are also, as I think Oliver mentioned, we are subject as all the lower cities are to HB 1110 requirements to allow four to six, in our case it's four to six units on all single-family lots, so there will be growth in those areas, we don't want that to be the necessarily the concentration of growth so we're looking at upzoning in corridors and centers throughout the city.

We're also looking to a more simplified system where we have fewer zones, and those zones are more flexible. We are keeping a heavy industrial zone but in other cases we're doing some consolidation to try and have a simpler and more manageable process.

We don't have a -- we're not bringing forward site-specific requests, we believe there's ample room, like many of the jurisdictions, we our plan involves some upzoning in our existing area, we think there's ample room both in the city and the UGA to meet the growth targets that have been established for us, which are pretty aggressive, but we also believe there's room there, so don't have a proposed site-specific request to bring before you.

And for those, just really quickly, for those who are into the numbers I think you saw some, they just came out today, capacity estimates VBLM and so one of those figures is 22,000 new job capacity in the City of Vancouver so that actually doesn't include some of the assumptions, I think Oliver went over that earlier today, so just for those who are into the numbers that's a number that I think we just need to look at more, and as I said it just came out today in the VBLM.

JOHNSON: Questions for City of Vancouver?

HALBERT: Bryan Halbert here. Could you point out where the growth boundary expansion would be.

SNODGRASS: We are not proposing an expansion.

HALBERT: Okay. I missed that then. Sorry. Thanks.

JOHNSON: Thank you, City of Vancouver.

ALVAREZ: I'm going to come back to the Vancouver UGA, I'll speak to it, just so we can get through the remainder of the cities, Washougal and Yacolt. Washougal would be next.

JOHNSON: Okay. Good. Washougal.

ALVAREZ: I think Ethan is online, Ethan Spoo.

SPOO: Good evening, Planning Commission. My name is Ethan Spoo and I am a consulting planner for the City of Washougal with a company called Dowl, D-o-w-l. My last name is spelled S-p-o-o. Mitch Kneipp, the Community Development Director, could not be present tonight so I'm presenting on his behalf.

Like the other jurisdictions that have presented here tonight we've been working closely with the County on our land use scenarios. Our scenarios continue to be refined through the public process as well.

We as you saw in one of the slides that the County presented listing the number of housing units and jobs for each jurisdiction, the City of Washougal is planning for an additional over 3,700 housing units and about 2500 additional jobs in the 20-year planning period to 2045.

Roughly half of those housing units would be serving households at or below 80 percent of the median, excuse me, of the area median income. And, you know, that that is a requirement under House Bill 1220 that's been previously mentioned tonight and so that has prompted the City of Washougal to look for opportunities to provide a greater diversity of housing products than it currently has including accessory dwelling units and meeting the middle housing requirements that are now part of the Growth Management Act.

And so our land use alternative that we have at this point we're also working on a second one but the land uses alternative that you see here before you tonight only has one urban growth area expansion in the north part of the City and that's primarily for jobs, that is a school site with some adjacent residentially zoned land. And then within the northeast and the northwest part urban growth areas of Washougal both of those areas were subject and approved for subarea plans back in 2016.

So we're expecting the zoning of those areas upon annexation to comply with those subarea, subarea plans which are a little bit different than the County zoning in those areas which really the County's zoning the existing zoning emphasizes jobs and specifically business park zoning, but that would be changed primarily to residential with less jobs in the northeast and the northwest UGA than is zoned for today.

And in addition to that, you know, within the City we're working with the County to look at the suitability of certain parcels for development in the County's Vacant Buildable Lands Model.

We think that there's a number of properties that the County has designated as constrained that we have local information on that probably are not constrained and therefore would be available for development. And then more generally at a countywide level we wanted to also offer a couple of comments there.

One is that we're requesting that the County take a second look at the work from home percent which was highlighted in the County presentation and I think the County's model was assuming a four percent rate of work from home, we think that that should be higher and we have some information

from the American Community Survey that shows that it's probably as high as about 18 percent.

And then we also just wanted to comment briefly likewise on the County's assumption that government jobs don't require land alloca- -- require an allocation of land to accommodate them and we think that they do, you know, as evidenced by police stations, fire stations, city halls and so forth, and so we're requesting that the County take another look at that.

So that's our land use scenario. As I said we're working on a second one. That second land use scenario what I can tell you about it is it's very similar to the first one, but it just assumes a different rate of development for middle housing. It would include the same urban growth area expansion as this first alternative. Thank you. Let me know if there's any questions.

JOHNSON: Thank you, Ethan. Any questions for Washougal? No questions. Thank you very much.

ALVAREZ: Paul Dennis is representing the Town of Yacolt.

DENNIS: Thank you, Commission. Thank you, staff. Paul Dennis with Jackson Civil, we're a private consulting company, the engineering and land use planner of record for the Town of Yacolt. Paul Dennis, last name D-e-n-n-i-s.

So, in looking at our, we have one alternative that we're asking the Commission and County Council to consider for the DEIS. What we did is we looked at the site-specific requests that came in over this last spring, that would be up in the northeast portion of expansion, those are currently within the Town's urban reserves.

And then there was another down in the south area of the Town there was another site-specific area, we considered that, that would have been disconnected from the current city UGA and so there was a parcel just north of that that we asked for inclusion. Part of that has to do, part of the residential, those would all be for residential.

Part of the consideration for that is we had about a 20-acre piece of property that developed over this summer with about 47 homes, we were allocated 150 new units through the year 2045 and so town council and mayor felt it appropriate to try to replace that. And looking forward this is a town that's had very little growth up until this year, we had well over 50 housing units come in this year and we've actually had some commercial development. When we look across, so we are looking at UGA expansion in those terms.

We're also looking at across the railroad down in the southeast corner, the Witt property, there's a city cemetery down there, the City also needs to expand some of its city facilities for Public Works and so forth, it's not necessarily going to generate jobs but we're looking at the industrial properties there on the east side of the railroad to actually convert over to public use.

The properties or the pieces of the property that wouldn't be for parking for the cemetery or Public

Works, a big portion of that actually would be for parks and open space.

So I know the Town has been in talks with the County on RCO grants and things of that nature, so that would actually go to public use so then we wouldn't have those industrial jobs. So, what we did is we looked on the west side of the railroad, it's kind of that blue triangle area, same ownership but actually converting that over to industrial to try to make sure that we are retaining some jobs for the Town. And so that's pretty much it in a nutshell.

JOHNSON: Questions for the City of Yacolt? Hearing none.

DENNIS: All right. Thank you.

JOHNSON: Thank you very much, sir.

ALVAREZ: Okay. So, I will cover the unincorporated Vancouver UGA and what was done to try to meet the allocation of the unincorporated area.

So, the largest deficit we had is in that lower income bracket for the unincorporated Vancouver UGA. What we looked at was sort of focusing on the Highway 99 area where there's new transit line, high-capacity transit line coming, there's already zoning in place to allow for high-density development as part of the Highway 99 mixed use or Highway 99 subarea plan, there's an overlay that allows for high-density residential outright in that area but our model doesn't capture that and when we updated the model recently we have the ability to do that.

So, we included that to add capacity and we're proposing to make some changes in our urban medium and urban high-density zones as part of the Housing Option Strategy.

We recently updated the uses that are allowed in the single-family urban low-density zones and allowed for densities up to about 22 units an acre, 2,000-square foot lots in the R1-5, R1-6 and R1-7.5 zones that could be developed for townhomes.

So, what we thought we would need to do is step up from what our current range of urban medium which is from 12 to 22 units per acre and start at about 24. So we've developed some new, we're proposing some new zones R-24 through R-50 to replace the R-12 through R-43.

With those changes we still didn't have enough capacity so we're looking to expand some areas in adjacent to existing urban area. So, along the Hazel Dell corridor we've looked to expand some multi-family there, in some areas along St. Johns at the medium density and just try to expand existing urban medium and urban high density zones to increase that acreage there because we don't have enough of land zoned that way.

In the 179th Street area we are proposing what seems like quite a bit of the R-24 which is our, the new lowest urban medium density zone, and then some upzoning on the east side where there may be larger parcels in R1-10 that I think we're proposing to make it R1-5 or R1-6 so you can take advantage

of maybe some of the duplex, not the duplex, but the townhouses that are allowed in that R1-5 through R1-7.5 zone in some areas where there may be some underutilized property.

The other thing we're proposing is in our mixed-use zones we currently our model assumes a split of 60/40 of residential/commercial, the code has a split of 80/20, so we just thought we would try to realign that and what we've heard are folks having a difficult time actually meeting the mixed use standards on the commercial side.

So, what we're proposing is looking at a split of 90/10. So going from 60/40 currently to 90/10 reduces significantly the amount of employment capacity. And then also with what we've done in Highway 99 in recognizing that multi-family can be allowed outright it reduces the employment capacity in that corridor as well.

So that left us short for employment and so those, that's the reason we're proposing expansion of the urban growth boundary to the north for business park and commercial and then east of WSU for business park.

There were also some -- so as we were trying to come up with an alternative we received site-specific requests, those that were within the urban growth boundary were the ones that were included if they met sort of the direction we were going, looking at upzoning, some did not and so those weren't included to be studied.

There were some areas, there were a lot of requests to expand the urban growth boundary mostly for residential, so those were not included in an alternative. In that area to the east of WSU there are two requests, but they were for residential, but like I said, we needed employment so they're included but that's not what the property owners have asked for so we'll see how that goes. I think that sums up what we were trying to achieve. Do you have any questions?

BAKER: This is Commissioner Baker. I don't know when the appropriate time to ask some of these questions would be. I understand what you're proposing with your urban growth boundary adjustments and different zonings and whatnot.

So one of the biggest things that we've heard this evening was job deficits, employment land availability, and I recall when we were doing the land use allocation and divvying that up to the municipalities in the UGA there was talk about the assumption of the underutilized and undeveloped land that is currently zoned for or we are going to put into zoning for employment land and there was an amount that was assumed that was going to be utilized that was different than the residential.

Like if there's a -- if we have 100 percent of our land that is zoned for employment what is the ratio of that land that will be utilized in this next 20, this growth, this comprehensive plan?

ALVAREZ: So, I think are you talking about the -- like a market factor?

BAKER: Yeah. So, it was in the, when you run your VBLM, your model, you have an assumption that 70 percent of the land that is allocated for employment will be used or it will be 40 percent or it will be 60 percent or it will be 30 percent, I was trying to get clarification on what that assumption was.

ALVAREZ: And I -- so for employment I think the assumption is that 100 percent of the land will convert.

BAKER: So right now, we're assuming that 100 percent of the land will convert to --

ALVAREZ: To employment.

BAKER: -- be employment and that goes throughout the -- all the municipalities are running in that same model like 100 percent of the land?

ALVAREZ: Yeah. I believe so, yes.

BAKER: So, when I hear that we're having job deficit in the City of Battle Ground, the City of Camas, La Center, unincorporated UGA and then we're assuming that 100 percent of the land is going to be used, we already have it.

So, I'm just kind of asking the question there seems to be a disconnect where there might not -- you get what I'm asking? Like the assumption might be a bit generous and what are we doing to account for that lack of availability in employment lands?

ALVAREZ: Well, so what I think all the jurisdictions are doing and what we're doing through this exercise is trying to account for the employment allocation that, the employment that we need over the 20-year period to make sure we have sufficient land for that employment.

BAKER: So, we have the allocations already --

ALVAREZ: Yes.

BAKER: -- applied, right. And so, everybody's looking to meet that number?

ALVAREZ: Correct.

BAKER: And we are developing this comprehensive plan that allows for 100 percent of this land will be used to meet the number, there is no excess? If that's the case, then it seems like we have a lack of employment land that's available in this comprehensive plan is what I was getting at. Thank you.

ALVAREZ: Yeah. I can keep going. Sure. So, this is just the summary of the expansion requests by UGA and zoning for the different jurisdictions and the total acreage for sort of UGA requests.

So we overall it's about a little over 2,000 acres. You can see the different zoning types, agriculture, forest, R-5, R-10, rural center, airport. We didn't double count for the different alternatives so those are sort of the max expansion requests by UGA and zoning. And then this is overall the site-specific requests that were received and so about 136 requests overall.

There were I think multiple parcels for some and then the total acres by resource designation and so it's about 11,000 acres overall when you add those three. And then I can show you what these site-specific requests look like. This is a map that's showing all of the site-specific requests. Oh, all right. That didn't work. All right.

So, these are all the site-specific requests that the red were the requests that were not included in an alternative. The green are the ones that were included in an alternative that, well, most of the ones near the UGA were included, some within the UGAs primarily in the Vancouver UGA.

There were, like I mentioned before, the two requests east of WSU where we included those in the request, but like I said, they were asking for residential, not employment, so that's accounting for those, the partial.

There was requests for these properties to become R, to go from R residential to general commercial, so we proposed making it community commercial which is similar to all of the commercial in the surrounding area and its proximity to the high school just to the south.

There was also the existing community commercial to the south was proposed to be general commercial, we think it makes sense just to keep it community commercial and that's why that split. Do you have any questions about the site-specific requests? Yes.

BAKER: This is Commissioner Baker again. So, when we do have like mixed use lots and we're having site-specific requests, so when -- is that part of -- if a piece of property is considered mixed use in whatever plan the City of Vancouver or city or whatever, is that part of the employment allocation like are they assumed that they will be part of that employment jobs?

ALVAREZ: Yes.

BAKER: Because I was looking at the Vancouver one and my house is considered mixed use and I know for a fact that it will never be used for any kind of business because that's just not -- so I'm just -- so that is, I just, that is part of the assumption?

ALVAREZ: Yeah. So, let's see, I'm trying to -- there is a sort of mixed-use split. So, a certain percentage will be devoted to housing and a certain percentage will be devoted to employment.

BAKER: So, like the 90/10 that you were referring to before where we went from 60 to 40, now we're going to 90/10?

ALVAREZ: Yes. Yep. Yeah. And then the capacity is based on if it's vacant or underutilized so if there's a house built on it, it might not show up in the model as having capacity because it's excluded because it's built.

BAKER: Thank you for that clarification.

ORJIAKO: Commissioner Baker, this is Oliver Orjiako, if I may. Although I can come back to it later, but if I may interject the question, you were having earlier or the question you asked earlier about job deficit, I believe we showed, I can't remember what slide that is, but it could be 6. Jose, can you, it is slide --

ALVAREZ: It's Page 6, yes.

ORJIAKO: Right. We are showing the allocation and we're showing the land, you know, the capacity that we have based on the 2023 run, we are showing only about 65,000 and the need is about 88, so we're showing deficit, but the deficit isn't that much, it's about 15,000, so just want to clarify that we are showing a deficit of jobs to begin with.

BAKER: So, well --

ALVAREZ: So, okay. Our capacity based on the VBLM is 65,091 that on the base, correct, and what's based on the allocation and what we need for land we need 66,000 so it's a 1500 deficit to begin with.

ORJIAKO: Right. To begin with, right.

ALVAREZ: And those that work from home and construction make up the remainder 17,000 that doesn't require land, so that's the difference, the distinction and it totals today the --

BAKER: So that if we go with this land use alternative that we're proposing is that we would be at this number or --

ALVAREZ: So, this is the allocation that the Council made, so essentially what we're planning for is we're trying to allocate the 66,000.

BAKER: Okay.

ALVAREZ: Yep.

BAKER: Thank you.

WOGEN: So, this is Commissioner Eldon. So just to clarify, the only site-specific requests that are incorporated to go on to the Draft Environmental Statement are those that will get incorporated into a new UGA?

ALVAREZ: Correct. We are not proposing any changes, any --

WOGEN: Anything outside the new UGA in a rural area is not included at all?

ALVAREZ: Correct.

WOGEN: Because the County feels that there's enough land already available to meet the targets for 2045?

ALVAREZ: The allocation that was made to the resource, to the rural land. To the rural area we have sufficient capacity to accommodate that.

WOGEN: How has the County done this before like the last comp plan where site-specific requests, were they all included into the EIS or I mean I wasn't a member of the Commission then? Does anybody remember?

ALVAREZ: No. So, well, I was just sharing with Oliver. So, we received requests and when the Council made the decision about what to include in the alternatives only those site-specific requests that were in the alternatives were studied and we sent letters to property owners letting them know that their requests weren't included in an alternative.

WOGEN: Okay. All right.

BAKER: And if just --

ORJIAKO: We will make that same decision when we are at that point and, you know, we welcome folks testifying before you and before the Council.

JOHNSON: Jack.

HARROUN: This is Jack Harroun. I wanted just to clarify, is the County still allocating 0 land for construction jobs, I mean it needs, the construction need 0 land, did I hear you correctly on that?

ALVAREZ: No. So, I think we got some feedback and I think, what was it, 77 and a half percent of the construction field jobs, well, there's going to be construction in the field so 23 and a half percent are going to require site --

HARROUN: I thought that was --

ALVAREZ: Yeah.

JOHNSON: Any other questions?

HARROUN: And then -- oh, okay. And I was just going to reiterate on Commissioner Baker's point of like the understanding of when we're assuming 100 percent utilization, we've already created a structural deficit because you never hit 100 percent utilization on land because people won't sell, generally people won't sell or they won't sell at a reasonable price or, you know, something, so I think it's something I think we should consider.

ALVAREZ: I'll check. I'll confirm that, but yeah. Okay. So, these are just some of the RCWs and WACs that we just wanted to point out to you that sort of our guidance from the State in terms of how to accommodate growth and looking within your UGA before you're looking outside to expand urban growth areas and also the requirements for designating and de-designating resource lands.

And so, when we were looking through this and accommodating the allocation that we were planning for, sort of we were looking internally to see what we, what could, what we could do to increase capacity within the UGA.

We discussed what we've done and if needed we could expand the urban growth areas which we've done for employment, and again since the capacity was sufficient, we didn't include any expansions of the urban growth area for residential.

We have areas designated for urban reserve that when we are looking to expand the urban growth area that's where we would look first. There were some site-specific requests that are adjacent or abutting the urban growth boundary that would made sense to include had we needed that, some have urban reserve and are also designated resource, the urban reserve doesn't trump the resource designation, that the de-designation still has to happen. So those were the considerations that we went through when we were crafting the alternative.

So, in terms of next steps, like you've heard from the jurisdictions we've been back and forth with the maps and alternatives and, you know, confirming the requests that we've received, we've run that through our VBLM, we've verified the mapping, shared that with the jurisdictions and then run the model to see what the yield could be.

And I can share with you charts that show what that would look like, and the evaluating the capacity to make sure that there is sufficient housing and employment to accommodate the growth. We are at your public hearing and looking forward to making a recommendation to Council on the how to proceed. I just wanted to share the VBLM output that I posted earlier or late this afternoon so you can take a look at that.

BAKER: Jose, this is Commissioner Baker. So just to clarify, our next -- when Oliver was talking about our next steps on slide 15, they were running, run the VBLM, excuse me, on proposed alternatives but then you just kind of referenced that you've made an initial assessment; is that accurate?

ALVAREZ: Yes.

BAKER: So, and then you had all those VBLM models, that those Option 1, 2 and 3 and I looked at those and it's out of my, you know, bandwidth on that so could you explain that a little bit for us.

ALVAREZ: Yes. Okay. I'll try to do that. So, yeah, again this is draft numbers we've gotten from running the Vacant Buildable Lands Model, this is a two pager, the first page is dealing with the housing units, it's broken down by jurisdiction. The total column here is the, what the allocation is for each jurisdiction and what we're planning for, what the target is.

So, in the case of Battle Ground the, when you go down to the chart that bar represents that total the 6979, the area in blue is what the sort of baseline Vacant Buildable Lands Model was showing when we ran the model in 2023. The green is the allocation, the darker area are the sort of the higher-density units that would be needed that 80 percent and fewer AMI. And then the 80 percent or greater is the lighter color. And then in the purple is showing you what the output is for that alternative.

So, for Battle Ground you can see there's a need for 3426 units at that higher intensity, less than 80 percent AMI, based on the model and we're showing 2840, again we are using the assumption that anything that's sort of multi-family would meet that AMI and anything single-family would just be in the 80 or greater.

There are various jurisdictions are looking at that a little differently where you could have accessory dwelling unit that might meet that criteria for the lower end, but we're not, this isn't, this is more of a crude instrument than that refined, so that's what the split is representing, so...

So for Camas when they were talking about the sort of excess capacity they have with their housing that's represented here, they did not, they haven't given us a parcel level data so that's why that is, the alternative isn't colored but they gave us some output that they've calculated based on their assessment where they're showing, you know, 7866 in the higher and 4938 in the lower, and you can see they're well above what they're allocated in terms of residential. So they're going to need to scale that back as we move forward in the alternative because that's going to be, we can't go that far.

BAKER: Well, is there a perc- -- this is Commissioner Baker. Is there a percentage above the line that we can go or it's you have to hit the line and that's it?

ALVAREZ: We're constrained by that total, so overall it's 103,000 and based on the allocation so Camas has allocated 4200 units and they're showing about 12,000.

BAKER: Okay. Thank you.

HARROUN: This is Commissioner Harroun. How do you, and this is I'm trying to understand this correctly, how do we reconcile when we're gaining, we're gaining density by upzoning, so like going to an R-50 like you had mentioned but then we have the affordability that we're required to target for and R-50 is basically a high-rise building-ish, they get very expensive to build so it blows up the

affordability component.

So, we're making an assumption of something that can't be built that meets the required goal and so that's, that's my -- like how do we balance the affordability with the density because if we have great density down on the Vancouver Waterfront, it's decided to be unaffordable, right.

So how are we -- how are we looking at that, how are we balancing that in our modeling? Because we can put it all on paper but if it doesn't pencil it doesn't happen and we're supposed to plan for what can actually happen.

ALVAREZ: Right. So, I don't, well, the R-50 I mean our current maximum is R-43, I don't think going from 43 to there's no, there aren't any towers in the county in that R-43 zone. Right.

HARROUN: I agree.

ALVAREZ: So going from 43 to 50 is not going to, isn't going to be that significant of a difference to get to a tower like you would get downtown, those are in the hundreds of units per acre.

HARROUN: So, are we -- have we modeled the costing of what we're doing to meet the affordability requirement of the zoning?

ALVAREZ: No.

BAKER: I'd like to piggyback off of that question because I actually was wanting to ask you, Oliver, when you, you said that we are required for intentional methods for our planning housing allocations, could you go into a little bit more detail on some of the methods that we are using that are intentional to meet these requirements of the lower in- -- lower brackets and whatnot, the different brackets of housing.

ORJIAKO: This is Oliver again. I think what I'm, if I may clarify, what I said or what I meant by the fact that the legislature was intentional, okay, in requiring counties and cities to plan for housing by various income band, that's what I meant by being intentional, so we are required to plan accordingly.

BAKER: Thank you for that clarification.

ORJIAKO: You're welcome.

ALVAREZ: So, the next part of this is the employment, essentially the same, we're showing again the land allocation, total number of jobs and that's what the target is. The work from home for each of the jurisdictions and then the total jobs is the 88,100.

Again, the blue is the baseline, the green is the allocation that was made and then the purple is the alternative and you can see where the bar, where the allocation, where the alternative is relative to

the allocation.

And so you can see some of the deficits in Camas, the Vancouver City exceeds the 22,000 exceeds the 18,000 that was allocated to the City as Bryan mentioned, the UGA is a little bit over the allocation, La Center's well over, Ridgefield one of their allocation is above, the other two are below and I think Washougal mentioned that they were having that deficit issue and that's captured in that.

BAKER: This is Commissioner Baker. So, what is it, if we are constrained by the Growth Management Act for our allocations and then what is the process once, if we are not meeting our goals for the allocations because the properties that are available aren't being developed?

ALVAREZ: So, for, so for example, residential we make an assumption that we have a market factor, the vacant land 10 percent, we have a 10 percent market factor so we assume that 90 percent will develop over the 20-year period. For underutilized it's a 30 percent market factor. So, we are accounting for some of that lack.

BAKER: In residential?

ALVAREZ: In residential.

BAKER: So that was 10 percent?

ALVAREZ: 10 percent market factor for vacant land and 30 percent for underutilized land. Underutilized is generally a minimum of an acre with a home of a, there's a threshold value that comes into that.

BAKER: And so currently we don't have any market factor for employment lands; correct?

ALVAREZ: That's correct, no.

BAKER: And so by being constrained to the growth and is there a way to put market factor into this? I know this was an assumption that was made a long time ago but we're kind of, I mean it seems like we're putting ourselves in a box that will give us some trouble down the road.

ORJIAKO: You can make that recommendation, but I know that the assumption and the Council decision and some of the conversation I'm hearing we had with you there were no recommendation to add market factor on the employment side.

BAKER: Thank you.

JOHNSON: Okay. So, let's, we've been going here for a bit, so it's 20 after, how about we come back at 8:30, use the restroom, get a drink of water and we'll be back here again at 8:30.

(Pause in proceedings.)

JOHNSON: Okay. If we can come back to order, please. And, Jose, do you want to continue on? I don't know where I left you off at exactly. Are you done?

ALVAREZ: Yes. So, you want to -- you want to get to the recommendation? Yep.

ORJIAKO: Yes, Planning Commission members. At some point maybe after you heard from taking testimony, staff will come and conclude with our recommendation to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Chair, my comment is that after you hear from the public, staff will come back, listen to your questions and then try to formulate a recommendation to you that you will be forwarding to Council.

JOHNSON: Thank you. That was kind of what I was just writing down there, just to clarify. So, at this time now if so we're going to go jump right to public testimony; is that correct?

ALVAREZ: Correct.

JOHNSON: Oh, let me. I lost my place. So now we'll hear, we'll open the hearing to public testimony. For tonight's hearing oral testimony should be directed to the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission will consider all public comments as they deliberate and vote on the recommendation for the Council.

Again, if I could ask you not to repeat, if you've submitted something and you just come up and read it, it's going to be long. The second thing I would ask is that you hold your comments to three minutes, and you'll be on a timer, so... Do you want to go ahead and do your thing now? Yeah.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

DELAPENA: Please note to be a party of record -- please note to be party of record you must submit written testimony before, during, or prior to the close of tonight's hearing, or provide oral testimony at the public hearing, or request in writing to be a party of record.

If written comments were received prior to November 7th, 2024, they were submitted to the PC members and posted on the Planning Commission website. Tonight's hearing is being transcribed by a court reporter, so please spell your first and last name and speak slowly. Public comment time is limited to three minutes.

We will now begin with those participants that have joined remotely via computer or telephone. Please raise your virtual hand or press star 3 on your phone to let us know you would like to provide comments.

ELLINGER: Jude, I'm going to request to unmute you.

WAIT: Hello. This is Jude Wait, J-u-d-e, W-a-i-t. Can you hear me?

DELAPENA: Yes, we can.

WAIT: I have a Ph.D. in environmental and natural resource science based on partnering with farmers to study the resilience of food farming in our rapidly urbanizing Clark County. And I'm going to be addressing primarily the agriculture and resource land analysis for determination of de-designation in Clark County, Washington documents.

And, again, instead of these multiple piecemeal analyses, I would recommend that we have a countywide analysis that would cover agriculture, forestry, grazing, biodiversity across natural and built environment, water quality and quantity and climate resilience.

And with all due respect, I disagree with the consultant's concluding opinion, and I think that we would all agree that farming has been greatly reduced in recent years, but I think the de-designation proposal are kind of symptoms of a failed support system and lack of political will and respect for farmers in the agricultural sector.

And they are kind of a self-fulfilling negative feedback loop where the County's farmland is converted to urban land uses and then you can say it has characteristics conducive to urban growth, and then as the boundaries expand, then the farms are increasingly adjacent to urban uses.

And soil type is not the only really important indicator of farm viability, but the support systems and favorable policies are important indicators for farm viability, and we should be asking what are the cumulative effects to the environment and to the agricultural sector, and can we have production neighborhoods.

Have you talked to the farmers in these areas? Have you considered transfer of water rights because there's a lot of information in these documents about water. And a countywide assessment could also look at the connectivity between the remaining islands of unpaid land uses, stream corridors, wetlands, parks and open space.

And given our new climate element how do these alternatives fare if we use the climate resilience and equity lens such as policies that are calling for planting trees and maintaining forest land and trees and maintaining and expanding food production and open space land uses in both rural and urban areas. I thank you for your attention.

JOHNSON: Thank you.

ELLINGER: Jackie Lane, I've just requested to unmute you.

LANE: Jackie Lane. I -- regarding these alternatives I want to thank the staff for the no changes to

current boundaries alternative. It seems to show that growth can be accommodated without impacting ag and forest lands and without incurring the cost of expanded infrastructure.

I'm also happy to see that the site-specific requests away from the cities are not included. In the past one of you stated that everyone wants a house with a yard, this is flatly untrue and ignores the income bands that need to be planned for. Single-family homes being built out in my neighborhood exceed a million dollars; they don't come near touching any affordability for anybody I know.

I understand work is still ongoing on climate requirements for the comp plan, but it needs to obviously needs to limit sprawl in order to meet the climate goals. We need to make sure that the alternatives used for the recent comp plan meets the guidance and goals of the Growth Management Act.

We can't let the influence of the building industry override the law and people of Clark County have submitted a ton of feedback and as I scan through the letters you have received, they overwhelmingly want to limit sprawl and protect our lands and waters.

Lastly, a lot of work has gone into the alternatives that staff present today, I implore you not to make any recommendations that would have them revisit this work. We are likely already at risk of missing the comp plan deadlines, noncompliance with the GMA is already costing the County millions in lost grants and loans. We need to ensure that we are in fact in this position at the end of next year. Thank you very much.

JOHNSON: Thank you.

ELLINGER: Andrea, I have requested to unmute you.

SMILEY: And I am a homeowner in unincorporated Clark County. I just wanted to chime in and request that the expansion I think it's Option 3 or Alternative 3 is considered.

I think a countywide look at where we need to further develop where the state and our local jurisdictions have told us that they want more dense and succinct development to occur that we actually allow that to occur. So, I would be supportive of something that considers that.

I also would like to just speak as somebody who's 31 and is lucky to own a house that has a very tiny backyard that I would love to have a diverse set of housing options in the county and preserve that and that includes, you know, having a yard where I can take my dogs out, hopefully have children and be able to take them out as well and play with them, just want to be able to preserve the opportunities for different housing types depending on what we want and need in our community. Thank you so much.

HOLLEY: I'm sorry, I didn't hear her name.

JOHNSON: Do we have her name still?

ELLINGER: Andrea, I've requested to unmute you again.

SMILEY: Yes. My name is Andrea Smiley. Thank you.

JOHNSON: Thank you, Andrea.

ELLINGER: We do not have any other raised hands online.

JOHNSON: Okay. With that said, we are, are we closing this portion now?

DELAPENA: We still have the hearing room. We will now begin with the participants in the hearing room. When we call your name on the sign-up sheet, please come up to the front and provide your first and last name for the court reporter. If you do not wish to provide public testimony, please say so. Diane Dempster.

DEMPSTER: Hi. My name is Diane Dempster and I'm representing Friends of Clark County. Friends of Clark County asserts that the only alternative that should be considered in Clark County's Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Comprehensive Plan update is the No Action Alternative.

Even the records provided by Clark County's own Community Planning Department support the fact that all projected growth can and should be accommodated in the existing urban growth areas.

Neither the alternatives presented by the cities of Clark County nor NW Partners proposal are representative of the needs of Clark County's communities and a collective vision for the future. Furthermore, other than No Action Alternative, the alternatives present substantially interfere with the goals of the Growth Management Act.

If the Planning Commission accepts these alternatives as-is, they will have actively and knowingly presenting the Council with alternatives to consider that are in violation of the GMA. We urge the Planning Commission to take seriously the County's obligations under the GMA.

The site-specific request reviews the surface mining overlays over forest land must be done as a countywide study process as was conducted in the previous Comprehensive Plan update. Friends of Clark County emphasizes that Clark County's Comprehensive Plan update should not include any de-designated of, designation of forest lands or agricultural lands or any conversion of rural lands to higher residential densities.

As stated in WAC 365-190-040(b)(i), De-designations of natural resource lands can undermine the original designation process. De-designations threaten the viability of natural resource lands and associated industries through conversion to incompatible land uses, and through operational interference on adjacent lands.

Cumulative impacts from de-designations can adversely affect the ability of natural resource-based

industries to operate.

(ii), Counties and cities should maintain and enhance natural resource-based industries and discourage incompatible uses. Because of the significant amount of time needed to review natural resource lands and potential impacts from incompatible uses, frequent, piecemeal de-designations of resource lands should not be allowed. Site-specific proposals to de-designate natural resource lands must be deferred until a comprehensive countywide analysis is conducted.

The devastating economic, environmental and public health impacts to our communities, notably the loss of soil, carbon sequestration, tree canopy, fish-bearing streams, headwaters and wildlife cannot be justified and would be a betrayal and failure of local government to protect health and well-being of the people of Clark County. Thank you very much.

JOHNSON: Thank you for your comments.

DELAPENA: Erik Paulsen.

PAULSEN: Good evening, Chair, Commissioners, staff. Erik Paulsen, Mayor Pro Tem for the City of Vancouver. Last name is spelled P-a-u-l-s-e-n. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

We're about to enter the third and final year of this countywide update process and still need to complete a ton of work that will be challenging under any circumstances, but probably impossible if we blow up recent County Council decisions and scoping notices from the last two years.

During that time and after numerous hearings the County adopted aggressive countywide growth forecasts including a population forecast that was higher than the cities jointly asked for and higher than the state predicts will occur.

This was allocated to individual jurisdictions and a vacant and buildable lands analysis was approved which found that there was enough land in existing UGA boundaries to accommodate almost all of the targets. Those adopted targets were published in the County's EIS Scoping Notice this summer.

During this time the County also began listing all site-specific requests on its website and then posting maps of their locations. This information has been available to decision-makers and the community for some time. We don't believe limited EIS time and resources should be spent studying an 11th-hour broader alternative that expands the Vancouver UGA by 18,000 acres in order to accommodate what is actually only around 600 acres of expansion requests according to the maps on the County's website.

This would require revisiting growth targets and allocations and would likely require republishing the EIS Scoping Notice since we would be planning for more than 70,000 more housing units and perhaps 200,000 more people than we said we would.

There would be that much more strain on our roads and schools, that much more conversion of

farmland, and that much more impact to climate. We understand that only two EIS Action Alternatives are budgeted and appreciate the staff recommendation focusing these around city alternatives since it is the cities that know their urban areas best and will annex and serve them over time.

We support the DEIS including a city's alternative based on their proposals and an alternative which accommodates growth in existing urban areas with some important changes in the Vancouver UGA which Bryan Snodgrass from our staff will testify to tonight.

This approach will give us a chance to meet our deadline successfully in a manner that's consistent with the requirements of the Growth Management Act and with the local public participation plan that the County Council formally adopted back in March of 2023. Thank you.

JOHNSON: Thank you for your comment, Mayor.

DELAPENA: Noelle Lovern.

LOVERN: Noelle Lovern, N-o-e-l-l-e, last name L-o-v-e-r-n. I am with the Building Industry Association of Clark County, and we signed on to a letter submitted by NW Partners. I have circulated a map that's included with that comment.

We see this as, as we looked at the alternatives that were provided by the County as far as No Action and then the two other options, we felt like there weren't enough tools in the toolbox and we're just asking for a broader set of tools, kind of those bookends looking at not necessarily, we're not here tonight to adopt a plan, we're here to decide what should be studied and we're just asking to give a few more tools in the toolbox by studying a broader perspective.

As you know affordability is an issue, scarcity of land contributes to that. I've experienced that in my own family, children moving away because they can't afford to purchase homes in this area and I think we would all like a solution to that, so we're just asking to study something a little bit broader just to see, give us something else that we might need to use. Thank you.

JOHNSON: Thank you for your comments.

DELAPENA: Eric Golemo.

GOLEMO: Hi. My name is Eric Golemo, SGA Engineering, and thank you for the opportunity to testify. First, I want to start by saying this is an extremely important decision that will shape our community. I think the plan does a good job of complying with the State requirements of House Bill 1220, but significantly impacts the character and quality of our community.

County staff and several cities' representatives have stated that the plan is not practical without significant subsidies. Approximately 50 percent of the housing plan in the proposal will be for below 80 percent of AMI and is not economically feasible to construct. Staff has stated that they only need to

plan for the growth, not ensure it's practical or possible to achieve.

So instead of actually planning for our growth we're merely doing an accounting exercise, this is too big of a decision for just making it an accounting exercise, it has significant consequences to not plan. If the planned housing is not practical to achieve, the land will not convert and will become strato-inventory in the model.

This will contribute to an even bigger shortage of housing, further driving up the cost of existing stock doing the exact opposite of what was intended with Bill 1220.

Secondly, this plan is not recommending any significant expansion of the urban growth boundary to accommodate our future growth, and instead advocating for increasing the density in our current boundary, this however doesn't provide a variety of housing types. Additional single-family owner occupied homes are missing.

HOLLEY: Slow down. Slow down.

GOLEMO: Instead, we are meeting most of our future housing needs with high-density apartments. This forces our community into being tenants and puts the dream of homeownership out of reach of thousands of Clark County citizens.

This broadens the gap between the haves and the have-nots and eliminates the opportunities for equity associated -- with equity associated appreciation and generational wealth. This is especially the case for marginalized communities.

While millionaires and billionaires get richer renting us apartments, our citizens are priced out of an already thin pool of owner-occupied homes. Furthermore, we attract what we plan for. While Clark County used to attract the best and brightest from the metro area it will now be a hub for low income and subsidized housing if this plan comes to fruition.

Without housing stock, it will be a hub -- without housing stock it will be difficult to attract quality employers. We also need to provide move-up housing opportunities to increase supply to make existing stock more obtainable.

We need to not only consider complying with the State bills but also have a plan that maintains the quality of life and character in our community. We need a fundamental change in the vision and philosophy from the decision-makers giving staff direction and guidance.

We need to give future generations a chance to find a little piece of the American dream here in Clark County without having to move out of the area.

So, my recommendation is we need to have an additional alternative that includes some target expansion of the urban growth boundary. At a minimum we need to include as an additional

alternative to the DEIS so we can consider it at a later date if it is proposed and considered. Thank you.

JOHNSON: Thank you for your comments.

DELAPENA: Ezra Hammer.

HAMMER: Good evening, Chair and Planning Commissioners. My name's Ezra Hammer, I'm a land use attorney with Jordan Ramis, my last name is Hammer, H-a-m-m-e-r. I want to thank everyone for being here tonight, it's going on 9:00 and you guys have given a lot of your time, and as Eric mentioned these are really important issues that are going to shape the way our county grows and flourishes for the several decades.

I want to thank all the cities for the hard work that they've done. I know you saw their presentations today but those presentations even though they're not final plans are the culminations of hundreds of hours of staff time and a lot of great public participation that went in, so a lot of credit is due to all the cities for that engagement.

I want to thank County staff as well for all their hard work kind of putting the cats as it were in this process. And we're here tonight with like a very, very simple request and that request is this which is allow the City Alternative plans to move forward and be studied.

So what you've seen and what you heard tonight is that cities like Ridgefield and La Center and Camas who are essentially bounded on all sides by agricultural lands and even have agricultural land within their own boundaries because of errors that were made over a decade ago, they're trying to accommodate natural growth and they're reacting to a fact that there's a, the tribe has set up a large and thriving casino, an economic center north of Ridgefield and just west of La Center, and the cities are adapting to that reality and need to ensure that they can grow and they can flourish for the years to come.

And so they presented alternatives for you today that includes bringing in land that has industrial overlays on it but it's zoned for agriculture uses and there are studies in the record that demonstrate that agriculture on those particular sites, not real large in the county, but on those sites isn't feasible in the long-term because they are either bounded by highway and high intensity uses or the site-specific conditions just aren't prime for agriculture uses.

So, in order to allow those plans to move forward we need to comply with the WAC and the administrative rules that kind of govern this process. And specifically, we need to look at Section 190-050 and it's corollary 060 for forest land.

And it states that in order to even consider doing what the cities want; the County needs to engage in countywide analysis which was kind of highlighted by the first speaker. The language is unambiguous it says, in classifying de-designating agricultural or forest lands counties must conduct comprehensive countywide analyses.

So, we're asking you today to recommend to the Council for the County to conduct the countywide analysis that would allow the cities to grow based on the plans they presented today. Absent that recommendation the cities would not be allowed to grow as they so desire. So, thank you for considering our request.

JOHNSON: Thank you for your comments.

DELAPENA: Bryan Snodgrass.

SNODGRASS: Good evening. Bryan Snodgrass again with the City of Vancouver. S-n-o-d-g-r-a-s-s. I wanted to speak to two specific issues just to the unincorporated Vancouver UGA which obviously the City of Vancouver is quite interested in and will be impacted by.

The first is the need to designate some, it doesn't have to be a lot, of additional commercial and employment land in the existing Vancouver UGA, not because we believe there's a numerical shortfall, but because some is needed there for a number of reasons, but particularly, and this is in our letter to comply with new climate requirements and existing other GMA policy and other city policy that as Oliver explained earlier and as I'm sure you know that climate requirements must be partially addressed in the land use element.

There's also they specifically refer to reducing vehicle miles traveled, there's a lot of things that go into that, but it probably can't be improved unless some uses are allowed if that's where the market goes to locate closer to residents that serve, residents that would use them or work or shop there.

Right now, in the Vancouver UGA the zoning doesn't allow it for many parts. If you happen to live near Highway 99 perhaps so, but there's large swaths of the area as you know where you have to go on not just a drive, but a long drive and so we're proposing, and we included in the record in earlier correspondence we had had where we identified 17 sites in the VUGA where that might be a possibility.

And so, I think this is just a case of maybe we ran out of time here, but none have been identified, and in fact the VUGA mapping before you I think in the alternatives proposed is to reduce the amount of commercial and employment land there.

So, we are suggesting to comply, not just with climate laws, but also with county policy saying you should have existing uses locate near each other and also GMA requirements that before you consider expanding boundaries you have to look in existing areas.

So we're not suggesting tonight, I don't think you would look at 17 sites or anything like that, we are suggesting I think this is okay with County staff but they can speak for themselves based on our conversation today, in your motion, if you could just have a motion that says explore looking for additional commercial and employment lands in the existing Vancouver UGA.

It doesn't commit to a process, it doesn't commit to an outcome, it just says that this is an important issue that we can look at, it doesn't mean that Vancouver as a city is looking for the VUGA to become something that looks like a city, that won't happen, but just a little can go a long way in terms of some additional designations.

The second issue with the Vancouver UGA is the concern about the, and it's in the letter, about inappropriate proposed designations in terms of their site for a VUGA expansion, staff mentioned that.

As you can see in the letter, we submitted expansions are proposed at highly parcelized sites that have a lot of critical lands and then also there isn't a whole lot of market demand in the area east of WSU, there's no requests, site-specific requests for employment but there's two only for residential.

There's a couple of employment requests in the area north, the other expansion area proposed, but they only account for about five percent of the land. We don't know if any of these lands have ever been identified on CREDCs inventory to our knowledge.

So, it doesn't make sense to study bad areas and we totally get the reason that the County staff looked at that because they're urban reserve, but we think employment policy and UGA expansions are too big just to look at a 20-year-old designation of urban reserve when you can change that, so there's probably more appropriate sites.

Then also the need we don't think is there either, and the letter goes into that, we do appreciate that there have been some changes on the ground in Highway 99 which might cause some adjustment.

I think stepping back and just looking how from a process standpoint there's been as I'm sure you've heard numerous hearings before the County Council adopted the last version of VBLM if we're going to be changing it on the fly we need to do it in a clear manner where it's very clear what it is and for very good reasons and I think there's a couple of reasons that it doesn't make sense to us at least in this case.

If we're going to revisit the assumption about mixed use and how the split goes and so forth, we understand the data is going towards 80/20, we don't know why that shouldn't be the assumption as opposed to 90/10 as County staff says.

We also question the implicit assumption if you have 80/20 or 90/10 or anything that adds to 100 you are basically de facto assuming you will get 0 mixed use buildings, none. You're probably not going to get a ton but there would likely be some and when you do get a mixed use building it's a piece of land that accommodates both residential and commercial.

The current assumption effectively says there will be none of those, no mixed-use building in the mixed use zone. There's other --

JOHNSON: Can I ask you to wrap up your testimony, your three minutes are over.

SNODGRASS: So, I'll just stop it right there I guess with one sentence. So, for those reasons we, you know, more discussion, more analysis is needed before we can conclude there's a need there and certainly those are not appropriate sites, so we'd rather than study those, other areas would be better.

JOHNSON: Thank you for your comments.

DELAPENA: LeAnne Bremer.

BREMER: Good evening, Chair Johnson, Planning Commission members and staff. My name is LeAnne Bremer, L-e-A-n-n-e, B-r-e-m-e-r. I along with my fellow land use practitioners submitted a letter into the record, Steve Horenstein of Schwabe and Jamie Howsley and Ezra Hammer of Jordan Ramis.

I just want to touch on, you have the letter, you have a lot to read, but I just want to kind of hit the high point of the letter for you and for the benefit of those listening.

So essentially, we made three points in the letter. First, under GMA, the requirements of GMA, there's a need for an alternative in the EIS to include all the site-specific requests filed by March 15th, 2024, and it's not too late to include an additional alternative or revised alternative because we're still in the expanded scoping process.

The whole purpose of this hearing tonight is for you to make a recommendation on what the EIS alternatives are and we're giving you that input, so this is directly relevant to your deliberations that you would consider modifying the alternatives that you've been proposed, that have been proposed to you so that there is this opportunity to do that modification.

And then the third Mr. Hammer had touched on there is a GMA requirement that the County conduct a countywide natural resources land study during this periodic comprehensive update. The County will not view site-specific annual reviews on ag lands or forest lands, the only time to look at those lands is during this process.

And in order to look at those lands the WACs that Mr. Hammer cited require the County conduct, and that's the words from the WAC, County conduct this natural resources study to determine if you are currently meeting the requirements of GMA, are these lands appropriately designated for resource, should they be ag, do they have long-term commercial significance. You have to do that periodic review required by GMA and you need that study to do it.

Going back to the site-specific requests, GMA also requires that, actually I'm running out of time, requires that the County allow property owners to propose amendments to the Comprehensive Plan.

There was a representation that I cited in the letter that where the County said please submit your site-specific requests by March 15th, they will be folded into the GMA update, they will be folded into

the SEPA review and based on those representations property owners had every expectation that their site-specific requests would be included in an alternative and we are requesting that you include all site-specific requests in the alternative. So, thank you.

JOHNSON: Thank you for your comment.

DELAPENA: Paul Dennis. Justin Wood.

WOOD: Good evening, Chair Johnson and fellow Commissioners. My name is Justin Wood, J-u-s-t-i-n, W-o-o-d, and I'm here tonight speaking on behalf of the Clark County Association of Realtors.

Our association represents 1,950 real estate professionals helping new and existing residents achieve homeownership, develop real property, start a business and facilitate sales for the next chapter of life.

The Commission will make a crucial recommendation tonight that will determine the land use alternative study as a part of the 2025 Comprehensive Plan update. Housing affordability is at an all-time low. In September of 2024 the median sales price of a home in Clark County stood at \$537,000.

Our membership wants to ensure that the County is studying land use alternative that will create homeownership opportunities including townhomes, condominiums, cottage clusters and single-family homes throughout the 20-year cycle.

Our association urges the Commission to recommend to Council that a broader land use alternative developed by NW Partners be studied in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement giving the County Council and our community the opportunity to see the merits of such an alternative.

Clark County continues to see a staggering amount of growth, with a current population of 525,000 and a year over year growth rate between 1.7 and 2 percent. The County already has a housing deficit of 2,500 units.

While density is part of the solution it will not solve the need for first time home buyers hoping to build equity and achieve their own version of the American dream. It will not solve the need of current and existing residents to upsize based on household need or to downsize to a different housing type restricting natural filtering within the housing market.

On the whole, vertical condominium construction in the State of Washington is expensive, difficult and perilous given the warranties and requirements within the Washington Uniform Common Interest Ownership Act and our community doesn't have time to wait for reform.

Requirements of private development have only increased in recent decades shrinking the amount of net buildable acres for all projects resulting in fewer units which means higher sales prices and rent.

Our members know that what home buyers want. According to a 2021 survey of King County residents

by DHM Research 83 percent of residents preferred to live in a single-family home and 76 percent prefer to own their own home.

If we do not ensure we have enough capacity to build housing of all types, prices will continue to increase, and homeownership will be out of reach for more and more Clark County families. We urge the Commission to recommend a broader land use alternative as a part of the DEIS. Thank you.

JOHNSON: Thank you, Justin.

DELAPENA: Minachi.

MINACHI: Pass.

DELAPENA: Rodney Shimogawa.

SHIMOGAWA: Pass as well.

DELAPENA: Katie Rasmussen.

RASMUSSEN: I'm going to keep it short. My name's Katie, K-a-t-i-e, last name is Rasmussen, R-a-s-m-u-s-s-e-n. I did provide written submission, so I'll keep this short like I said.

So, my name is Katie Rasmussen, I'm the trustee of a property located in the urban reserve, one of the two properties that probably keeps being mentioned on the east of Washington State University at 6208 N.E. 139th.

This was my mom's property up until about two years ago when she unfortunately passed away of unfortunately of cancer, so it is in our family and we are frankly speaking looking to sell it and the proceeds of the sale are to go per my mom's request to fund, make it possible for her kids to be able to buy homes of their own, so she had five kids, I'm one of those children.

It's a 15-acre rectangular parcel, it is nonsloping with no wetland or habitat restrictions and we would love to be included in the DEIS. Thank you very much for your time and consideration.

JOHNSON: Thank you.

DELAPENA: Joel Stirling.

STIRLING: Good evening. For the record my name's Joel Stirling, last name is spelled S-t-i-r-l-i-n-g. I'm here simply to support the testimony we've heard from Ms. Bremer and Mr. Hammer and the future testimony from Mr. Howsley.

I think this is an important juncture in the land development process. I'm a land use planner and a civil

engineer, my business is in land use planning and what happens here tonight is going to have a big impact on how this county moves forward.

The term shadow zoning I think really reflects what we deal with looking at feasibility of projects. Just because something is zoned a certain way doesn't mean that it actually ends up redeveloping, and a lot of that's due to cost.

So, as you move forward considering the cost of removal, some of the impacts that we're seeing, the increased environmental constraints, all of those factors really need to be looked at in more detail in my opinion and that's mainly what I wanted to say is let's take a good hard look at it. We don't get this opportunity very often, so we need to take it very seriously.

And then on a specific project note for the City of La Center we've been working with them on a project, I would like to recommend Scenario 3 if it's appropriate. I don't know if this is the right venue to do that, but I did want to voice it into the record. Thank you.

(Commissioner Johnson left the hearing.)

HALBERT: Thanks for your comments.

DELAPENA: Nick Massie.

MASSIE: Good evening, Commissioners. Nick Massie. I had prepared a speech but I'm just going to throw it away.

HALBERT: Spell your last name.

MASSIE: M-a-s-s-i-e. I was selected to sit on the climate action group as part of the project there, I was very concerned about the consensus-based format that was going to follow. I'm going to back up and say that was a great program to file.

We had representatives from every part of the county, every social diversity, we had equity based in there, we had everything there, we need to do the same with this. We hear all over the place of staff making decisions and we hear, and I'm sure we're going to have more, of every, everybody that wants to talk here.

I think everybody should have a chance to talk, not in three minutes, but in an organized fashion, we sit down and we settle this with, and I'm going to tell you on the climate action thing, I didn't get everything I wanted but neither did Don Steinke, but you know what, when we meet in the halls there's no animosity there, we're asking about each other's health, we're asking each other about each other's kids.

I'm on a program with the Identity Clark County called the Civic Engagement Opportunity where Denny

Heck is pushing this forward that we be civil with each other and go through this process to find a solution. We have that in this room right now.

I want to push this issue out to say put these groups together, sit down and have a meeting about it, get everybody's input, get a consensus on it and then go forward with it, that's the way we're going to have a successful program. If we go the way that staff wants to go, I think we're going to get hurt.

We can't have everything we want but I just want to recommend that that we really need to start focusing especially in this county, especially in this country on working together to solve problems instead of having separate seats. We should be sitting together instead of dividing up so that's what I'm going to say about that tonight. Thank you.

HALBERT: Thanks for your comments.

DELAPENA: Heidi Cody.

CODY: Hi. Good evening. My name is Heidi Cody. H-e-i-d-i, C-o-d-y. I'm with Alliance for Community Engagement or ACE which is a coalition of 12 environmental groups.

The alternative land uses question is crucial to charting a path towards an equitable and healthy future for all Clark County's residents and for preserving forest and agricultural land.

ACE asks the Clark County Planning Commission and County Council to postpone making any decisions about land use alternatives until new County Council are elected. Given the impact land use zoning changes have, we feel it is more appropriate for the new Clark County Council to make this decision that will profoundly affect our future.

Multiple organizations, including several BIPOC-led community-based organizations and Washington Conservation Action have been granted or sub-granted funds from the Department of Commerce to help and participate in Comprehensive Plan at Clark County, comprehensive planning I should say.

ACE whose participation in comprehensive planning is supported by a Commerce grant to Washington Conservation Action. We request additional time to suggest at least one land use alternative in coordination with organizations that have received funding from Commerce to participate in this work.

We understand the Planning Commission is currently only considering three land use alternatives, any other alternatives need to be considered with the full public process for procedural reasons. I'm going to keep this short. We submitted a longer letter. I'll just go straight to the conclusion. Unrestricted -- no, I will skip that.

In conclusion, the climate element priorities reducing GHG emissions and fostering climate resilience to climate impacts. Clearly, the Department of Commerce is interested in input from the groups it has funded including many BIPOC community-based organizations to participate in comprehensive

planning here in Clark County.

ACE requests that Clark County postpone decisions about land use alternatives until a more equitable community-based people's alternative can be included in the land use alternatives and until a new County Council member, or until new County Council members are elected and are in office. Thank you for your consideration.

HALBERT: Thank you.

DELAPENA: David Campos.

CAMPOS: Good evening. Dave Campos, C-a-m-p-o-s. Just in my reading this week I found two statistics that I thought would be kind of relevant to this conversation. The average age of a home buyer in the United States is now 56 years old up from 49 and Washington State is the fifth highest median sales price in the nation.

I would urge at a broad level to seek an alternative that opens up as much available land as we're able to, to alleviate our housing issues. And then as a concerned landowner in the La Center model I would like to lend support for the -- for the third option. Thank you.

HALBERT: Thank you.

DELAPENA: Marty Snell.

SNELL: Good evening, Commissioners. My name is Marty Snell, last name S-n-e-l-l. I'm here on behalf of MacKay Sposito at 18405 S.E. Mill Plain Boulevard, Suite 100, Vancouver, Washington.

We submitted a couple of site-specific requests on behalf of Sarkela 10 and Ten Talents Investments 4. These parcels are located off SR-503, one's on the west side and one's on the east side. These are small properties that are residual properties from larger mixed use zoning properties. They are currently zoned mixed use and have been passed over through two or three economic cycles.

In looking at staff's recommendation and their map it looks like the recommendation is to change the zoning from MX to R-45 so I applaud that recommendation. Would ask that the Planning Commission support the staff recommendation and consider that in the Draft EIS alternatives. Thank you very much.

HALBERT: Thank you.

DELAPENA: Jeff Borchardt.

BORCHARDT: Good evening, Chair Johnson, Commissioners. Oh, Chair Johnson is not there, and Commissioners. Jeff Borchardt, the last name spelled B-o-r-c-h-a-r-d-t, I'm the Fore Planning Director

for Taylor Morrison. For context most of my comments are not geared towards the city alternatives, they're mainly geared towards the unincorporated UGA alternative.

So, everyone on this Commission is aware that housing costs have increased drastically over the last decade. This cost has increase or this cost increase has been driven by a lot of different factors but particularly exacerbated by a lack of housing supply.

In fact, we're starting this Comp Plan update process with a significant housing deficit already and the proposed County alternative before you today will only increase that supply deficit going forward.

Much of the assumptions in these alternatives is that there's sufficient capacity within the existing UGA using vacant and underutilized land with increased densities to accommodate housing.

While some of this land will likely convert at the assumed densities, the model overestimates the rate at which that land will convert and the density at which that land will develop. Market economics, infrastructure constraints, design feasibility, zoning requirements and other limitations will lead to fewer lots being developed than what's being estimated.

Look, I'm a planner, I understand the need for higher density development in key locations, provide affordable housing growth, I understand that smart growth is necessary for proper infrastructure investment and fiscal solvency for a jurisdiction.

However, this update is more than a simple accounting exercise. It's important to truly understand the likelihood of land converting and the reality of what that development could look like based not just on density, but on the variety of other factors that must be considered in the development of a project. It is also important to ensure that densification is complimentary and consistent with the community character.

Further, it cannot be ignored that 67 percent of perspective home buyers still prefer a single-family detached home. It cannot be ignored that in a healthy market move-up buyers free up existing more affordable housing when they purchase a new home. It cannot be ignored that a majority of the land within the existing UGA that can support single-family residential development is already entitled and planned for future development projects.

The County received over 100 site-specific requests for UGA expansion consideration with the potential for real feasible projects, but a large swath were not considered or analyzed because they didn't fit within the narrative for limited growth that had already been crafted.

I ask the Commission, take a step back, request another alternative be incorporated into the analysis that reflects a more realistic growth scenario and to actually consider and analyze the site-specific requests. Thanks.

HALBERT: Thank you.

DELAPENA: Jon Girod.

GIROD: Hi. My name is Jon Girod, J-o-n, G-i-r-o-d, I own Quail Homes, 4501 N.E. Minnehaha, Vancouver. I've been building here for 35 years prior to the Growth Management Act coming in and most of my career during.

A couple of things I'd like to add is, one, is the land boundaries have been limited, most of the easy land has been developed, we are working on much harder projects which really just means more constraints more expense.

As we kind of look backwards in our rearview mirror and we had an incident just recently with COVID that drove down interest rates to historic low levels.

One of the challenges we have in the housing market, traditionally 85 percent of the market is existing homes, 15 percent new construction, new construction now is about a third. So, when you look at your modeling for what we're planning for the next 20 years I would suspect you're looking at more historical build-out of 15 percent, not 30.

So when you look at new construction being 30 percent, think of this this way, you could probably poll this room of people who own homes, most of them that have mortgages are probably under 4 percent, some even under 3, that's called the locked-in effect that really hurt the existing home market sellers because the inventory is limited, home prices have stayed up even though our rates are north of 7 percent, there's little inventory.

And when you look at your planning here, I would like someone to show to me that that's taken into consideration with the boundaries because if you take historical building that the new construction has played a role, my guess is you haven't factored in that we have a double role now than we've had in the past.

The other thing I'd like to kind of think about is the overweighting of the multi-family particularly on the subsidized below market component. I'd sure like to know where the below market financing comes in when you have that high of a percentage.

Somebody showed me the subsidized markets across the country, the State of Pennsylvania has about 5 percent subsidized housing and that's the most in the country, and we're looking at, at a presentation I saw is roughly 50 percent of the new housing in the next 20 years would be below market, so I'd sure like to see where that money comes from. Thank you.

HALBERT: Thanks for your comments.

DELAPENA: Phil Wuest.

WUEST: Thank you, Commissioners. My name is Phil Wuest, P-h-i-l, W-u-e-s-t, I'm with Ginn Group at 502 N.E. 72nd Street, 98665, we're up in Hazel Dell.

Ginn Group has been developing and building middle housing in Clark County for 15 years, so we have a ton of experience building the kind of housing, developing and building the kind of housing I think the County wants to see more of.

My comments are primarily focused here on the Vancouver UGA, not the cities. I think the City Alternatives are all in pretty good shape. The Vancouver UGA however I think is important and what I want to impress upon the Planning Commission is this, comprehensive planning is one of the most important things planning commissions do, it's the most exciting work you do, you're setting a blueprint for the community's character and values and aspiration and its unique character for a 20-year period, right, that's the exercise that we're after.

It's not just a spreadsheet and trying to jam growth into an existing boundary.

Ginn Group submitted a letter November 4th it should be in your record and included with that is a density guide, I'll let you look it up for yourselves, but you can look in there and see what different products look like at different densities, right, and that's important when we're talking about the kind of densities that Clark County has proposed in the single DEIS Alternative.

So, to be clear Ginn Group supports the NW Partners addition of another DEIS alternative that looks at areas outside of the existing UGA just so that we have a broader range of alternatives and here's why.

The June 2023 version of the Vacant Buildable Lands Model says that the Vacant Buildable Lands Model only has capacity for 16,954 homes, right, and we need to accommodate and the DEIS alternative that's before you presented by the County says we're going to stick over 40,000 homes in land that the model says can accommodate 16,000 homes, that is a radical change in the character of our community. And I just haven't heard anybody address that yet, it's just numbers on a spreadsheet.

Well, take a look at what kind of building products those are, 21.8 units per acre in an R1-6 zone in a neighborhood of 5,000-square foot lots, what does that look like, what kind of community are we planning for. I think that's very important to keep in mind. Yeah, I think that's it.

I mean, in summary I just think it's important at this stage in the process to study a broad range of alternatives so that, you know, as we proceed through the process you have the opportunity to ask the real questions about what kind of character you want the community to have. Thank you.

HALBERT: Thank you.

DELAPENA: Alondra Abrego Viveros.

ABREGO-VIVEROS: Good evening. First name Alondra, A-l-o-n-d-r-a, last names Abrego-Viveros, A-b-r-e-g-o, hyphen V-i-v-e-r-o-s. I serve as the Community Engagement and Policy Organizer for the

Southwest Washington Equity Coalition, SWEC, which has been active since 2016.

SWEC, alongside other community-based organizations, was awarded funding from the Department of Commerce to help integrate an equitable lens into the Clark County Comprehensive Plan amplifying the voices of BIPOC communities of both development and implementation.

In the light of -- in light of the Clark County Council's 2020 declaration that racism is a public health crisis, we strongly urge the County to prioritize the inclusion of BIPOC communities as the Comprehensive Plan moves forward.

SWEC has been closely involved in advising the City of Vancouver on its comprehensive plan and our experience shows that when communities of color are included from the start, plans are more inclusive, responsive and reflective of actual needs. We would welcome the opportunity to bring the same approach to Clark County.

We understand the planning process is behind schedule and while delayed funding has affected our timeline as well, we've been working with County staff to better understand the current issues around affordable housing and land use.

Unfortunately, due to time constraints we were unable to fully engage in the recent land use alternatives presented to the community and we believe this has resulted in our community's priorities being underrepresented. There is still a significant opportunity for collaboration, and we are ready to provide valuable input moving forward.

As the county continues to grow now is the time to ensure that planning reflects our shared values and does not leave anyone behind. We respectfully request to be more actively involved in the upcoming phases particularly around the community involvement, affordable housing and equitable land use.

We also urge the County to postpone any decisions on land use alternatives until we can develop a comprehensive community engagement plan with staff, especially as new County Council members are sworn in. Thank you for your time and consideration. We look forward to continuing our partnership to create a Comprehensive Plan that reflects our collective vision for the future. Thank you.

HALBERT: Thank you.

DELAPENA: Jamie Howsley.

HOWSLEY: Good evening, Commissioners. My name is Jamie Howsley, J-a-m-i-e, H-o-w-s-l-e-y, and Cindy, I know you're out there so I will try to speak slowly. I've been chastised by her enough over the years.

My colleague spoke really eloquently about the asks contained in the letters from the law firms as well as NW Partners and so I don't need to belabor that. And like Nick I sort of tore up my prepared

remarks just having listened to the testimony this evening.

I want to give a different perspective having been around the GMA for, you know, all of the cycles except the first, and the Planning Commission provides the citizen advisory point of view during this process to the County Council specifically on what you think the citizens of Clark County would like their community to look like, to do that you need to look beyond the math. This is not a two-dimensional exercise.

When you start applying these, the zoning and what the built environment looks like in the natural world, a lot of that math starts to break down and many of these professional practitioners will tell you that, just because you assume a certain type of density doesn't mean that will come.

This new plan is predicated on massive upzones, ignoring also the realities of funding these types of projects. I think that the Ginn Group does a really good job of illustrating what these types of projects would look like from a product standpoint, and simply put, you know, you go talk to the multi-family builders right now they can't get any money to do any sort of type of project like that, at best you would be looking at garden-style apartments to get funded.

I would also really look to our neighbors to the south. The State of Oregon passed a middle housing bill several years ago, the City of Portland has had a little bit ahead of that, they had something called the Portland Residential In-Fill Project. In 2023 they did an analysis of how many units were yielded out of that and it's only 271.

That is simply we are not going to meet the housing needs and the various housing types that Jose had put up there at that rate. We need tens of thousands of units in this region.

I think that the one issue that's being also severely overlooked in this is what the implications are for capital facilities planning. It's much easier to serve new sites on the edge of boundaries rather than a lot of these predicated plans on upzones which will require massive retrofitting of sewer lines, waterlines, potentially roads, that isn't a shoe that will drop later on.

And so the ask here really is study more land at this point because when we get to those decisions and those other points to come you won't, we won't be able to go back if we don't study it, so...

And then finally I would urge the County Council and you too; to conduct this area wide ag analysis as my colleagues had discussed and it's contained in the letter. So, thank you.

HALBERT: Thank you.

DELAPENA: That is all the names on the sign-up sheet.

HALBERT: Is there anyone who wishes to testify that hasn't signed in? Anybody online that's waiting to speak?

DELAPENA: No one online wishing to speak.

Return to Planning Commission

HALBERT: Okay. Yeah. Hearing that we'll close public testimony at this time and bring it back to staff. Are there any staff comments to the public testimony that you've heard?

ORJIAKO: Planning Commission members, this is Oliver again, unless Planning Commission has specific questions of staff, I do not intend to respond to any of the comment, it is meant for the Planning Commission.

BAKER: Bryan, this is Commissioner Baker. I have a few questions that I would like to ask for staff, is that –

HALBERT: It's a good time. Yep, it's a good time.

BAKER: The first thing that I'd like you to address is address the City of Vancouver's comment for zoning and commercial land use in the UGA. Specifically, I was intrigued with the climate, the miles driven aspect of that request, can you respond to the comment and so we can have an understanding of where the staff is on this subject.

ALVAREZ: I think we are open to revisiting looking at where we put commercial. I think some of the challenge -- we looked a lot at the areas along sort of the east side of -- west side of Hazel Dell. There's so much commercial along Highway 99, we could look at, we've considered looking at adding commercial along those corridors heading west, but our experience has been that it's very difficult to have small scale commercial when you have these larger scale commercials not very far away, so the challenge is where to locate it.

We're open to revisiting that, that's not an issue, but that's kind of the challenge of where we are with the commercial market and the difficulty of, you know, some areas where there's existing vacant commercial land in that area that just hasn't been developed and so adding more to it wouldn't necessarily, it just might be sitting there for a while, so that's --

BAKER: That's what I was looking for is what your response to that, that statement was. The next thing that I was hoping you could address it was brought up by multiple parties was basically that like what our models, our land use models are and the zoning that you have proposed and how that's going to look like in the future for our communities, right.

So, I didn't write the gentleman's name down, but that represented the realtors and was talking about cottage, cottage clusters and townhomes and things of that nature, and the Ginn Group with the developments that are proposed that they seem to assume that our models that we are proposing would require those type of developments, can you address those concerns.

ALVAREZ: Let me see if I can find something to share to sort of demonstrate what we're trying to achieve. Let's see. So what I want to start with was right now the baseline for the vacant buildable lands is showing about 39,000 units in housing capacity in the unincorporated Vancouver UGA, 6,000, roughly 6300 of that is in that multi-family range where the sub 80, the allocation and our target is to get to 26,000, so we're going from 6 to 26,000 of 40,000 total, that's why we're focused so much on the upzoning within that Vancouver UGA.

So, the disparity we have right now of 39,000, 33,000 out of the 39,000 is dedicated for single-family residential, we have an imbalance that we're trying to address, that's why we're doing what we're doing. If we, I mean that is the status quo and this is where we are, right, we still have a problem, we still have all of that land designated for single-family and we have this issue.

What we are required to do is provide for a diversity of income bands to try to reach those different targets and so the increase in multi-family land because we don't have enough of it is what we're trying to achieve. We -- I don't think our densities are out of line, they are 50, again in the Highway 99 area there's no limit but we're not coming close to that.

We have a transit line that's going to be coming up, the State is requiring us to reduce our parking requirements along those parking lines. We're at a point where we're looking at changing the types of housing that are provided in the community.

BAKER: Okay. Along those lines at what - I appreciate your explanation on it, and I take that - at what point in this process do we talk about like market viability like what like for getting funding and, you know, making projects that, so we've zoned it this way and then what if the economy or the market won't allow us to build it.

ALVAREZ: So, I think we've heard from the community and the building industry the difficulty with getting financing for multi-family, that's a concern that's or that's something that's not unique to this jurisdiction, it's a function of how we fund that type of housing.

It's, you know, if the rental doesn't pencil out right now that doesn't mean the demand isn't there, right, you can't get the financing to build that housing but that doesn't mean the demand isn't there, it's just how we structure and come up with the financing is something that might need to change.

The State is trying to invest a lot more resources and money into creating housing, but there are limitations with how we finance some of these multi-family projects that it's vagaries of the market that if you can't make a profit at the current rate, the housing's not going to be built, it doesn't mean that the demand has lessened.

BAKER: Right, which is my point is like that we need housing and if the market won't allow us to build the particular housing that we are planning for, what is our ability to maneuver in such a market to build houses that the market will allow like the financing can be found to build houses that we need

because we need housing units.

ALVAREZ: Right.

BAKER: Right. So, like what is our capacity to adapt?

ALVAREZ: Right. It's the same as the single-family, right, the people are having a hard time affording loans at a 7 percent interest rate, we don't have any control over that, but we have the land to build it, but if the market slows down and doesn't build it because of the financing --

BAKER: Well, to Jon Girod's point that we're building land on difficult pieces of property which adds, which obviously adds more cost if you have to develop the land prior to building a house.

ALVAREZ: In 2019 we've had land in urban holding at the 179th Street area, there are some large projects, some large pieces of property that were developed, are in the middle of being developed and developed first and there's a lot of smaller parcels intermixed with that, whenever you expand an urban growth boundary the large parcels always go first and then it trickles on down.

BAKER: Thank you for that. Let's see. I -- I think that the last thing that I was, I'd like you to comment on if possible is there's several comments on the countywide agricultural and forest land assessment analysis, and what is the staff's position on that request?

ORJIAKO: This is Oliver again. I understand the reading of the WAC and the section that was cited it doesn't really go to section WAC 365-190-040 and look specifically to what it says in 10(b) sub Roman Numeral (i) or 1 and (ii) 2.

I can only say that staff have looked at as Jose have indicated and ensuring that we have looked at the requests that were made within the existing urban growth boundaries, looked at those first and then see how they meet or align with the allocation that the Council made or the direction that the Council provided and came to a point where we at this point we are exceeding that allocation which we have to make adjustment there.

So, there wasn't any need for us to look at urban growth boundary expansion that will lead to the de-designation of resource land and that was how we arrive at not looking at any other requests beyond how we've met the allocation to the urban growth boundary and that was the approach that we took.

BAKER: Okay. Thank you. I think just the last question that I have that at the beginning of this evening that you had mentioned that we, that the County had hired an environmental consultant and then -- but there wasn't -- and I've noticed that through some of the other comments some of the other municipalities had hired land use consultants and I just wanted maybe you could comment on the reason that Clark County did not look for a land use consultant, I mean if you can explain that decision for me.

ORJIAKO: I have every confidence in my staff. They have done this, the majority if not half of them, since the beginning of the process, so with that confidence I didn't see the need to hire outside consultant.

Two, I don't have in-house -- we have in-house staff that could write the EIS, but I made the decision not to do so because I want that to be independently done, so I specifically asked for help in the environmental assessment of the alternative being studied or that will be studied, that's the decision that I made.

BAKER: Okay. Thank you, Jose and Oliver, I appreciate your responses. That's all I have.

ORJIAKO: And if any of my staff are out there working as consultant, they are qualified, they're overqualified, I just want to put it out there.

HALBERT: Commissioner Mark, do you have any comments or questions for staff? Commissioner Wogen.

WOGEN: I do have a couple. So, in order to move forward on the DEIS do all the jurisdictions have to meet their allocations exactly, can't be over, can't be under to move forward on the DEIS for all the alternatives?

ORJIAKO: Thank you, Planning Commissioner Eldon. That's why I wanted to hear from the testimony and your question before I made the recommendation.

The cities that have submitted three scenarios have narrowed it down to two, you heard that tonight. There are some that submitted one like Washougal and requesting some time to dial up with county staff to make adjustment internally.

So, the two alternative that the jurisdictions are advancing or asking you to advance for the studying the EIS, and I will say this with confidence, they have to adjust to come down to not exceeding.

WOGEN: Because right now they're, none of them are meeting it, right, or maybe one or two are?

ORJIAKO: Some of -- almost all of them are exceeding it, very few are within the allocation, that's what this preliminary information shows, I believe you have it.

WOGEN: On the VBLM?

ORJIAKO: Yes. You have that, it's a draft, you can review that carefully. The majority of the jurisdiction are exceeding it in terms of the allocation and at the end of the day we do not have to go above that allocation.

The decision have already been made and have studied the presentation about the population is like a ceiling, you've made that decision, we have to be within that. If you come with an alternative that exceeds that, we have to start all over, we cannot go beyond that previous decision, it's our allocation.

WOGEN: But some jurisdictions still had some work to do.

ORJIAKO: Yes, and part of the analysis might get us to helping us to get to the preferred, the preferred has to be very consistent with the county-controlled number that we are working with.

WOGEN: Right. Yeah. For employment and residents?

ORJIAKO: Everything, yeah.

WOGEN: Everything. But for the draft EIS do they have to be compliant on everything?

ORJIAKO: They have to come very close so that we know what is it that we are analyzing, yes, they have, yeah.

WOGEN: We're not there yet.

ORJIAKO: We are not there yet, but we can based on the two that the scenarios that they are submitting we can advance those.

WOGEN: You say the two that are submitted we can?

ORJIAKO: We can, we can study those, yes. If that's your recommendation that you go with the two scenarios that those cities that have submitted 3 and asking you to advance forward given the discussions and their preference, I will support that, but does that mean at the end of the day that I will be making that recommendation to you or to Council the answer will be no.

HALBERT: Okay. Commissioner Jack.

HARROUN: Okay. I'm, yeah, thanks for all the work and the public testimony, I know there's a lot of hours that have gone in from everyone because it's a decision that matters.

One of the things I've noticed to both I'd say call it the environmental community and the building community which I wouldn't say is antienvironmental at all, they both were asking for a comprehensive agriculture forest land analysis and there's some testimony here regarding that that needs to be done, the legality of it for some of these cities to expand in their designation, so that will certainly be one of my recommendations that I would put forward.

I'm really concerned around the when we look at cost analysis and we say, oh, they're just not building apartments because they can't afford apartments, you know, because they can't get the financing for

the apartments, but it doesn't change the demand.

A large part of that affordability is the land costs and that goes directly to the very first hearing that we had here this evening that you have the nonprofits that are saying, hey, can you give us an exception so we can build in commercial areas because commercial land is cheaper than residential apartment land.

It had nothing to do with them wanting to revitalize an area or anything like that, it has everything to do with cost, it was the same thing with the city and it's the cost of land and because there's a shortage of available land to build on.

As an anecdote, I'm closing on a \$350,000 single-family lot in the next two weeks to build a house because that's how much land costs, it costs in downtown Vancouver to acquire a decent piece of property. Shortages, shortages drive that.

And so, when I look at a very constrained map that we're, that we didn't look at outside the site-specific requests, they didn't -- you didn't want to trigger anything that you could avoid doing, this is from my understanding of what you just said, an agricultural forest study that you just arbitrarily cut them out.

And there's a lot of public testimony regarding those site-specific requests that they've been on the back-burner for three years, four years and they were promised a review process and -- and by statutory they're required to be looked at every year.

And so, and again there's some leeway there I guess in order to pause in it and you'd want to have a compre- -- you know, a good global comprehensive look but I think it's important that we include that in the analysis, at the very least just to meet the obligations of what we owe our citizens in honoring that process.

There was the map that I think it was NW Partners put together they're asking for a much, much larger study area, and though I'm like -- I'm like that's a lot, that's a lot more land than has been proposed in option, you know, 2 and 3, but I'm kind of at a loss in that -- I'll step back.

When I read the testimony from that the whole building industry feels very from their testimony feels very excluded from this process and they even put on record that they said staff was not working with them, not meeting with them, not responding to e-mails and not providing timely or accurate data.

And unfortunately, I can relate to that. I've had staff tell me I didn't want to look at it from this dais. Said, I said we ask a question in a workshop and then I come up here and, you know, it's two weeks later, ask for the answer, told directly it wasn't in my scope.

So, I'm sympathetic to that to having a quote, unquote, workshop where we're supposed to have input and 15 days later there's the hearing and nothing of our concerns or our thought processes were

included in that. And so and we've talked about this and it's not the process like that other cities use and I think what happens is it's a breakdown of public process.

And so instead of coming with some pretty well-defined maps that have been developed with the community and with the Planning Commission and with the other interests and saying, hey, we really think these one or two options that the community is around, and it meets a lot of needs and there's always gives and takes we can recommend this to Council.

Instead, we have what staff has given us, really force fed us, two weeks later, vote on it or something the industry comes up with and says, hey, could you just please consider a larger, a larger scope, please take the time to consider a larger scope. So I mean that would be my recommendation as well is that we take the time to consider a larger scope and that we do the agricultural study.

And personally, I would like to see some economic feasibility overlaid into to our goals and then that really needs to be looked at because we can put it on paper, but if it doesn't get built people don't get a place to sleep and that's really important. And, yeah, and just we need to produce what the market needs and wants, so there's my thinking.

HALBERT: Yeah. Jack, it seems like the State is dictating our, what our community should be as opposed to our community working together to, as I think it was Phil said, you know, to be a community that people want and the realtors saying, hey, 75 percent of the people want to be in a single-family home, own their own home and the State doesn't seem to want to hear that for Clark County, they're dictating this process, so and how do we get a balance.

HARROUN: Well, I appreciate that, but I think it's kind of like say that we're building a great transportation system, we got the Vine, fantastic, really expensive, watch a bus go by, how many people are on it, two, it's cheaper to Uber everybody.

It doesn't -- if it's not what people want, if it's not what the community wants, this is our community, this is, you know, we're the Planning Commission, it's not the State and we have like while we're meeting the State requirements we absolutely need to look at what our community needs, what do we want for our families, do we want just apartments.

I mean, we built a great bus system that nobody uses, you know, I don't want to raise my kids in an apartment, I want to raise them in a home.

HALBERT: Okay. Just a couple of questions from me. There was quite a few comments, public comments about site-specific requests that to be included and I'm confused a little bit because I see that there are some site-specific requests, do you gather from the public testimony that they're saying all site-specific requests should be included or what am I missing on that piece?

COOK: I would construe what some of the folks said as saying, yes, all site-specific requests must be included and perhaps some of them used words to that exact effect. Yeah, that's my answer to your

question.

HALBERT: Yeah, go ahead.

WOGEN: I'd like to comment on that a little bit. I think the public is a little confused because when you look at, go to the website for submitting site-specific it says follow this process, you submit the process and then the next thing it goes talks about going to the DEIS, it doesn't say anything about any steps between whether they're going to be evaluated for or anything.

So, I think most people were thinking that once you submit a site-specific request that it is going to at least get to the DEIS.

COOK: Commissioner, with respect, most of the folks who said things like that here are land use attorneys or consultants who have been engaged in their business in this county for a number of years, and I understand that they would like for their clients' properties to be given the designations that they asked for, that doesn't mean that the County is required to do so.

This is a different process from an entitlement process, nobody is entitled to a Comprehensive Plan change. Entitlements arise from permit applications, you know, you got your criteria for a permit, you submit an application if you meet the criteria, you get the permit, but you are not entitled to a comprehensive plan change and at some point, staff needs to evaluate what is in front of it.

There are some site-specific requests that are just not even imaginable as being approved, there are some site-specific requests which are close, as Jose said, there's some that seem like they would be appropriate if there were a need.

In the last Comprehensive Plan periodic review and update one of the areas where the County was held to be noncompliant and invalid was in expanding urban growth boundaries beyond what the need was for those expansions, and I'm afraid that need is a term of art and it's legally defined.

And there is -- there are decisions that have in fact been made by the County already concerning allocation and assumptions and that those facts and State law do not prevent you from making a recommendation to the contrary, doesn't prevent the County Council from making a decision to the contrary, but know that there are legal consequences of those sorts of decisions.

HARROUN: Just a point or I think, Chris, my understanding is the site requests, the site-specific requests are just being asked to be looked at, to be studied, it's not obviously anybody could ask for the moon whatever and it could totally not make sense, but statutorily don't we like and I'm trying to understand because I'm going from the letters, right, isn't there a requirement that like, I don't know, like every dog has its day and everybody gets a chance to go, to like they put in the application according to the guidelines on the County and then the County then is obligated to take a reasonable look at that?

COOK: No.

HARROUN: That's just what I'm trying to understand, so...

COOK: So, one of the things we heard tonight is that the County has to look at this every year, not true. Most years, yes. But you all may recall that a hold was put on annual reviews because there's yet another provision that pesky State law that prohibits revising the Comprehensive Plan more than once a year.

When that moratorium on annual reviews was adopted, it was because we all assumed that the Comp Plan update would occur on June 30, 2025, and then a year or so later we got a six-month grace period, I'm not sure what that would have done to the moratorium but here it is.

And annual reviews would be as I understand it are welcome again starting in, well, if you make a decision on December 31, 2025, then you can get your annual reviews at the end of 2026 and I think that is when they were scheduled. Yes?

ORJIAKO: Yes.

COOK: Yes, so...

HARROUN: But they do have the right to be looked at; correct?

COOK: A right to be looked at?

HARROUN: Well, meaning that the County --

COOK: Well, okay, here's the question, how much looking do you have to do. So, there is for example a site-specific request for changing a lot size in a way that was just precisely ruled invalid at the last Comprehensive Plan update. Now how much more do we have to look at that, do we really have to pay somebody to do an environmental analysis of that site-specific request along with a number of others that simply do not appear to comply with the law.

HALBERT: I'll just throw out too, and I looked at that map, the dots, each one had additional information on it so it did look like to me that each one --

COOK: Yes.

HALBERT: -- had been looked at --

COOK: Yes.

HALBERT: -- and had some information even if it said no or yes or to be included but even to get a red,

green or yellow dot or there was a couple other colors, certainly meant that they were, I'm defending the County here on this one, but they did look at them.

COOK: They have all been considered.

HALBERT: Yes.

COOK: And in the annual review process of course there's a pretty significant fee to apply, no fee here which might have something to do with a number of requests.

But speaking of maps, I thought, Commissioner Halbert, that you were going to address the map that we received from Ms. Lovern from the BIA and it's an interesting map. I understand there's a total of something like 18,000 acres or something of land in these four areas adjoining the Vancouver urban growth boundary and beyond, there are only, what, 4,000 or so acres of site-specific requests outside the UGA, so this, this is way beyond the site-specific request.

There's a lot of land which we are asked to study that nobody actually asked to include, why should we study that, it's not an idol question because it goes to this whole conversation.

HARROUN: Well, I think it goes back to the conversation that you have a whole community that believes that they were deliberately cut out of the process.

COOK: You know --

HARROUN: I mean, I'm just telling you, I'm reading the comments and there's a lot of them, there's like 400 pages worth.

COOK: So, Oliver and Jose and I actually went to the BIA just last week and met with people there. If, you know, letters have gone back and forth. I have heard that you never listen to us before, I'm not buying it this time.

HARROUN: Well, with respect, when you have industry representatives that are saying that we were not included in the conversation.

COOK: Which conversation?

HARROUN: Well, okay. So, again, let's get back to my personal experience where you're saying that you met with them last week, but this was already a baked cake last week. So, you can't say that I certainly don't feel you can say that you really took their input when you already baked the cake.

COOK: They -- it's -- I'm sorry. Go ahead.

HARROUN: So, this is my concern. So then I get a map from the industry that includes way more land

than I think, you know, then I go there's -- there's probably more land there than, you know, I don't have a good justification for each of these areas because I don't understand that, but on the flip side I see the maps from the County which seem like grossly inadequate and certainly from a market analysis grossly inadequate for what we need as a community.

COOK: Have you conducted the market analysis?

HARROUN: Have I conducted a market analysis?

COOK: Yeah. You said from a market analysis our growth is grossly inadequate, I'm wondering about this analysis.

HARROUN: Yeah, I just paid \$350,000 for a single-family building lot to build a house, that is grossly out of proportion to what we want to be building, paying to build affordable housing, so...

COOK: It's an interesting anecdote. I wouldn't call it a market analysis but that's up to you. I just --

HARROUN: Chris, my goal is not to be combative, I'm just saying that it's like -- I feel like I'm stuck kind of between a rock and a hard place between, you know -- you know, some alternatives I don't like and another alternative that -- I mean, I guess and I would err on this they're asking for it to be studied, to be considered, to consider a greater area and I think that's reasonable at this point.

COOK: And my assessment --

HARROUN: And I wish --

COOK: I'm sorry.

HARROUN: I wish that there would have been more community, there would have been more collaboration that we could have developed a really solid plan that everybody was like tomatoes, you know, all things being equal I think this is a solid plan but we're not hearing that, and I think there was a missed opportunity there, so...

ORJIAKO: Planning Commissioner, this is Oliver again, Chris is correct that at the invitation of the BIA we answered that invitation. I will also add that, and this is not being combative or defensive, but there have not been any invitation by the Clark County Realtors, they said so in their letter. If there is any invitation that they have extended to me, I will honor it, there's been none.

I have been to Clark County, Identity Clark County at their invitation, told my staff to be there, I have been to CREDC at their invitation, I have been to so many numerous neighborhood association at their invitation and there have not been an invitation from the Clark County Realtors Association.

When we went to the BIA several of their members were there, that is one. Two, and I will defend my

staff, no one was working on this to not include ag land because we don't want to study it. I think what is missing in this conversation is that we are all of a sudden ignoring the allocation that was made, and we are required to plan for by the various income bands.

Now would you say that this map will get you to those various income bands, I haven't studied it, but I will say no. Chris is correct there are so many parcels here that none of the property owners have seen or they have made a request to be included or to be studied.

Now when you say consider, there is no promise that when you submitted your site-specific request that it will be approved or recommended to be approved. There were talks that we have looked at and cited all the WAC requirement in sizing of urban growth boundary and we are inline to meet that. The reason we cited it is that if we don't, those that are watching what we do, will cite it for us. So, we were mindful of putting a plan that is consistent with the Growth Management Act.

You may disagree, but Planning Commissioner Eldon asked me a question about what do we do and how many of this alternative will we study, we've asked the cities, you know, this is, you know, give and take, we've asked the cities to readjust what they have submitted to us and they have done so, some that have submitted three have narrowed it down to two, does that mean that I will be making a recommendation that at the end of the day those be what the Council and the Planning Commission adopt, there is more work to be done.

We shared with you that Washougal is looking at making some changes, what is also missing is Vancouver, Camas, Washougal are required, required to comply with the new bill which I mentioned 1110. The County, we have a huge urban unincorporated area, we are not required by the 1110 bill but we are required at least because of the five that we are managing a huge unincorporated area that is urban to plan as we are required to comply with House Bill 1220.

Now you seem to be forgetting that you've already made a recommendation on code changes to the housing that gets you duplex, triplex, townhouses and cottage houses and so forth in the single-family zone, you seem to forget that you made that recommendation and Council adopted that.

Now what will that get you? It will get you up to 22 units or 21 plus, 21 and a half or close to 22 units on 2,000-square foot lot in the single-family zone. As someone who have done this professionally you have to step up the multi-family district because currently now the multi-family district is R-12 to R-18 and so forth, you can have the same in the single-family zone up to 22 units an acre and then allow your multi-family to be remain at 12 and 18, it doesn't pencil, I can't defend that.

Now having made that recommendation we'll see, you know, how this, you know, turns out. Now the SSR again we have considered them and as Jose and Chris is saying there are some that if you look at the map which you have seen we have put that in terms of public process, we've put that out for quite some time so that people can see what is being requested.

There is nothing in GMA that says you must consider them. I don't see where it says you must consider

them or include it in any of the alternatives. If you look at what the sum of, the majority of the smaller cities have done they've included some. In Battle Ground we didn't have any request that came to us directly, that request went to the City of Battle Ground and they included it in some of their proposal. In Town of Yacolt you have them.

But the majority of the requests that are just in between are in the middle of nowhere want to be in the urban growth boundary. If you look at the map there is nowhere I'm going to ask that a site-specific request that is half a mile away from the urban growth boundary, I'm going to study you and include, I can do a cursory study and provide you with the reasons why they were not considered or suggested to be included or to even to be studied.

I think also what is being missed is that when we open up, and I'll put that into the record, when we open up the plan amendment the majority of these requests will not be submitted. As Chris indicated, yes, this is free, so I will throw in anything and see what happens. If I get it, I get it; if I don't get it, I don't get it.

There are so many requests here for mining, for example, we went through a process in 2014 that requires community input and a task force and a new information from DNR, I have been lamenting that there is no new information, I've reached out to DNR, when will you update that DNR aggregate map, it's not their top priority, they're studying landslide issues throughout the state to address that issue, so until we have new information nothing is lost.

When we updated that surface mining as an example we added some surface mining area, some areas were not added. I can attest that there are some areas that we added for surface mining that no one have come in for permit. And as you know mining can take 30, 50 years, so that is one request that again is not considered but not being addressed or providing an overlay to those areas.

So, there are a variety of requests out there that when you really look at it you may disagree, but I'll use an example, there are some requests that want to go from AG-20 to 1 acre or to 2 and a half, the only areas where you can have 1 acre or 2 and a half is in the rural center.

Why should we go studying those requests? You will reasonably say, sorry. I will do that cursory study and provide you the reasons why majority of this have not been looked at if that's what you would like to see or by the time we go to Council is as if we can do that in our shop and provide you, provide the Council as to the reason why they were not looked at. So, no one from my shop or my staff is ignoring inclusion of resource land.

And if I may we have provided it to Council, to you, I think I have it somewhere, this is what I'm looking at here is WAC 39- -- 365-190-040 and this is the recent rule making that came out of Commerce and in Section 10(b), Roman Number (i) it says, "De-designations of natural resource lands can undermine the original designation process." Okay.

So, I have to make a finding that the original resource designation was in an error. I couldn't make that

finding. Why? Because when this particular issue was challenged the court found that the agricultural designation was done right.

"De-designations of natural resource lands can undermine the original designation process. De-designations threaten the viability of natural resource lands and associated industries through conversion to incompatible land uses, and through operational interference on adjacent lands."

It goes on to continue to say in Roman Numeral (ii) "Counties and cities should maintain and enhance natural resource-based industries and discourage incompatible uses. Because of the significant amount of time needed to review natural resource lands and potential impacts from incompatible uses, frequent, piecemeal de-designations of resource lands should not be allowed."

Again, if you don't adhere to this WAC those that watch what we do will point it out to us, I want to be mindful of that and I am putting it into the record, some will disagree, we are not avoiding looking at resource land not intentionally doing so.

If their requests does not meet the or align with the decision that have already been made, what we have scoped out is inline with what we are presenting to the Planning Commission and we will be presenting to Council.

So, I would like to know what question you have here is? Good points, Planning Commissioner Harroun, but there is -- we're not required to do economic analysis or market analysis of what will or what wouldn't happen.

We will get there by doing the necessary Capital Facilities Plan.

The other comment that I will make is that you hear me say that through this process if we come out and do a very good work on meeting the housing requirement as prescribed by the State, you hear me say answering your question this was intentional, what I meant by that that the legislature was intentional by requiring local government to plan for housing by various income bands, we cannot ignore that, it's a requirement.

Too, they have us also have this new climate bill that calls for reduction in vehicle mile travel, those are some of the things we have to consider as we put this land use together. It's new and it's challenging, I get that, but I want to do a plan that meets the Growth Management Act and not subject us to risk.

HALBERT: I think I'm going to move right into Karl's seat here and Karl had an emergency and had to leave, so... I do want to figure out how we can land this ship and move on tonight.

ORJIAKO: I thank you, Planning Commissioner Halbert.

HALBERT: Or Karl.

ORJIAKO: Or for Karl. Staff will be making a recommendation to the Planning Commission that you

make a recommendation to Council to move forward with 3 Alternative to study in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement with the requirement that the alternatives provided by the jurisdiction meet but not exceed the housing and employment allocation. That is my recommendation to the Planning Commission. You can make whatever motion you like, but that is my recommendation.

HALBERT: So, at this are there any other questions of staff? I'll bring it back to --

WOGEN: I just had one question. Is there a timeline when the jurisdictions would have to come back to you to get to the point where you can go ahead with the DEIS? I mean, let's say we make that motion that you just mentioned.

ORJIAKO: I will press this the local jurisdiction. I promise you I will give them deadline, if they don't meet it, I will move forward. The reason I say that is because I've been saying we are falling really behind.

There are two things that could happen, and I will go, and Chris may correct me, if the County does not meet the timeline, that goes with the cities as well, we will be in noncompliance, so that is something that I'm very aware of that could happen, that's why I will press the cities to submit. Right now, I cannot tell you if you make a recommendation, I cannot tell you when we will be going to Council.

HALBERT: Any other questions for staff? And perhaps, you know, let me bring it back to the Board, have a discussion, but perhaps we have a motion and then open that up for discussion and amendments if that's what we desire.

BAKER: I do have one motion that I would like to make for consideration. This is Commissioner Baker.

HALBERT: So is it outside of what we're --

BAKER: No, it's part, it's part of this but it -- so I would like to make a motion --

HALBERT: Yeah, why don't you.

BAKER: I would like to make a motion to recommend to the Council that prior to considering proposed land use alternatives that the Council consider adopting a market factor for land allocated for employment to align with the market factor of 10 percent for vacant land and 30 percent for underutilized land that is currently used for residential land.

HALBERT: And, you know, I need some help on this, but it seems like we really need the motion that's before us presented and then amend it with your motion.

BAKER: That -- Oliver's motion was not our motion.

HALBERT: No. But we need to have something on the table to discuss and amend.

HARROUN: Well, technically we make a motion for whatever. So, I guess the -- I mean the goal is to pick, you know, one of their 3 or an additional land use alternative and then also we can put any kind of other motions for disclaimers or what we want studied as well.

So, I guess could you restate your motion because I would like to hear that again just to kind of understand what you're asking for specifically, and, yeah.

BAKER: Sure.

HALBERT: Go ahead, Jeremy.

BAKER: Yes. So, I motion to recommend to Council that prior to considering proposed land use alternatives that the Council consider adopting a market factor for land allocated for employment to align with the market factor of 10 percent for vacant land and 30 percent for underutilized land that is currently used for residential land.

HARROUN: So, you're recommending a pause on recommending anything without further study?

BAKER: I would like to, yes, that's what I'm recommending.

(EVERYBODY TALKING AT THE SAME TIME)

BAKER: That's the motion that I am proposing to the Commission that we ask the Council to reconsider the market, this aspect of market factor for employment land and then that way then that can, that could give us the information that we need to understand a little bit better for this DEIS that they're trying to do.

HALBERT: But why couldn't that be within the DEIS that they're planning to start studying now?

BAKER: No, that is fine. I'm not opposed to that.

HALBERT: That could be part of an amendment to our recommendation to, you know, back to staff to say, hey, include this, we recommend that you include this in that.

BAKER: Yes, but the Council has to approve the market factor, right. Yes. Okay. So, I'm okay with wording including this motion if you guys are interested in entertaining it with a larger motion.

HALBERT: I think it makes sense. So, Oliver read a motion that -- is there -- Jose, could you give it to Mark.

BAKER: I think I could --

HALBERT: We can wait for Oliver to come back.

BAKER: I think I can make a motion that is similar to the motion that Oliver --

HALBERT: Because in Oliver's motion he is asking for 3 Alternatives.

BAKER: That's the -- they have the option to, they can have the --

HALBERT: Up to 3 Alternatives.

BAKER: They've done 4 in the past as well, and so but they are at --

HALBERT: And actually, they're trying to narrow it down to 2 Alternatives.

HARROUN: Can I step in real quick here. So, I want to make sometimes we get a little pigeonholed when we start making motions and then amendments to motions and stuff. I really kind of want to understand what all of the Commissioners are thinking on the kind of 2 Alternatives that have been presented.

I'm in favor of expanding the scope of the EIS to include some more land. I'm not necessarily sure that, you know, it needs to be the entire thing that NW Partners, you know, came up with, but I definitely expanding the scope and including the market analysis for land and jobs I think that's pretty critical.

So that's kind of my thinking and so I don't know, you know, to formulate something that kind of captures that, and then I think there would be a separate standalone motion for doing a countywide agricultural and forest land thing, but that's a little, a separate motion. But the -- but I kind of wanted to, I really haven't heard from everybody, so I'd really like to hear.

HALBERT: Let's go down. Mark.

BERGTHOLD: I like the 10 and the 30. I have a dead battery. This is Commissioner Bergthold; I like Jeremy's motion with the 10 and the 30. I can see validity of doing that. I also hear, I'm not sure how to blend all those together, if you could do it in one, I suppose you could do it in a two or three phase motion.

HALBERT: I think we'd just take each motion or amendment to the motion at a time, one at a time.

BERGTHOLD: Okay.

HALBERT: Eldon, any comments?

WOGEN: Well, I think we just need to probably make a motion about moving forward with getting a DEIS on the 3 Alternatives, 1 with the No Action and the 2 that was discussed and I think that what we

could probably do is say in addition we would like Council to consider using the market analysis, but I think it's important that we give staff direction on what to do about moving with the DEIS today.

HARROUN: What is your -- what is the Commissions' thoughts on expanding, expanding the map a little bit, looking, just looking at a larger area than is currently before the County here? I mean, I'm personally in favor of that but I kind of want to, you know, what's your thinking along that?

WOGEN: Well, already there's some UGA expansion in those alternatives. How much more? I don't know the jurisdictions have put together what they think is what is needed, I'd leave it at that.

HALBERT: I would also think that with Commissioner Jeremy's proposal of the percentages that would also push land expansion too if that was adopted. I agree with you, Eldon, the jurisdictions have put a lot of time in to getting to this place and --

WOGEN: To second guess.

HALBERT: Yeah.

BAKER: And I also think it's important to realize that we have to, we are constrained by the allocations that have, that decision has already been made, and so I think that by adding this market factor may allow us to get more land in the plan for that's not currently being considered but then that way we can still meet the constrained limits of what the DEIS has to --

HALBERT: And will the market factor hold up to the scrutiny of the State and their very narrow criteria that the jurisdictions work with.

HARROUN: Would the Council be open to or Commission be open to looking at the market factor for the residential component as well?

BAKER: It is in there, that's why, yeah, that's what I'm saying, just to match the market factor. And I don't know if that's appropriate, I'm just asking them to consider that and maybe they make a different decision that would be more inline to what's historically valid.

HARROUN: I think legitimate, yeah.

HALBERT: We ask staff that question. Thank you, Christine. I know you had your finger on the button.

COOK: I'm afraid I did. So, again, if you all want to do this, I suppose you can. You said that the allocation decision had already been made, the decision about what kind of market factors to use and how big those market factors should be was also already made and it was made unsurprisingly prior to the allocation because those assumptions figured into the Vacant Buildable Lands Model which figured into the allocation.

I don't remember when the assumptions were adopted by Council, but they were the subject of a great deal of input from the industry and public proceedings, a Planning Commission hearing, they went to Council. If you wish to reopen that I suppose that you can do so.
The more things we reopen the more difficult it becomes.

And if the Council does decide to do a countywide study of resource lands, that's not a quick or easy process. So, the more things we reopen, the more it would push that back and, you know, it took years literally when the County first adopted resource zoning under GMA. I don't know how long it would take to do that kind of study now, but it makes me a little nervous, that's, that was my comment.

HALBERT: Thank you. Jeremy, you offered to make a motion, why don't you give it to us.

BAKER: And so I would like to make a **motion** that we recommend to the County Council that they consider the 3 Alternatives proposed by the staff for the EIS land use alternatives with the addition of recommending to Council that prior to considering those land use alternatives that they consider adopting a market factor for land allocated for employment to align with the market factor of 10 percent for vacant land and 30 percent for underutilized land that is currently used for residential land.

HALBERT: Okay. Hearing Jeremy's motion and recommendation, do I get a second on that motion?

WOGEN: This is Eldon. I will **second** that as long as it's clear that when we ask Council to move forward with the 3 that when we say consider that they may say, well, we're not going to consider it.

BAKER: I just -- I don't want them to -- I'm not telling them to do anything. I just would ask them to consider it and if they don't want to that's fine.

WOGEN: Okay. Then I can go, I'll second Jeremy's motion.

HALBERT: So, we have a motion and a second. Let's open it up for more discussion here. Any changes or other amendments?

BAKER: Well, I think, well, to Eldon's point I think my whole goal here is just to try to make sure that we, I understand Chris's point that this decision has been made and I understand that sometimes we have to live with our decisions but I think this, at this juncture, it would be important just to give us the opportunity to reconsider how the employment aspect is going to impact our community for the next 20 years because each one of these municipalities have come in with a job deficit, job deficit, job deficit and so I think that's a big risk and if we don't have a market factor the Council may disagree, that's fine, but if we give them, if we ask them to maybe they will and then maybe that will help us navigate the next 20 years.

WOGEN: Well, and I'll just bring up that if we do pass with that motion at least that gives staff the opportunity to march forward to get the EIS's started and put this thumbs on the jurisdictions to get their act together.

HALBERT: I also think that there's been a lot of public testimony tonight that's in the record that Council will get to hear and consider as they deliberate about this alternatives.

You know, one of them of course is looking at more job lands within the Vancouver UGA, looking at land expansion based on the allocation that you talked about, the market factors, you know, think what other was asked or talked about.

The site-specific requests, there are site-specific requests that staff has already got into the process that is going to be part of one of these alternatives, I think Alternative 2 that -- and there are site-specific requests that are outside of these alternatives. Council will hear this and will need to consider it and may come back and ask for more site-specific sites to be looked at. Am I wrong on that? No?

HARROUN: I guess in the motion though I didn't hear there was any market viability for residential housing of the zone. I think that was kind of the, unless it was addressed in there somehow that I didn't catch, but it was kind of that along the lines of the commercial is the residential of just because we, just because it's zoned that way is it going to be built to meet the need, I think that's my greatest concern of that, so...

HALBERT: I think what's in front of us isn't to do a market analysis or determine what land is usable but the draft environmental impact report that will allocate the lands that can then be used.

I know what you're saying, Jack, that just because they say the lands are included in that zone or upzone or added or revised they can't necessarily be built or sold or funded.

HARROUN: Right. And that's I mean the City of Vancouver did actually do a market, you know, analysis on there when they were putting stuff together and the County has not and that's I guess my concern is like we're going to wind up, we're going to be screaming about housing affordability and I mean we literally are changing the code in two weeks, you know, recommending to changing the code in two weeks so nonprofits can buy cheaper land for their multi-family.

So that's -- it's important to me to get in there at least in the signal up to like, hey, we need to really look at this because it's pretty limited land that we're putting. I'm not advocating for, you know, 80,000 acres being added either, but maybe some balance there, so...

I mean, but I am certainly supportive of Jeremy's motion, I just am concerned that we're not meeting the other acts of, the other parts of our process that need to be met.

HALBERT: Yeah, I don't disagree with you. I just, you know, we're putting more layers on top of something that may not actually be able to be studied and then the alternatives, they'll never get traction, they'll never get started because we'll spend all our time -- I know it's important, Jack, but, yeah, there's --

BAKER: Bryan, I would just go back to the statement that Oliver had made that the Council has already approved some additional zoning for multiplexes and ADUs and whatnot that to try to alleviate some of these pressures for affordable housing and we haven't even got to the part of that where that process is being fully -- it's just we -- it hasn't even been implemented yet.

It's been -- it's part of the process that's been okay and so it's like I think we're in a good spot right now that we can move forward with the Draft EIS and kind of look, kind of see where it all comes out because eventually they'll come back with what the actual numbers are and then we can have further discussion on it but this gets the ball rolling.

HALBERT: Yeah, thanks, Jeremy. Okay. Any other discussion? If not, I'll close the discussion and call for a vote. And, Jeff, will you give us a roll call.

ROLL CALL VOTE

HALBERT: AYE

BERGTHOLD: AYE

WOGEN: AYE

HARROUN: AYE

BAKER: AYE

DELAPENA: 5/0.

HALBERT: Thank you. Thank you. Boy, this has been a long night.

HARROUN: Chair, I'd like to make a **motion**.

HALBERT: You want to make another motion?

HARROUN: I do.

HALBERT: Okay. Jack.

HARROUN: I move that the Planning Commission recommend that the County Council direct staff to conduct a comprehensive countywide agricultural and forest land analysis pursuant to WAC 365-190-050 and 365-190-060 as part of the 2025 Growth Management Act Comprehensive Plan update process.

HALBERT: There's a motion on the table for a recommendation for the, yeah, how do I shorten that up, for the ag/forest land analysis. Is there a second? Yeah. Hearing none, let's say that the motion is tabled or actually the motion is dead.

HARROUN: Yeah, it's dead.

HALBERT: So, boy, with that vote, I think we can conclude the public hearing. And is there any other further business?

OLD BUSINESS

None.

NEW BUSINESS

None.

COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION

WOGEN: I'd like to comment on the one, two, three, four, five visitors that are still here, congratulations, you have a lot of patience.

HALBERT: Oliver, please.

ORJIAKO: I know it's very late and want to also commend all those that have testified, I share their concerns. We will move forward with your recommendation and see how soon we can be before the Council.

I just want to take this opportunity, I'm sure some of the Planning Commission members are aware of this already, but I want to take this opportunity to say congratulations to my staff and congratulations to the Planning Commission.

The two studies that we brought before you, the Housing and the update to the Aging Readiness Plan both those projects earned Clark County two award from the governor's 2024 Smart Growth Award so you were a part of that and just want to give a shout out to your work and as staff indicated during the first work session we are moving into Phase 2 of the Housing.

You know, this is very challenging but when I said I have confidence in my staff I do and this is the first time that a County received two awards in the same year, so kudos to Community Planning staff and to you that participated in that effort. That's all I have to say. Thank you.

HALBERT: Congratulations, Oliver, and staff, that's tremendous. And, Jose, thank you for your input tonight, you dug deep on a lot of questions and thank you for doing that.

BAKER: And I to want to thank you guys. I, you know, in my naivety and just my curiosity, I really appreciate your patience with my questions and your feedback to them is much appreciated and I do, I would say those awards were, recognitions were well earned by your professional delivery of your job,

so thank you.

HALBERT: All right. Guys, if there's no other business I'm going to go ahead and close tonight's meeting and adjourn and thank you guys for sticking around and I don't think anybody fell asleep, but I'm ready to, maybe Susan. Okay. Thank you again. Good night.

The record of tonight's hearing, as well as the supporting documents and presentations can be viewed on the Clark County Web Page at:

<https://clark.wa.gov/community-planning/planning-commission-hearings-and-meeting-notes>

Television proceedings can be viewed on CTVV on the following Web Page at:

<https://www.cvtv.org/program/clark-county-planning-commission>

Minutes Transcribed by:

Cindy Holley, Court Reporter – Holley Court Reporting

Jeffrey Delapena, Program Assistant – Clark County Community Planning