



CLARK COUNTY WASHINGTON

clark.wa.gov

1300 Franklin Street
PO Box 5000
Vancouver, WA 98666-5000
564.397.2000

Clark County Climate Change Planning

Community Advisory Group Meeting #11

February 26, 2025, 5:30-8:30pm PT

Public Service Center in Vancouver, WA, and
Zoom Webinar

Meeting Summary

FUNDED BY WASHINGTON'S

**CLIMATE
COMMITMENT
ACT**



The WA Department of Commerce climate planning grant is supported with funding from Washington's Climate Commitment Act. The CCA supports Washington's climate action efforts by putting cap-and-invest dollars to work reducing climate pollution, creating jobs, and improving public health. Information about the CCA is available at www.climate.wa.gov.

Attendees

Community Advisory Group members: Councilor Michelle Belkot, Jessica Brown, Gabriela Ewing, Ann Foster, Nelson Holmberg, Janet Kenefsky, Noelle Lovern, Nick Massie, Brent Marsden, Sunrise O'Mahoney, Dave Rowe, Don Steinke, Terry Toland, Alana Tudela, Justin Wood, Monica Zazueta

County staff: Amy Koski, Jenna Kay, Harrison Hustings, Oliver Orjiako

Consultant team: Sylvia Ciborowski, Nicole Metildi, María Verano (Kearns & West); Tracy Lunsford (Parametrix); Dana Hellman (CAPA Strategies)

Number of members of the public in attendance: 9

Welcome

Clark County and Kearns & West staff welcomed everyone to the meeting. Sylvia Ciborowski, Kearns & West, provided an overview of the agenda and outlined the meeting's purpose and desired outcomes:

- Begin discussing and seeking consensus on Climate Element goals and policies.
- Share an update from the Buildings & Energy subcommittee.
- Share an update on greenhouse gas emissions reduction targets.

Sylvia reviewed the CAG vision statement and reaffirmed its commitment to implementing House Bill 1181 and supporting Clark County's climate goals. Additionally, Sylvia reviewed meeting logistics, participation guidelines, and the process for public comments.

Finally, Sylvia asked if members had corrections for the CAG Meeting #10 summary. There were no suggested corrections, and the summary was accepted.

Project Updates

Jenna Kay began by reviewing the meeting materials provided to participants. She noted that additional materials, which could be found online, included correspondence from the Building and Energy Subcommittee, offering insight into their recent discussions.

Jenna highlighted key documents for the meeting, particularly the "Draft Climate Element Policies 2-26-25 version," which would serve as the foundation for discussions and voting. Supporting materials included a summary of the CAG pre-meeting survey results, a compilation of survey feedback with goal-specific responses, and a comment tracker featuring staff-reviewed feedback categorizations. She also pointed out two documents related to Building and Energy policies, which were not the focus of the current meeting but were available for review.

- Question: One member inquired about providing packets to guests in attendance.
 - Response: *The extra copies can be distributed.*

Jenna then provided an overview of the group's progress in the Climate Chapter decision-making process, indicating that the group was nearing the finalization of its recommendations. She acknowledged the significant work completed over the past year, including information review, policy brainstorming, and discussions. With the group now in the final policy recommendation phase, Jenna emphasized that once recommendations were finalized at the next meeting, the CAG's role would be complete, and their recommendations would advance to the Planning Commission and County Council.

Jenna briefly introduced the possibility of an optional subcommittee to draft a letter to County Council and the Planning Commission that would accompany the policy recommendations, noting that more details would be provided later in the meeting.

Discuss Climate Element Goals and Policies (Part 1)

Sylvia began with an overview of the consensus-seeking process. She reminded participants that the goal was to review policies and determine whether CAG members could "live with" them, even if the policies weren't their first choice. Full consensus would carry significant weight with the Planning Commission and County Council, and the group was encouraged to move as many policies forward as possible with unanimous support.

Jenna shared how the project team incorporated feedback from the survey. The team first analyzed the ratings, recognizing that there were too many items marked as "3" or "4" to discuss each suggestion individually. To manage this, they categorized feedback into three main buckets: Quick Check, Discuss, and Subcommittee.

- **Quick Check:** These items had broad support, with most concerns related to minor wording changes rather than fundamental issues with the policy itself. Some suggestions from CAG members were incorporated, and the items in this category will be presented for a quick approval vote.
- **Discuss:** These items had substantive concerns or suggested changes. Minor edits were made for clarity, but final revisions will be shaped by the group's discussion.
- **Subcommittee:** These policies generally had support but contained numerous suggested edits. Rather than revising them in real-time, a small group would work offline to refine the language before bringing them back for a final review and quick check at the March meeting.

Policies and goals that do not receive full consensus at the February and March CAG meetings will be documented and shared with the Planning Commission and County Council, along with a summary of the differing perspectives within the CAG. This will help ensure that policies without unanimous agreement will still contribute to Council and the Planning Commission's decision-making process.

Review of "Quick Check" Goals and Policies Discussion

Sylvia introduced the process for reviewing and voting on the Quick Check goals and policies.

Before voting and discussion began, several members raised questions about Goal 1, specifically the language around "net zero greenhouse gas emissions" and its alignment with I-2066, the initiative that requires access to natural gas.

Jenna explained she would talk more about the net zero greenhouse gas emissions language when the group got to the Building & Energy policy portion of the agenda, but generally noted the county needs to navigate the pathway between both laws (HB1181 and I-2066) to be consistent with both of them.

Members had the following additional questions and comments:

- One member said they were concerned that Goal 1 might not align with language in the Building and Energy goals and policies.
 - *Response: This can be flagged for further discussion at the next meeting.*
- A member recommended Goal 1 could explicitly say "as close as possible to net zero" to align with a previous Building & Energy subcommittee discussion.
- Another member said they believed Goal 1 should reflect the passage of I-2066, as it changed the legal context.
- A few members had clarifying questions about voting for the Quick Check goals and policies and if a "yes" vote meant that you support all of these goals and policies with no further changes
 - *Response: A "yes" vote means that you support all of these goals and policies. If there is a goal or policy you do not support, mention it when you are called on to vote.*
- One member said they felt overwhelmed and hadn't realized they needed to review each policy before the meeting. Another member similarly felt overwhelmed, and while they had thoroughly prepared for the meeting, they did not realize how the voting was going to be organized, and they were only able to quickly review their comments through Goal 13 in the meeting itself.
 - *Response: The structure of today's meeting was designed to focus discussion on the most contentious policies while streamlining those that had already received strong support through the survey sent before the meeting.*
- One member said they expected to move through policies one at a time instead of voting on a large batch at once.
 - *Response: There is a need to focus discussion where it is most needed, but we can also check in with individuals offline.*
- One member shared feedback on staff categorizing comments about plastics as being out of scope for the project. They noted that plastics are primarily made from fossil fuels and contribute significantly to GHG, suggesting that reducing plastic use should be included in climate policies.
- One member said they would vote "yes" to ensure the policies moved forward, even though they had additional feedback on them and felt like there was pressure to vote.
- A member said they had concerns about the wording of Goal 1, Policy 2, and Goal 13, Policies 1 and 2.
 - *Response: The project team will propose an approach regarding these concerns before the next meeting.*

- Two members raised concerns about the language “consult with Tribes” in Goal 1 Policy 1 and asked why the County could not pay Tribal members when they are in consulting or advising roles?
 - *Response: The County is following Washington state and federal guidance on collaboration with Tribes. Tribes are sovereign nations and formally collaborate through nation to nation relationships. Local governments are responsible for inviting Tribes into comprehensive planning processes, but it is entirely up to each Tribe on whether or not and how they wish to engage on local government projects. The word “consult” here is a formal term and is not meant to refer to the hiring of a paid consultant. (Post meeting note: here is a link to state guidance for local governments regarding consultation with Tribes on comprehensive planning: <https://www.commerce.wa.gov/growth-management/tribal-planning/>)*

Voting on Quick Check Policies

After reviewing the quick check policies, Sylvia asked the group to vote on moving them forward as a block.

The group reached consensus on the following goals and policies: Goals 4, 9, 10, 17, 18, 20, 22, 29, 32, 33 (and the policies within each), Goal 1 Policy 1, Goal 13, and Goal 13 Policy 3.

The following policies did not receive unanimous support:

- Goal 1 and Goal 1 Policy 2: Concerns were raised about wording and alignment with existing policies and laws. This goal and policy will require next steps before the next meeting.
- Goal 13, Policies 1 and 2: Some members expressed reservations about the language and its implications. These policies will require next steps before the next meeting.
- Goals 2, 15, 21, and 30 – One member expressed concern about these goals through the survey and was interested in more time to review them before voting. The project team will follow-up with them to discuss them before the next meeting.

Members who did not support these goals and policies moving forward as written without additional information, questions answered, and/or discussion:

- Noelle, Justin, Nelson, Nick, Janet, Terry, and Gabriela had concerns about Goal 1.
- Jessica had concerns about Goal 1 Policy 2.
- Monica had concerns about Goal 13, Policies 1 and 2, and Jessica had concerns about Goal 13 Policy 1.
- Sunrise had concerns about Goals 2, 15, 21, and 30.

Review of “Discuss” Bucket Goals and Policies

Following review of the Quick Check goals and policies, the group shifted its focus to the Discuss bucket—policies that had more substantive concerns and required further deliberation. These policies were identified based on survey feedback where members provided suggested edits, flagged issues, or expressed reservations that prevented full consensus.

Sylvia emphasized that this discussion aimed to refine policies and goals and reach consensus on as many as possible. She encouraged members to share their concerns and propose modifications that could bring the group closer to agreement. The guiding questions for this section were:

- If you can't live with a goal or policy, what specific aspects are problematic?
- What modifications could get us all to 'yes'?

The group began by discussing Goal 19 Policies 1, 2, 4, 5, 10, 11, 12, and 14. The policies were shared onscreen during the group's discussion, which is captured below.

Goal 19: Equitably reduce vehicle trips and miles within the county through changes to land use, transportation infrastructure (transit, walking, bicycling, rolling), and commuting options/modes.

Members had the following questions and comments:

- A member asked what "equitably" means in this goal here and asked if it was being used broadly.
 - *Response: The county interprets the use of "equitably" in this goal to mean that equity needs to be thought about when implementing this goal and the policies within it. The term is being used broadly and is asking that when this goal is implemented, decision makers and county staff should think about who would benefit and be harmed, and how to minimize any harm.*
- One member expressed a desire to see the word "sustainable" in this goal.
- One member suggested adding "zoning" before "commuting".
 - *Response: The term "land use" includes zoning.*
- A member asked how "equitably" will be measured
- One member sought clarity on the word "equitably," asking whether it meant everyone would reduce VMT equally or if the burden would be distributed differently.
 - *Response: "Equitably" means considering who benefits and who is harmed in policy implementation.*
- A member suggested including "sustainably" alongside "equitably" to make the policy's intent clearer.
- Another member expressed concern that reducing VMT could disproportionately burden lower-income car owners.

Members suggested revising the goal from "equitable" to "viewed through an equity lens." The policy was amended as follows:

Reduce vehicle trips and miles viewed through an equity lens within the county through changes to land use, transportation infrastructure (transit, walking, bicycling, rolling), and commuting options/modes.

Goal 19, Policy 1: Implement policies under this goal to: prioritize benefits to overburdened communities and community members experiencing barriers to transportation, and improve air quality, especially where it is worst in the unincorporated county. Anti-displacement strategies must be designed and implemented in coordination with policies under this goal to discourage displacement of vulnerable population groups due to gentrification.

Transportation system improvements should: improve safety and accessibility for people experiencing transportation barriers such as being hard of hearing, visually impaired, use a wheelchair, or speak a language other than English; and advance environmental justice through engagement with overburdened community members in transportation system projects.

Members had the following questions and comments:

- There was concern about how this policy will help Unincorporated Clark County achieve emissions reduction goals.
 - *Response: This policy states that all policies within Goal 19 need to consider equity.*
- A member commented that they are supportive of “anti-displacement” as a concept, but that they have concerns about certain types of anti-displacement measures. They suggested to add the following language: “anti-displacement strategies must prioritize public private partnerships and discourage policies that increase the price of housing for all.” Multiple CAG members opposed this addition.

The group decided to keep the policy language as-is for the purpose of the vote tonight.

Goal 19, Policy 2: Encourage mixed land use in the unincorporated Vancouver urban growth area to locate many activities near each other and locate mixed land use near public transit stops.

Members had the following questions and comments:

- A member stated that they would like the word “encourage” be changed to “advocate.”
 - *Response: The word “encourage” means that the county would allow what is stated in the policy. If it is changed to “advocate,” it would change the meaning of the policy.*
- There was a request for a glossary to define terms used in the policies. The member requesting this wording change to “advocate” stated that they were okay keeping the wording as-is. (Post meeting note: A [glossary of terms](#) was developed earlier in the process and includes a definition of encourage.)
- A member asked if it should be Clark County instead of Vancouver listed in the policy.
 - *Response: The county confirmed that Vancouver is the appropriate term in this case.*

The group decided to keep the policy language as-is.

Goal 19, Policy 4: Plan for including 15-minute communities in the unincorporated Vancouver urban growth area through amenity-rich activity centers and corridors and dense, mixed-use urban development in which daily needs can be met within a 15-minute walk, ride, roll, or transit ride.

Members had the following questions and comments:

- A member expressed that they felt that “15-minute communities” is restrictive.
 - *Response: The county reminded the group that this policy originally stated “30-minute communities” but then was amended when the Environmental Justice Coalition (EJC) suggested shortening it to 15-minutes because the community members they spoke with were interested in services being convenient, and 30-minutes didn’t seem convenient enough. They preferred a 15- or 20-minute target.*

- There was a suggestion to amend the language to “30 minute or less” or “15 minute or less.”
- There was a suggestion to change “plan” to “develop”
 - *Response: The county does not do development, only planning. This is the appropriate term for what the county can do.*
- One member said they were concerned about the placement of housing along corridors with high levels of particulate matter (PM 2.5) and how that impacts air quality. They also expressed interest in seeing more ownership opportunities within 15-minute communities and suggested including language to reflect that
- Staff noted, in case helpful for CAG consideration that this policy can be accomplished in multiple ways. In some places in the county, it might be more about improving connections to key destinations, where housing and commercial areas are nearby, but it may feel unsafe to travel without a car. Staff have checked the current unincorporated Vancouver UGA zoning maps, which, if you use a tool like Google Maps, indicates most housing is within a 20-minute bicycle ride of at least one commercial area.
- A few members expressed support for the way the policy is currently written, stating that it focuses creating communities in which people do not have to drive everywhere and that 15-minute communities should be encouraged.
- A member stated the need for flexibility when developing land.
- A member stated that without developers we don’t have a community.
- A member asked whether 15-minute cities were still a policy priority.
- A member supported 15-minute communities but cautioned against making them a strict requirement, arguing that it could deter developers who largely look at the feasibility of projects regardless of how close it is to amenities.
 - *Response: Staff noted that the policy says to plan for these communities, not to mandate them universally in every part of the unincorporated urban area, in case helpful for CAG consideration.*
- There was a suggestion to add “including” after “Plan for.”
- Another member expressed that boundaries in urban planning were necessary for long-term sustainability.
- One member asked how public transit would be incorporated to ensure accessibility.
 - *Response: Transit integration is a key component and would need to be a part of implementing this policy.*
- A member expressed that the wording should remain as-is as it is what the EJC suggested.
- A member stated that the City of Vancouver stopped using the term “15-minute communities” and would follow-up with documentation. Another member disagreed.
- A member commented on how 15-minutes for one person might be different for another, if, for instance, it was about how far someone travels walking in that amount of time. They wondered about capturing the concept of community hubs and moving away from a time metric.

Due to the duration of the discussion on this policy, Sylvia facilitated the group to move to other policy topics, with staff to make a plan on next steps for this policy before bringing it back at the next meeting for full group consideration.

Goal 19, Policy 5: Reduce or remove parking requirements where appropriate to support more dense, mixed land use.

Members had the following questions and comments:

- A member asked for more context for this policy.
 - *Response: Most types of development have some sort of parking requirements tied to them. A policy like this could mean that the county could look at areas where there are parking requirements and then see if or how it makes sense to reduce or remove those requirements, which could result in revising county code.*
- A member asked if this policy would have impacts to parking in mixed use developments and if the intent is to increase or decrease parking.
 - *Response: The intent is to decrease parking.*
- One member stated that this policy feels unclear and vague and that more detail would be helpful.
- A few members expressed concerns that there is not enough parking in new developments and that sometimes people living in those developments are not allowed to park on nearby streets.
- There was a suggestion to add language around engaging community members to support reductions in parking (such as providing street parking).
 - *Response: Engagement language could be added to the policy's wording.*
- There was a comment that reducing parking requirements allows the developer to decide what parking is needed. The goal should be to make housing more affordable, and adding parking can make developments more expensive. Another member agreed with this comment.
- A member commented that extensive community engagement on parking for every development proposal is challenging for developers, and they would prefer to see community engagement by the county on any proposed changes, so developers can then focus on meeting the requirements.

Staff to follow-up with those raising concerns before the next meeting and bring back the policy for full group consideration.

Goal 19, Policy 8: Improve existing county roads to reduce miles traveled by vehicles (vehicle miles traveled, or VMT) and emissions per mile traveled, including maintenance and repair, and incorporating advanced technologies that improve efficiency and safety, etc. Road improvement projects should prioritize reducing emissions in areas of the county with the worst air quality. (Note: in the meeting, Goal 19, Policy 9 was said, but the comment was in reference to Goal 19, Policy 8).

Members had the following questions and comments:

- A member expressed concern about “complete streets” and asked if that meant that closing vehicle travel lanes.

The group voted on the policy language as-is without changing the wording.

Goal 19, Policy 10 and 11:

Policy 10: Support equitable, safe, reliable and convenient transit services throughout Clark County, including increasing frequency, improving reliability, and expanding routes to align with key destinations and land use planning policies (including zoning and development) that encourage transit use. Facilitate expansion of community transportation options in rural Clark County and explore alternatives such as regional rail on new and existing rail lines. Transit service improvements should include robust language access where information is accurately available in multiple languages to serve the county's linguistically diverse population.

Policy 11: The county shall support new and improved freight and passenger rail transportation services between Clark County and the Portland metropolitan area and along the I-5 corridor from Vancouver, BC to Eugene, Oregon, prioritizing electric rail when possible.

Members had the following questions and comments about Policy 11:

- The county began by explaining that this policy already exists in the Transportation chapter of the Comprehensive Plan, plus a few minor edits the group made to it several months ago, and suggests not editing the policy extensively as it is already adopted policy.
- A member expressed concern that freight is mentioned here and that community members are concerned about improving freight rail transportation. They stressed the need for explicitly addressing freight concerns in rail planning.
- There was a suggestion to describe word freight here, whether by updating it to read “sustainable freight” and/or “limit hazardous freight.”
 - *Response: The county does not have authority on what is transported by freight.*
- There was a suggestion to edit the language to read “utilizing freight tracks for improved passenger rail” instead of “improved freight and passenger rail.”
- There was a suggestion to amend the language to read “support utilizing freight tracks for improving/increasing passenger rail.”
 - *Response: Staff would need to internally discuss this suggestion. However, the county would be ok removing “freight and” from the policy.*
- A member raised concerns about prioritizing electric rail and wanted to clarify its role.
- There was a suggestion to add “prioritizing electric rail when possible” to Policy 10 and removing Policy 11 from the list.
- One member wanted to understand the implications of removing Policy 11 before agreeing to merge it with Policy 10.
 - *Response: Policy 11 already exists in the Transportation chapter of the Comprehensive Plan, so its removal from the Climate Chapter would not have any impact.*
- One member asked how public transit would be incorporated to ensure accessibility.
 - *Response: Transit integration is a key component and will need to be included in implementation plans of policies.*

The group ultimately decided to remove Policy 11 as it is already included in the Transportation chapter of the Comprehensive Plan and agreed to add “prioritizing electric rail when possible” to Policy 10.

Goal 19, Policy 12: Expand the interconnected network of safe, accessible pedestrian sidewalks, bicycle facilities, trails, and multiuse paths by integrating active transportation into transportation engineering and planning, implementing complete streets, and updating and implementing standards for sidewalk and bicycle facilities to align with best practices.

Network expansion should be strategic and prioritize engagement with overburdened communities in project priorities and design; improve air quality and physical health in overburdened communities; connect key destinations to help reduce vehicle miles traveled; and create pathways so that active commuters and recreational users do not need to cross traffic.

Improved connections can also serve as potential evacuation routes in emergencies. Evacuation routes should be planned in collaboration with Clark Regional Emergency Services Agency (CRESA) and community partners and prioritize where new evacuation routes are most needed.

Members had the following questions and comments:

- A member suggested explicitly allowing for corner cafes, general stores, and other small businesses at intersections and adding language about them between the second and third paragraph.
 - *Response: This policy is about how we connect networks. Talking about commercial options in this policy does not seem like the right place to put that type of edit. Things like cafes would be covered in Goal 19, Policy 4 about 15-minute communities or other policies about locating things near each other. The county also currently has neighborhood commercial zoning, which allows small scale commercial at key intersections in the unincorporated urban area.*

The group decided to keep the policy language as-is.

Goal 19, Policy 14: Provide subsidies to purchase, and/or programs to share, micromobility and active transportation devices and safety equipment. Micromobility devices include but are not limited to: e-bikes, scooters, and wheelchairs. Prioritize benefits for overburdened communities and households experiencing transportation barriers.

The group decided to keep the policy language as-is.

Voting on “Discuss” Goals and Policies

After reviewing Goal 19, Sylvia called for a vote. The remaining goals and policies in the “Discuss” bucket will be discussed at the March meeting.

The group reached consensus on the following goals and policies as amended during discussion: Goal 19 and Goal 19 Policies 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 (agreed to delete from the list), 12, 13, 14, 15, and 16.

Goal 19 Policies 1, 4, and 5 were not voted on during the meeting and would be revisited at the next meeting, since the group did not seem to be in complete agreement on them yet.

End of Meeting Disagreement

During the meeting, one CAG member made a comment to another CAG member that they later apologized for making. A third CAG member highlighted the inappropriateness of the comment shortly after it was made. It was a tense moment towards the end of the meeting. During a break shortly after the exchange, the two CAG members involved, with support of a third CAG member, talked about the situation, with one apologizing and the other accepting their apology. They shared this resolution with the rest of the group.

Sylvia reflected with the group on how challenging some of the discussions have been and as the group moves forward to keep in mind being soft on people and hard on issues.

Next Steps

Jenna reviewed the next steps. She discussed how some policies, including Goal 1 and parts of Goal 13, would be revisited by staff before the next meeting. The project team would need to huddle to confirm how to address the items that weren't resolved yet in the meeting and would confirm those details with the group in advance of the next meeting. Sylvia thanked the group for their engagement, recognizing that the discussion had been challenging but productive. They emphasized that while disagreements remained, the meeting had highlighted the importance of continued collaboration before final recommendations were made.

Buildings & Energy Subcommittee Update

Jenna provided an update on the Building and Energy subcommittee, which included Monica, Noelle, Nelson, and Don. The group met twice since the last CAG meeting and focused on revising policies to meet the GHG goals of House Bill 1181 while adhering to Initiative 2066, which states that a county shall not in any way prohibit, penalize, or discourage the use of gas in any building.

Key revisions included reframing energy goals, adding education-related policies, and removing language that specified exact fuel sources. Several policies were dropped, including an electrification goal and one aiming to reduce dependence on fossil fuels, as they directly conflicted with Initiative 2066. The updated policies, along with a comparison between the old and new versions, were included in the meeting materials and a survey will be sent out for CAG members to weigh in on their level of support before the next meeting, with responses due by March 13.

Members had the following questions:

- One member asked if the revised policies would be available to the public or if they were just for the group until the next meeting.
 - *Response: The policies are posted on the CAG webpage and available to members of the public.*

Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions Reduction Targets

During the meeting, Jenna explained that the Buildings and Energy survey will also include a question about GHG reduction targets, noting that House Bill 1181 and the associated Department of Commerce guidance mandate local governments align with the state's goal of net

zero emissions by 2050, with interim targets to ensure progress. While the CAG won't set these targets, their feedback will be shared with the County Council to help inform their decision.

Members had the following questions and comments:

- One member asked if the survey would be presented in a similar format, with the final GHG emission reduction target being determined by the option that received the most votes, or if individual answers would be shared.
 - *Response: We are not asking for consensus on the targets. Instead, we will collect feedback and share it with the Council for consideration.*
- A member asked if the net zero goal would be impacted by I-2066.
 - *Response: We will double-check with legal counsel, but based on our current understanding and our need to meet both HB1181 and I-2066 requirements, the net zero language works as because 1) it is fuel neutral, and 2) it does not require absolute zero emissions reduction; it provides wiggle room for emissions that cannot be reduced to be sequestered or offset if necessary.*
- One member asked if Jenna would reach out to people by email regarding subcommittee participation.
 - *Response: We will ask people to volunteer for the subcommittee by email and provide a summary of each subcommittee's purpose.*
- One member provided context regarding the lawsuit against I-2066, noting that King County and the City of Seattle are challenging the constitutionality of the initiative. They mentioned that a hearing on the case is expected in late March, which could be followed by potential appeals, meaning there is still a long while until there will be more certainty on this matter.
 - *Response: Sylvia acknowledged Don's mention of I-2066 and noted that the outcome remains uncertain. She encouraged patience as the process moves forward and thanked everyone for their contributions.*

Public Comment

Sylvia opened the public comment period where one member of the public requested to share their thoughts.

Member of the public: "My name is Carmen de Leon. I don't know if this gets broadcast or not, but I asked Monica how far the things you all are voting on reach. I don't know if it's just Clark County or statewide.

I would like to see a statewide ban on deforestation. I know that and I have it written down—some legacy organizations are cutting down all the trees even though they're not supposed to. Who cares? If you all have any influence over the whole state or with the legislature, we should be like Sweden and become the first state with no clear-cutting allowed.

Bamboo and hemp grow and yield the same amount of product in a much shorter growing time. So, it's completely feasible to switch to hemp and bamboo if we want to grow and manufacture products.

When it comes to housing, there's no mention of fireproof housing. I've seen homes go up, and within a year, they're already falling apart because they're built cheaply. It's just cheap construction, over and over. My kid rented an apartment, and it's already leaking through the roof—and it's not even five years old!

There should be a standard in building codes. Don't just buy cheap, made-in-China materials—buy non-flammable hemp bricks and make them mandatory for housing.

As I was reading through this, I saw there are a ton of things I didn't even sign up for. But what stands out to me is that there are 400,000 people in Clark County, and just a handful of 20 people are involved in this process.

I think it should be a top priority to get the public more involved. If you're only doing this for 20 people, and whoever happens to view it online, what's the point? The only way to win this is by getting the public on your side. I shouldn't be the only one here."

Sylvia reminded the public that there is a form on Clark County's website to submit comments at any time during the project at <https://clark.wa.gov/community-planning/comp-plan-comments> and comments can be emailed to comp.plan@clark.wa.gov.

Wrap-up and Next Steps

Sylvia reviewed the next steps and noted the following action items for the project team and CAG members:

- Jenna to coordinate the subcommittee(s) to review goals and policies needing more discussion before the next CAG meeting.
- The project team will send a survey to CAG members to show their level of support for the Buildings and Energy goals and policies before the March CAG meeting. Survey responses will be due on March 13.
- Jenna to coordinate CAG letter writing subcommittee.

Jenna expanded on having at least one subcommittee to discuss and refine certain policies that were previously flagged as going to subcommittee, or that perhaps need more discussion after today's meeting, and a separate letter-writing subcommittee to draft a message for the Planning Commission and County Council from the CAG. Details on all subcommittees will be shared via email.

Additionally, Sylvia shared information about the next meeting, which will be held on Wednesday, March 26, 5:30-8:30 pm. This meeting will focus on identifying agreements, addressing remaining concerns, and seeking consensus on the remaining goals and policies.

Adjourn

Sylvia ended the meeting and thanked everyone for their participation and contributions.

The meeting adjourned at 8:38 pm PT.

Appendix A: Zoom Chat

Below is a verbatim, unedited transcript of the Zoom webinar chat.

17:33:28 From Maria Verano, Kearns & West, she/her to Everyone:

For Zoom technical issues, email mverano@kearnswest.com

17:34:34 From Gabriela Ewing to Hosts and panelists:

Hello, I'm driving, sorry I'm off camera

17:37:43 From Maria Verano, Kearns & West, she/her to Everyone:

Email comments to comp.plan@clark.wa.gov or submit a comment online:
<https://clark.wa.gov/community-planning/comp-plan-comments>

17:38:06 From Maria Verano, Kearns & West, she/her to Everyone:

CAG members, please check your chat settings and choose "Everyone" from the drop down before sending messages.

17:44:08 From Maria Verano, Kearns & West, she/her to Everyone:

All meeting materials can be found on the CAG website for this meeting:
<https://clark.wa.gov/community-planning/community-advisory-group>

17:53:56 From Nicole Metildi, Kearns & West (she/her) to Everyone:

Comment tracker: <https://clark.wa.gov/media/document/194176>

17:57:34 From Maria Verano, Kearns & West, she/her to Everyone:

Please click here to access the goals and policies:
<https://clark.wa.gov/media/document/194171>

18:06:06 From Maria Verano, Kearns & West, she/her to Everyone:

Please click here to access the goals and policies:
<https://clark.wa.gov/media/document/194171>

18:18:44 From Gabriela Ewing to Hosts and panelists:

Could they talk closer to the mic?

18:34:25 From Alana LG Tudela to Everyone:

I'm good with moving forward.

18:38:23 From Nicole Metildi, Kearns & West (she/her) to Everyone:

We will come back at 6:42

19:03:01 From Gabriela Ewing to Everyone:

yes

19:14:15 From Gabriela Ewing to Everyone:

Thank you Jenna for the explanation

19:27:44 From Gabriela Ewing to Everyone:

yes

19:42:10 From Gabriela Ewing to Everyone:

Yes

19:42:16 From Gabriela Ewing to Everyone:

thank you

20:11:49 From Nicole Metildi, Kearns & West (she/her) to Everyone:

We will come back at 8:15

20:14:53 From Don Steinke to Hosts and panelists:

If I remember correctly, removing parking minimums is a legislative priority of the Sierra Club.

20:18:40 From Alana LG Tudela to Everyone:

I'm so glad to hear that!!

20:18:55 From Gabriela Ewing to Everyone:

thank you Nick

20:28:12 From Nicole Metildi, Kearns & West (she/her) to Everyone:

Side-by-side Comparison of Jan. 2025 and Feb. 2025 Revised Building & Energy Policies:
<https://clark.wa.gov/media/document/194506>

Draft Building & Energy Policies – 2/26/25 Version:
<https://clark.wa.gov/media/document/194501>

20:31:36 From Maria Verano, Kearns & West, she/her to Everyone:

CAG webpage: <https://clark.wa.gov/community-planning/community-advisory-group>

Project webpage: clark.wa.gov/community-planning/climate-change-planning

Project contact: Jenna Kay, jenna.kay@clark.wa.gov