



CLARK COUNTY WASHINGTON

[clark.wa.gov](http://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 #12

April 7, 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](http://www.climate.wa.gov).

## Attendees

**Community Advisory Group members:** Andrea Smiley, Ann Foster, Brent Marsden, Councilor Michelle Belkot, Dave Rowe, Don Steinke, Gabriel Mendoza Ewing, Janet Kenefsky, Justin Wood, Monica Zazueta, Nelson Holmberg, Nick Massie, Noelle Lovern, Sunrise O'Mahoney

**County staff:** Chris Cook, Jenna Kay, Harrison Husting, 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: 8

## Welcome

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

- Seek consensus to finalize a recommendation on Climate Element goals and policies.
- Share and approve the letter from CAG to County Council and Planning Commission.
- Review next steps in Climate Project process.

Sylvia reviewed the CAG vision statement and reaffirmed the group's charge to help the county implement House Bill 1181 and support 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 #11 summary. There were no suggested corrections, and the summary was accepted.

## Project Updates

Jenna Kay began by reviewing the meeting materials provided to participants, noting that participants had also received an email beforehand with public and CAG member comments. She highlighted several key documents, which she described as supporting the major discussion for the day. She also pointed to a draft letter from the CAG to the County Council and Planning Commission, supporting materials summarizing the results from a pre-meeting surveys sent to CAG members between meetings, additional feedback CAG members shared outside of the surveys, a comment tracker, and an updated glossary that now includes a few new terms.

Jenna then provided updates on the broader comprehensive planning process, informing the group that the County Council would be considering a revised resolution related to land use alternatives to be studied in the draft Environmental Impact Statement. That meeting was scheduled for the following day, April 8.

Next, Jenna gave an update on Initiative 2066 (I-2066), which limits counties from discouraging or prohibiting natural gas use. She explained that a King County Superior Court judge recently ruled the initiative unconstitutional, and the case is expected to move to the State Supreme Court. The

county is monitoring the situation and following Department of Commerce guidance, but no changes to the draft Climate Element goals and policies are being made at this time.

She closed by confirming that the Climate Element policies up for the CAG's vote had not changed since last month and are consistent with both House Bill 1181 and I-2066. She also noted a small revision to the first goal in the climate policy list, adding the phrase "in accordance with all applicable laws" in response to a legal review and participant questions.

## Recommendations for Climate Element Goals and Policies

Sylvia shared how the group would work through and seek consensus on the remaining goals and policies. She reminded everyone that there are 155 total goals and policies (156 if you include the policy the group agreed to remove from the list at the last meeting), and that the group had already reached consensus on 50 of them (51 of them if you include agreement on the one policy the group agreed to remove from the list). The focus for this meeting will be to review the remaining goals and policies and determine which ones CAG members can support as-is and which ones they cannot.

Since the last meeting, small groups of CAG members met in subcommittees to revise goals and policies that the group identified at the last meeting as needing further subcommittee discussion. Additionally, the project team met with CAG members one-on-one to discuss specific goals and policies they had concerns about. Many changes were made to the goals and policies in response to those conversations.

Sylvia the plan for the meeting: The group will discuss and then vote on six specific goals and policies that had received significant concern or changes since the last meeting referred to as the "Discuss" goals and policies. After that, the CAG will move into a "quick check" of the remaining goals and policies, which generally had low levels of concern from most CAG members.

Sylvia closed by explaining that goals and policies with full consensus would go forward as CAG recommendations to the Planning Commission. For goals and policies without full consensus, staff would note these goals and policies and the concerns members who voted "no" had raised through pre-meeting surveys or CAG meetings. Members can also email additional context about why they voted "no" to Jenna.

- One member asked whether the Planning Commission makes final decisions on the goals and policies or simply advises the County Council.
  - *Response: Jenna clarified that the Planning Commission makes a recommendation to the County Council, but the County Council is the body that makes the final decision on what gets approved.*

### Review of "Discuss" Goals and Policies

Below is a summary of the CAG's discussion of and voting on the "discuss" goals and policies.

**Goal 5, Policy 2:** Take steps to preserve existing agriculture by prioritizing the infrastructure that keeps the existing agriculture operationally sustainable, including education, research, and technology, such as cold storage facilities, development of programs that support food transportation, and showcasing education, research and technology resources.

Jenna introduced Goal 5, Policy 2 by explaining that it had been revised by the Health and Wellbeing Subcommittee since the last meeting and was a policy that received significant discussion earlier in the CAG's process. The policy focuses on preserving existing agriculture through supportive infrastructure and practices. Members of the subcommittee included: Ann, Jessica, and Monica.

Members had the following questions and comments:

- One member questioned whether the Agricultural Commission was still referenced in the policies.
  - *Response: The Agricultural Commission is referenced in Goal 6, Policy 4, which is located on page nine of the document.*
- A member commented that the policy focuses only on preserving existing agriculture and lacks mention of support for new farmers.
  - *Response: New farmers are mentioned in Goal 6, Policy 4, particularly in reference to land access. Additional support is also implied in Goal 6, Policy 5, which covers programs, research, and technical assistance. While new farmers may not be explicitly named in Goal 5, Policy 2, they would be included in the policy.*
- Another member expressed strong support for the current language, noting that it includes a broad focus on environmental and social resilience, conservation, climate adaptation, innovation, and alignment with global sustainability goals.

A vote was called on Goal 5, Policy 2, and it received unanimous approval from the group.

### **Goal 11, Policy 1:**

Implementation of policies under this goal must:

- Be designed in collaboration with community partners such as community-based organizations, Tribes, and partner agencies;
- Include culturally inclusive and accessible engagement;

Policies under this goal should:

- Link with other efforts, such as those related to job creation, workforce development, conservation, and education initiatives; and
- Include opportunities for homeowners, landowners, and renters to create habitat dispersal corridors and connectivity.

Jenna introduced Goal 11, Policy 1 by explaining that it was included for discussion due to feedback from several CAG members on different aspects of the policy. The edits made were primarily focused on wordsmithing, and the intention was to ensure that the language accurately reflected the group's input.

Members had the following comments:

- One member expressed gratitude for the changes, thanking the team for their work on the revisions.

The vote for Goal 11, Policy 1 was called, and the policy received unanimous support from all present.

### **Goal 11, Policy 2:**

Develop and adopt a tree plan and implementing ordinance to maximize planting and protection of trees in alignment with best practices and relevant state and federal laws.

The tree plan must:

- Establish community-wide tree canopy cover targets and tree equity goals.
- Include strategies to address tree loss from development and other site altering activities, extreme heat, drought, wildfire, extreme precipitation and storms, diseases, pathogens, pests, and other tree stressors.
- Include sustainable strategies to build climate resilience, carbon sequestration, ecosystem and watershed health.
- Prioritize benefits to overburdened communities.
- Align with tree requirements in the county's Phase 1 Municipal Stormwater Permit and all applicable laws and regulations, including but not limited to: RCW 76.09 Forest Practices Act and associated rules and RCW 36.70A Growth Management Act and associated rules.

Jenna introduced Goal 11, Policy 2, explaining that it had undergone extensive revisions following significant feedback from the pre-meeting survey. The policy now includes more specific details in a newly added section, which outlines key county commitments related to tree planning. Jenna emphasized that the goal was to avoid getting too specific due to the complexities surrounding tree management, given the various laws involved and the potential future work required by the county if the policy is approved. Additionally, she noted that a statement about setting tree targets and equity goals, originally found in Goal 11, Policy 4, was moved to this policy as it was deemed a better fit.

Members had the following questions and comments:

- One member expressed concern that the proposed revisions have made the policy too detailed. They were particularly concerned about the use of "must" instead of "should," which seems too rigid.
  - *Response: If this were to be approved, county staff would develop a plan with the community. The list of what to include in a tree plan does not contain details on how the plan would be implemented or how those listed items would be addressed. These details would need to be figured out after the Comprehensive Plan is adopted.*
- A member questioned whether breaking down the policy into several parts was necessary, suggesting that prioritizing benefits to overburdened communities and aligning tree requirements with existing laws might cover most of the bullet points, negating the need for additional specification.
- Another member supported using the word "must," emphasizing the critical importance of tree preservation, especially in light of climate change, and argued that it needed to be a stronger mandate.
- A member raised a question about the grammatical issue with the phrase "tree plan" and "implementing ordinance," asking if it should be worded differently.

- Another member expressed concern over the word "must," suggesting that it could lead to negative press and recommended finding a softer word that would still encourage accountability.
- A member commented that the term "must" fits in this policy as it contains the phrase "implementing ordinance," as ordinances must be implemented. They also commented that the balance between housing production and tree preservation should also be considered in the future ordinance, suggesting that "balancing tree canopy and housing production" be added to the list of what a tree plan must include.
  - *Response: A balance between tree canopy and housing production is covered in the Comprehensive Plan in separate goals and policies about housing production. The county is already required to plan for adequate housing under the Growth Management Act. Decisions about issues like tree removal related to housing and other development goals would be addressed in the future, if the policy is approved, through the creation of the tree plan and implementing ordinance.*
- One member questioned whether this policy would require developers to submit a tree plan for each new development.
  - *Response: This policy is for the county to develop a countywide tree plan; it does not create any specific requirements for developers. Any specifics applicable to future development would need to be figured out in the future plan and implementing ordinance.*
- A member suggested removing the distinction between urban and rural areas in the policy, as it might cause issues with wildfire management and insurance concerns, especially in areas affected by the rural-urban interface.
- Another member supported removing the urban and rural distinction and recommended a county-wide approach instead.
- One member expressed concerns about the impacts of tree policies on insurance premiums, sharing personal experience with increased costs due to tree preservation requirements.
- A member suggested adjusting the language to remove "in urban and rural areas" to be more inclusive and address concerns about rural and urban differences.
- Another member supported keeping the word "must," but was open to suggestions on how to improve the phrasing to ensure it wasn't seen as overly authoritative.

A vote was called on Goal 11, Policy 2 with the modification to remove the distinction between urban and rural areas. The policy, amended as follows, passed with unanimous approval from the group:

Develop and adopt a tree plan and implementing ordinance to maximize planting and protection of trees in alignment with best practices and relevant state and federal laws.

The tree plan must:

- Establish community-wide tree canopy cover targets and tree equity goals.
- Include strategies to address tree loss from development and other site altering activities, extreme heat, drought, wildfire, extreme precipitation and storms, diseases, pathogens, pests, and other tree stressors.

- Include sustainable strategies to build climate resilience, carbon sequestration, ecosystem and watershed health.
- Prioritize benefits to overburdened communities.
- Align with tree requirements in the county's Phase 1 Municipal Stormwater Permit and all applicable laws and regulations, including but not limited to: RCW 76.09 Forest Practices Act and associated rules and RCW 36.70A Growth Management Act and associated rules.

### **Goal 16, Policy 3:**

Protect groundwater and surface water as a resource for drinking water, commerce, recreation and for wildlife under changing climate conditions by:

- Implementing a comprehensive and forward-looking stormwater management program to reduce stormwater run-off and erosion, promote stormwater infiltration, and reduce sources of non-point pollution under a variety of climate scenarios. (See additional Stormwater policies in Comprehensive Plan Chapter 3 and Chapter 6.)
- Implementing and enforcing critical areas regulations and the Shoreline Master Program in accordance with state laws. (See additional critical areas and Shoreline Master Program policies in Comprehensive Plan Chapters 3 and 13, respectively).
- Educating and incentivizing climate-resilient nature-scaping, water conservation, and rainwater capture county-wide.
- Utilizing climate resilient, nature-based techniques for streambank and watershed restoration on county land.
- Strategically acquiring lands for conservation and restoration.

Jenna explained that the policy had been revised following significant feedback from the pre-meeting survey and follow-up discussions with CAG members who provided feedback. The policy had been placed in the "discuss" category to ensure the group was comfortable with the revisions before moving forward to a vote. Jenna clarified that the previous policy wording seemed outdated after staff reviewed it again based on CAG member feedback, so staff scratched most of the previous language and reworked the policy. She also noted that water and stormwater issues intersect other laws and county requirements, such as the county's stormwater permit with the Department of Ecology.

Members had the following questions and comments:

- One member commented that the greatest threat to salmon is not just water quality but whether there is enough water in streams during critical months.
  - *Response: Stream flow is indeed critical for salmon survival, especially during those summer months when stream flows are often reduced. While the county cannot control water rights (that falls under the state's authority), the county can work to manage stormwater and promote infiltration to help maintain stream flow and reduce runoff.*
- Another member noted that temperature and sediment were the main concerns in water quality management when they served on the Clark County Clean Water Commission 25 years ago.

- *Response: In regards to temperature, the county can plant trees and vegetation along streams. Regarding sediment, the county's stormwater program is supposed to help reduce erosion.*
- A member questioned if stream flow concerns were adequately addressed in the policy, mentioning that erosion impacts stream flow by widening and narrowing creeks.
  - *Response: The policy includes nature-based techniques for stream bank restoration and other efforts (that would be covered in the county's stormwater policies and programs) to mitigate erosion's impact on stream flow.*
- One member suggested adding back the language about minimizing impervious surfaces created by development.
- Another member noted that the county's stormwater manual already directs developers to do low impact development (LID) and they had concerns with adding language about minimizing impervious surface because it was already happening. However, most of the impervious surface relates to roads and sidewalks, which they have concerns about reducing in width due to safety issues. The language could focus on minimizing the impact of development rather than cutting back on infrastructure.
- One member commented that impervious surfaces in developments, especially parking lots, could be minimized by adding green areas or using permeable surfaces. They also mentioned that LID techniques like pervious asphalt and concrete are already being used in some places, and acknowledged can have their own challenges.
- Another member questioned the need to include "minimizing impervious areas" in the policy if the county is already practicing these strategies. They also expressed concerns about the potential redundancy of including such language.
- A member expressed concern over the vagueness of the term "minimizing impervious surfaces," asking for clarity on how it would be defined or applied in practice.
- Another member suggested that while the wording may seem redundant, it could still be important to include for clarity, as it emphasizes minimizing the impact of impervious surfaces in developments.
- Another member asked if the county needs to follow the comprehensive plan policies for its own operations and how the county might incentivize the use of non-toxic pesticides and fertilizers, especially within government departments. They questioned how this would be implemented within county operations.
  - *Response: Staff confirmed the county does need to follow the policies in the comprehensive plan for its own operations. A broader term like "promote" may be helpful for this policy, as it could include incentivizing action in the community and could include promoting action such as through modeling by example with county operations.*
- A member expressed their concerns about prioritizing the use of non-toxic pesticides and fertilizers, recognizing the complexities of funding sources and opposing chemicals in general but unsure of practical application.
- A member asked how the proposed policy aligns with existing state and local permitting processes, such as the County Stormwater Permit and NPDES.
  - *Response: The County Stormwater Permit, which is approved by the Washington Department of Ecology, already directs permittees to use the County Stormwater Manual.*



- One member questioned the relevance of repeating certain educational components in the policy if they are already included in the NPDES.
- Another member noted that while some language overlaps with NPDES requirements, this policy section is intended to reflect and reinforce countywide priorities, especially for nature-based solutions and stormwater management practices.
- A member asked why only some items were explicitly listed in the policy text and not others that are also already covered in existing plans and regulations.
  - *Response: Some items, like point source pollution, are already regulated under the NPDES stormwater permit, which the county implements, and thus may not need restating in the policy text. The intention was to highlight more specific items that had a specific climate resilience connection, which may not be emphasized in existing permits and programs like the NPDES.*
- A member asked for clarification on the phrase “continue to...” in the policy, questioning which practices or programs it refers to.

A vote was called on the revised language for Goal 16, Policy 3, which included adding back the language about promoting and prioritizing non-toxic pesticides and fertilizers, as well as minimizing the amount of impervious area created by developments. The vote passed with all members in favor with the policy being amended as follows:

Protect groundwater and surface water as a resource for drinking water, commerce, recreation and for wildlife under changing climate conditions by:

- Implementing a comprehensive and forward-looking stormwater management program to reduce stormwater run-off and erosion, promote stormwater infiltration, and reduce sources of non-point pollution under a variety of climate scenarios. (See additional Stormwater policies in Comprehensive Plan Chapter 3 and Chapter 6.)
- Implementing and enforcing critical areas regulations and the Shoreline Master Program in accordance with state laws. (See additional critical areas and Shoreline Master Program policies in Comprehensive Plan Chapters 3 and 13, respectively).
- Promoting and prioritizing the use of non-toxic pesticides and fertilizers.
- Minimizing the amount of impervious area created by developments.
- Educating and incentivizing climate-resilient nature-scaping, water conservation, and rainwater capture county-wide.
- Utilizing climate resilient, nature-based techniques for streambank and watershed restoration on county land.
- Strategically acquiring lands for conservation and restoration.

**Goal 19, Policy 4:** Provide connected and accessible communities in the unincorporated Vancouver urban growth area where a significant majority of daily needs can be met within a convenient and safe walk, ride, roll, or transit ride by planning for amenity-rich activity centers and corridors, areas of dense, mixed-use urban development, neighborhood-scale commercial opportunities, and safe connections between destinations.

Jenna introduced Goal 19, Policy 4 by explaining that it had undergone significant discussion during the previous meeting, which led to the formation of a subcommittee to continue working on it offline. The revised language presented to the group was the result of this subcommittee’s work, though some members of the subcommittee were still debating certain aspects of the

proposed wording. The members of the subcommittee included Monica, Noelle, Justin, and Don, had discussed various changes and refinements.

Members had the following questions and comments:

- One member questioned how the county would provide these communities, suggesting that "provide" may not be accurate. They recommended changing the language to "plan for" instead.
- A member supported the idea of 15-minute communities, noting that although there were differences in how far one could travel in 15 minutes by bike versus walking, the 15-minute concept remained important.
- A member noted that if "15-minute communities" was used, the term should be more clearly defined and not open to broad interpretation.
- A member shared how the subcommittee modified this policy to take into account different viewpoints about "15-minute communities." The subcommittee came to a compromise and replaced "15-minute communities" with the phrase "significant majority," which reflects a commitment to meeting higher standards, such as 80% or more of community needs.
- A member mentioned that they were part of the City of Vancouver's planning efforts and that the 15-minute neighborhood concept was actively being used, particularly with the goal of minimizing car usage and enhancing public transportation.
- A member shared that while the City of Vancouver is not currently using the term "15-minute communities," the concept had been discussed in a past meeting. They expressed support for planning that increases accessibility to essential services in urban areas, noting that applying this model of "15-minute communities" would be challenging in more remote or rural areas.
- Another member clarified that although the City of Vancouver supports the ideas behind connected, accessible neighborhoods, they no longer use the term "15-minute communities."
- Another member proposed including both the term "15-minute communities" and the concept of "connected and accessible neighborhoods" within the policy, possibly using quotes to signal that the former term was a popular nickname for the concept. However, the group decided to not include "15-minute communities" in the policy language.

A vote was called on the revised language for Goal 19, Policy 4, which included changing the wording from "provide" to "plan for" to better reflect the county's role. The vote passed with a consensus after the language was amended to the following:

Plan for connected and accessible communities in the unincorporated Vancouver urban growth area where a significant majority of daily needs can be met within a convenient and safe walk, ride, roll, or transit ride by planning for amenity-rich activity centers and corridors, areas of dense, mixed-use urban development, neighborhood-scale commercial opportunities, and safe connections between destinations.

**Goal 23:** Encourage holistic development within the unincorporated urban growth area and away from areas that are prone to climate-related hazards such as flooding and wildfire.

Jenna introduced Goal 23, explaining that it had been placed on the “discuss” list due to some comments made previously regarding the term “holistic.” The goal had generally received support, but there were concerns about the term’s meaning and whether it required a more clear definition. Sylvia asked the group for any additional comments or suggestions on the wording before proceeding to a vote.

Members had the following questions and comments:

- One member questioned the use of the term “holistic,” noting that it is often associated with child development when used in the phrase “holistic development,” which doesn’t seem relevant in this context.
- A member suggested replacing “holistic” with “comprehensive,” believing it better suited the goal of sustainable development.
- Another member agreed that “holistic” was a problematic term and proposed using “comprehensive and resilient” as alternatives.
- A member commented that the term “regenerative” could work well alongside “resilient.”
- One member stated that using “resilient” would align better with the goal’s focus on climate-related hazards like flooding and wildfire.
- Another member emphasized the need to focus on sustainable development practices and community planning rather than growth, suggesting that “resilient” should remain as the core term.
- A member agreed with the sentiment that “resilient” was preferable, noting that it offered flexibility in climate change planning.
- Another member also supported the use of “resilient” over “regenerative,” expressing concerns about public understanding and the potential cost impacts on housing.

A vote was called to approve the revised language with “holistic” replaced by “resilient.” The goals received “yes” votes from all CAG members except one “no” vote from Monica Zazueta. The language of the revised goal is as follows:

Encourage resilient development within the unincorporated urban growth area and away from areas that are prone to climate-related hazards such as flooding and wildfire.

### **Quick Check Vote**

Sylvia began the “quick check” voting portion of the meeting after a break. She explained that the group would vote on the Quick Check goals and policies labeled with a “Q” in the “Draft Climate Element Policies – 3/26/25 Version” PDF. These goals and policies were all marked in blue and had either received strong support in the pre-meeting surveys or had been updated based on feedback gathered through the surveys or one-on-one meetings between the project team and CAG members. The purpose of this segment was to vote on the policies as a block, with members only needing to identify specific goals and policies they did not support.

Sylvia emphasized that this was not a discussion but a chance to formally register support or concern. Policies that receive one or more “no” votes will be noted for the record. CAG members can send Jenna an email with additional comments on why they voted “no” by April 14.

All policies were approved by unanimous vote, except for the following goals, which received one or more “no” votes:

**Goal 5 and Goal 6:**

- **Goal 5:** Promote holistic and resilient local food economies.
- **Goal 6:** Promote holistic, regenerative, and sustainable agriculture and landscaping community-wide that provides high quality food while reducing greenhouse gas emissions and improving resilience to changing environmental conditions

The following CAG members voted no on goals 5 and 6 and cited the following reasoning:

- Noelle: Objected to the use of the word “holistic.”
- Brent: Opposed the goal language only, not the associated policies. Objected to the use of the word “holistic.”
- Nick: Opposed the goal language only, not the associated policies. Objected to the use of the word “holistic.”

**Goal 24:** Promote energy efficient buildings.

- Sunrise voted “no.”

Additionally, Sunrise requested that all Building and Energy policies be re-evaluated if Initiative 2066 is repealed. Jenna stated that the county will seek guidance from the Department of Commerce on how to proceed based on the timing of, and outcome from, when the Washington state Supreme Court makes a decision on I-2066.

Sylvia then announced the results of the quick check vote, highlighting a significant milestone: The group had reached consensus on nearly 100 “quick check” goals and policies. The three policies that did not receive full consensus were Goal 5, Goal 6, and Goal 24.

Jenna requested that anyone who wanted to elaborate on their “no” vote submit a brief explanation via email by April 14. These statements would serve as the basis for the explanations provided in the formal packet shared with the Planning Commission. Jenna followed up with a broader summary of the group’s overall progress, noting that of the 155 goals and policies reviewed throughout the process, consensus had been reached on 151. Only four policies remained without full agreement, underscoring the thoughtful collaboration and dedication of the group.

## **Discuss CAG Letter to County Council and Planning Commission**

Sylvia introduced the next agenda item, which was a review of the draft letter from the CAG to the County Council and Planning Commission. The purpose of this discussion is to approve the letter.

Jenna then explained that the letter had been drafted by a subcommittee of CAG members and that it was included in the meeting materials. The subcommittee included: Jessica, Don, Monica, and Ann.

Members had the following questions and comments:

- One member said they read the letter when it was first sent out and fully supported it, calling it a great letter.
- A member questioned whether everyone could support the opening phrase “we strongly urge you,” pointing out that not all members agreed with every policy.
- A member commented that they interpreted the letter as applying to the policies that the CAG reached consensus on.
- Another member expressed concern about potential confusion the phrasing “we strongly urge you” may cause if members later in the process advocated against the CAG’s recommendation for the item they voted no on, for example.
- A member shared that after initially agreeing with the language in the letter, they now had reservations due to concerns about limiting their ability to voice disagreement or concerns about specific goals and policies in other venues.
- A member suggested adding language like “on the policies we came to consensus on” to clarify what the group was urging support for.
- Another member said the letter should not imply full agreement on everything and stressed the importance of being mindful of the CAG process when speaking to the County Council and Planning Commission
- One member emphasized the importance of unity and the value of consensus, while also acknowledging everyone’s right to hold and express individual views.
- A member voiced appreciation for the collaborative experience and affirmed the importance of being able to speak freely even after consensus was reached.
- Another member stressed the hard work and dedication behind the letter and supported the inclusion of consensus-based language to make the letter clearer.
- A member online echoed the sentiment that the group should strongly urge adoption of policies they reached consensus on, noting the remarkable level of agreement achieved.
- One member said that they did not see a need to change the wording in the letter but that he had voted “no” on something but felt the letter accurately reflected the consensus-based process, not unanimous agreement.
- Another member emphasized that there’s no need to clarify which goals and policies the CAG did and did not reach unanimous consensus on.
- Another member agreed, saying they had reservations about two goals and policies but supported the letter as written because the group reached consensus on the majority of the goals and policies.
- A member commented that they initially interpreted the letter differently but felt the second sentence already clarified the consensus-based process.
- One member said that although there were a few goals and policies without full consensus, the letter reflected the overall process accurately. They added they were fine with the wording either way.
- A member reflected on the emotional significance of the group’s work and expressed pride in what was accomplished, noting that even partial implementation of the recommendations would be a big win for future generations.
- Another member suggested adding the word “consensus” before “recommendations” in the letter to add clarity.

- One member responded that adding “consensus” would be redundant because the sentence already includes that word.

The group approved moving the letter forward to the County Council and Planning Commission as written, noting that it reflects recommendations reached by the consensus-based process.

## CAG Wrap-up

Jenna provided an update on the next steps following the completion of the group's work. She acknowledged the team's efforts over the past year, including developing a vision, brainstorming, debating ideas, and finalizing a draft list of climate goals and policies. After today's meeting, the CAG's work is concluded. Moving forward, any continued participation by CAG members in the Comprehensive Plan process would be as individual members of the public.

Jenna outlined the adoption process, highlighting that county staff will now work on packaging the goals and policies into a draft climate chapter for the Comprehensive Plan, which will go through internal reviews, legal checks, and copy edits. The draft will then be presented to the Planning Commission, who will make a recommendation to the County Council. The County Council will ultimately vote on the Climate Element as part of the Comprehensive Plan.

Jenna also mentioned upcoming opportunities for individuals to stay involved, including signing up for project notifications to stay informed on meetings and hearings. A joint hearing with the Planning Commission and County Council is tentatively scheduled for November, which is when formal public testimony will be taken. She emphasized that staff can answer procedural questions if CAG members or members of the public have them but cannot provide advice on advocacy.

Members had the following questions and comments:

- One member asked for clarification on whether the County Council would see the original version of the policies as recommended by the CAG if the Planning Commission votes to modify them.
  - *Response: If the Planning Commission recommends a modification to the proposal, the Planning Commissions' recommendation on the proposal is presented to the County Council. However, the County Council also receives all relevant supporting documentation. This includes the original materials, the CAG's recommendations, the work of the advisory group, the work of the Environmental Justice Coalition, etc. Providing this comprehensive information ensures the Council understands what was initially proposed and what modifications are being recommended—enabling an informed final decision.*
- A member raised a concern about overwhelming the County Council with too much paperwork and emphasized the importance of presenting a clear and focused summary. She suggested that the final presentation should clearly distinguish between what the CAG had agreed upon and the modifications or suggestions made by others, like the Planning Commission. Her goal was to avoid inundating the Council with excessive documents and to ensure that they understood the core recommendations of the CAG and the key differences, making the decision-making process more streamlined.

- *Response: Staff will work hard to present the materials in an organized and digestible format. While the volume of information is substantial due to the large scope of the project and the many comments collected, all project-related materials must be sent to the Planning Commission and County Council for their consideration.*
- Another member asked for clarification about the voting process, specifically whether the vote would focus on the individual goals and policies or the entire Comprehensive Plan.
  - *Response: The vote will be on the full Comprehensive Plan, which includes the new Climate Element.*

## Public Comment

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

Jude Waite, member of the public: " Thank you all for your great work. I would like to first make a couple of comments on Goals 5 and 6. Sustainable development and sustainable agriculture are scientifically demonstrated over decades, and while there may not be perfect agreement on them, they are terms that you can look up, study, and define in your glossary. However, I noticed that the glossary is missing the terms 'sustainable,' 'resilient,' and 'consensus,' which I would recommend adding.

I'm Jude Waite with the Farm and Food Justice Network, and I also served on the Environmental Justice Coalition, so none of this is unfamiliar to me. I would like to comment on Goal 16, Policy 3, which addresses water use. One of the significant applications of water use is irrigation, particularly in agriculture. However, agriculture is not just subsumed under the term 'commerce,' as much of food growing, gardening, and even lawns receive irrigation. I would appreciate it if you could consider including those specific areas.

As a watershed scientist, I also want to note that we are not doing enough to encourage permeability and address impervious surfaces. We might want to consider including a general hydrology lesson, which could be exemplified by a presentation that one of the Friends of Clark County Board members gave at a recent Water Forum.

Lastly, I would like to comment on Goal 19, Policy 4. The change from 'provide for' to 'plan for' is appreciated, but I would prefer 'provide for.' There are many places in the urban growth area where we could retrofit, redesign, or remove barriers to accessibility. Some places make it difficult to cross the street, and we end up having to drive or walk around, which is a challenge for some of us. While the goal is focused on future development, I believe there are things we could address and provide for in the near future, rather than only focusing on future development. That's all I have to say."

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](mailto: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:

- Members who voted “no” and want to share more about their reasoning need to email Jenna by April 14.
- Staff to finalize the CAG letter to County Council and Planning Commission.
- Staff to notify the CAG when final letter, meeting notes, and the copy of CAG agreed-upon policies are posted to webpage.
- Staff to move CAG recommendations forward into adoption process.

Jenna went on to explain that the next major task would be completing the climate chapter and preparing it for the Planning Commission and County Council. With that, she transitioned into asking for any parting thoughts.

County staff, consultants, and CAG members shared the following comments:

Sylvia expressed deep gratitude to the committee members for their dedication and collaborative spirit, highlighting how meaningful it was to work together throughout the process. She reflected on how the group courageously addressed difficult topics, commended their passion and commitment, and celebrated the strong relationships built.

Oliver Orjiako emphasized that the committee truly embodied the goal of shared planning, noting that this was the kind of authentic engagement he encourages within his own team. Oliver extended special thanks to Jenna, the staff, and the consultants, acknowledging their vital contributions. He concluded with appreciation for the journey they shared and hope for future collaboration.

A CAG member expressed appreciation for Jude’s suggestion to use the terms “plan” and “provide,” acknowledging it as a thoughtful contribution and something they could advocate for in the future, even if it didn’t change their current stance.

A CAG member shared a personal invitation to visit the Lake Oswego trolley they work on, highlighting efforts to convert it to battery power and advocating for expanded passenger rail options in Clark County using existing rail infrastructure.

Another CAG member shared concerns raised during a recent Planning Commission meeting, specifically about receiving information at the last minute and the lack of upcoming public hearings. They asked for clarification about opportunities for public input before the fall hearing. In response, the County clarified that the only formal hearing will be on the Comprehensive Plan as a whole, with earlier Planning Commission and County Council work sessions dedicated to reviewing the CAG’s recommendations. Public comment will be accepted at the final hearing before a vote.



Chris Cook added that written comments are strongly encouraged from members of the public, as they offer more space for thoughtful input and are part of the public record. They noted that oral comments at hearings are currently limited to three minutes and could be shortened further depending on the number of speakers, making written feedback a more effective way to share detailed opinions.

## Adjourn

Jenna expressed her gratitude to the group, acknowledging that they had no way of knowing how the process would unfold. She mentioned that they were unsure how well the group would work together or if they would listen to each other, given the challenges often seen on complex and contentious topics. She thanked the group for their efforts over the past year, noting how much they had learned from everyone and how much they appreciated being part of the journey.

The meeting adjourned at 8:42 pm PT.

## Appendix A: Zoom Chat

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

17:35:46 From Maria Verano, Kearns & West, she/her to Everyone:

For Zoom technical issues, email [mverano@kearnswest.com](mailto:mverano@kearnswest.com)

17:36:04 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.

17:41:07 From Maria Verano, Kearns & West, she/her to Everyone:

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

17:44:39 From Maria Verano, Kearns & West, she/her to Everyone:

The goals/policies can be found at the following link:  
<https://clark.wa.gov/media/document/196211>

18:00:21 From Maria Verano, Kearns & West, she/her to Everyone:

The goals/policies can be found at the following link:  
<https://clark.wa.gov/media/document/196211>

19:44:17 From Maria Verano, Kearns & West, she/her to Everyone:

The goals/policies can be found at the following link:  
<https://clark.wa.gov/media/document/196211>

19:47:34 From Janet Kenefsky to Hosts and panelists:

issues with my mic. going to reboot. I'm a yes on all

19:58:23 From Nicole Metildi, Kearns & West (she/her) to Everyone:

Link to letter: <https://clark.wa.gov/media/document/196216>

19:58:49 From Nicole Metildi, Kearns & West (she/her) to Everyone:

From Janet Kenefsky to all panelists 07:47 PM

issues with my mic. going to reboot. I'm a yes on all

20:33:37 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](https://clark.wa.gov/community-planning/climate-change-planning)

Project contact: Jenna Kay, [jenna.kay@clark.wa.gov](mailto:jenna.kay@clark.wa.gov)