



Minutes of Public Hearing

Joint Hearing of the Clark County Council and Planning Commission

2025 Comprehensive Plan Update

Thursday, January 8, 2026, 6:30 P.M.

6th Floor Hearing Room, Public Service Center, 1300 Franklin Street, Vancouver, WA

CALL TO ORDER

Planning Commission Rules of Procedure

JOHNSON: Okay. Ladies and gentlemen, I'd like to call this meeting to order for Thursday, January 8th, the joint hearing with the Clark County Council and the Planning Commission. My name is Karl Johnson and I'm 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 then make a final determination.

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

County staff will first present, then Planning Commission can ask questions. Next, we'll invite the applicant to speak if there is one, and 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 via the sign-up sheets in the back of the room.

During public testimony you will have three minutes to speak, and the remarks should be directed to the Planning Commission only. Please do not repeat testimony that has already been provided.

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

For both the 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 and/or a second to a motion, please state your name for the court reporter.

Do any members of the Planning Commission have any conflicts of interest tonight?

MONTGOMERY: Yes, I have two that I'd like to raise as potential conflicts. Alicia LeDuc Montgomery. The first is I'm self-employed as an attorney and currently have a client with a pending case against Clark County. It is a civil rights matter; it is not related in any way to growth management but wanted to flag it.

The second is that I previously represented the Friends of Clark County in a prior lawsuit against the Washington Department of Natural Resources regarding the Dabbler Timber Sale, that also did not involve Growth Management Act and that case has been over for several months now.

And so, neither of these matters involve Growth Management Act or comprehensive plan and I believe I can fairly hear the testimony tonight.

JOHNSON: Counselor, do you have anything to add to that or are we -- sorry to put you on the spot, Chris.

COOK: Chris Cook, Chief Civil Deputy Prosecuting Attorney, and I believe that the Commissioner's evaluation that her legal services had nothing to do with GMA, I think that's correct, and I think that that indicates that there is not a conflict of interest here.

JOHNSON: Okay. Thank you. And thank you for being upfront with that. So, Jeff, can we get a roll call, please.

ROLL CALL VOTE

HALBERT: ABSENT
BERGTHOLD: HERE
FADNESS: HERE
BARCA: HERE
HARROUN: HERE
MONTGOMERY: HERE
JOHNSON: HERE

Staff Present: Kathleen Otto, County Manager (Virtual); Oliver Orjiako, Community Planning Director; Christine Cook, Senior Deputy Prosecuting Attorney; Jose Alvarez Program Manager II; Amy Wooten, Planner III (Virtual); Harrison Husting, Planner II (Virtual); Jenna Kay, Planner III (Virtual); Michael Sallis, Planner III (Virtual); Garrett Ginter, GIS Coordinator (Virtual); Jeffrey Delapena, Program Assistant; Larisa Sidorov, Office Assistant II; and Cindy Holly, Court Reporter (Virtual).

GENERAL & NEW BUSINESS

A. Approval of Agenda for January 8, 2026

JOHNSON: I'd like to get an approval for the agenda for January 8, 2026, can I get a motion and a second, please.

BERGTHOLD: I'll make a **motion** to accept the agenda.

HARROUN: Commissioner Harroun, I accept it or **second** it.

JOHNSON: We have a motion and a second. Can we, Jeff, can we please get a roll call.

ROLL CALL VOTE

BERGTHOLD: AYE

FADNESS: AYE

BARCA: AYE

HARROUN: AYE

MONTGOMERY: AYE

JOHNSON: AYE

DELAPENA: 6/0.

B. Approval of Minutes for August 21, 2025

JOHNSON: Motion passes. I'll take a motion and a second for approval of minutes for August 21st, 2025.

BARCA: This is Ron Barca. I'd like to make a **motion** to approve the minutes for August 21st, 2025.

FADNESS: Kyle Fadness. **Second**.

JOHNSON: We have a motion and a second. Can I get a roll call please, Jeff.

ROLL CALL VOTE

BERGTHOLD: AYE

FADNESS: AYE

BARCA: Not being present I ABSTAIN

HARROUN: AYE

MONTGOMERY: ABSTAIN due to not attending

JOHNSON: AYE

DELAPENA: 4/0 with 2 abstentions.

JOHNSON: Motion passes. With that said, we are going to move to really quickly election of the Commission Chair and Vice Chair. So, can I start with a motion for a Chair for the 2026 year; is that correct?

CHAIR & VICE CHAIR ELECTIONS

FADNESS: This is Kyle Fadness. I make a **motion** to elect Karl Johnson as the Chair for the Planning Commission for 2026.

BARCA: Ron Barca. **Second.**

JOHNSON: We have a motion and a second. All those in favor say aye.

EVERYBODY: AYE

JOHNSON: All those opposed? That said, that passes. Next up can I get a motion for the Vice Chair and a second.

BERGTHOLD: This is Commissioner Bergthold. I'll make a **motion** to have Jack Harroun as Vice Chair.

BARCA: Ron Barca. I **second.**

JOHNSON: We have a motion and a second. All those in favor aye.

EVERYBODY: AYE

JOHNSON: All those opposed? Hearing none, we have a Vice Chair.

Communications from the Public

JOHNSON: Moving on, well, before I do that, is there any communications, I hate having my back to the public because I'm looking at you from there, so I do know you're there behind me, is there any communications from the public of anything that is not, I repeat, not on the agenda tonight? If there is, you may approach the microphone that is not on the agenda.

DELAPENA: We do have one raised hand online. Caller, you've been sent a request to unmute. Please state your name for the record and go forward with your comment.

GOHEEN-ELBON: Thank you. I just got unmuted. Can you hear me?

DELAPENA: Yes, we can.

GOHEEN-ELBON: Thank you. My name is Kimberlee Goheen-Elbon and I'm a life citizen of Clark County, Washington USA.

Mostly what I have to say is not on the agenda at least that I could read, it was a little bit not very clear as to what the agenda was, but anyway, I want to mention a book called Sustainable by Tom DeWeese, capital D-e-W-e-e-s-e, that will tell you everything that's going on, this is to the public, to inform yourselves also about what's going on in our local government here.

Also, I'd like people to read the online newspaper for Clark County Today.

First of all, I'd like to mention that quite a few or a few days ago quite a few people mentioned that they want no building at the Philbrook Farm area, it's a hazard actually.

And I also want to say that Clark County opted into the Growth Management Act quite a few years ago, there are only one of a handful that are in Washington State that are doing this. I don't understand that, that you would find that the public is interested in any more growth.

In fact, that I've been for about the past year asking for a five year no growth overlay over all of Clark County so we can at least see how we can get melded into breaking our heritage of our family lives here and the huge impact in mental instabilities of other people coming here which I call overgrowth population pollution.

Our natural resources are depleting, and you guys know this, and we must stop it now. We've got to, you know, gather up and see what we're doing here with us homeboys, okay. So, you guys are, I don't know how long you've lived here, but we the people here in Clark County want no more growth for a while.

Also I'm going to mention that I live in La Center, Timmen's Landing I believe was passed through our City Council, it was pretty extraordinary, they knew that people were going to show up so I went out early in the mornings put up some signs and gathered 60 people that were concerned about putting a roundabout there on our road coming into town which is a very steep slope going in and out of town and developing there at Timmen's Landing where the people had voted it down many times for many decades.

The eagles soar over there, they have homes there, our deer, our rabbits, everybody, we don't want anything up there and we said so at a meeting back in last year, I believe it was in October or June maybe.

Anyway, we want to contest this and so I'm asking you folks to somehow look into this and get back to me especially as to what we can do about this because they had a five-day deadline to pass that and nobody knew it, the public did not know that there was a deadline and that's why the city passed it without when the people were all saying 60 people. We want you to at least hold off on this and put it aside. So could you folks find a way so that we don't develop --

JOHNSON: Ma'am, thank you, your time has expired.

GOHEEN-ELBON: -- and ruin our natural town there in La Center, Washington USA. Thank you.

JOHNSON: Thank you. Okay. Once, again, just a reminder, we're limited to a lot of people wanting to speak tonight and we'll have a three-minute timer on public testimony.

With that said, Jeff, I didn't get, I ran over the top of you before giving instructions, would you like to do that now. Thank you.

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 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.

JOHNSON: So, this is going to be difficult, Jeff. Will you just flag them to come up because I can't see them, I can only see you, so... Yeah, you guys will come up here to the, up here looking at us so you can comment to the Councilors and the --

DELAPENA: Please provide your first and last name for the court reporter, sorry.

MCCULLOCH: Yeah. My name is Steve McCulloch, I (inaudible) out in Ridgefield.

HOLLEY: I can't hear him.

MCCULLOCH: There was information posted online --

HOLLEY: Hello.

JOHNSON: Steve. Steve, excuse me. Steve, can you look at me over here. I'm over here, Steve. Look at me over here. This is kind of who you're speaking to here. So, thank you. Sorry. You just got to turn it on, and it will turn green. We have a court reporter so it's, yeah.

MCCULLOCH: What I'm also asking is there was information posted online which is informative, the maps that were online were so small it was difficult to see anything. If they could be put in a different format, if they could be --

JOHNSON: You're good.

MCCULLOCH: -- perhaps enlarged --

JOHNSON: Sure.

MCCULLOCH: -- so it could be legible, it would be very helpful so we could all ascertain exactly where the lines are being drawn.

JOHNSON: Absolutely. Yeah.

MCCULLOCH: I'm seeing heads nodding so I think most people agree with me. Thank you very much.

JOHNSON: Thanks, Steve. Thanks for coming. Okay. That said, I just want to make sure I make some introductions, and we have our Councilors here. For those of you that have not ever done this it's usually the Councilors or us up there independently, we rarely, if ever see each other except once about every six years when we're appointed.

And, by the way, I'll get to that in a minute, but Glen Yung, Michelle Belkot, Sue Marshall, Wil Fuentes, and I can't see yours, but it is Matt Little, see pretty good, so, but I want to thank you for coming, it's always good for you to hear, sometimes we don't know if we always hear what we hear.

And so, to that I'd like -- one thing you must know is we deliver information to the Councilors, they are the deciding vote. A lot of times people think it's us, but we're getting this information in and getting to them, this is the best way to do it, so...

So, that said, also tonight we have two new Councilors, Ron Barca, and help me out here, Alicia LeDuc Montgomery are brand-new Commissioners tonight as we finally get a full vote, we have one of them missing, so I just want to make sure we do that before we're doing that, so you're speaking to more than just the Planning Commission tonight.

Ma'am, go ahead. We're speaking to something that is not on the agenda.

DELEON: Not on the agenda. Okay. So that's my time. Okay. My name is Carmen Deleon, I go by Melo, and I did read this, and they want economic growth and things like that.

Just so you know that countries like Denmark and Norway have eliminated clear cutting so you can't clearcut the land anymore, but we have plenty of land that we can use that I know in Camas they want to grow stuff and do logging and I've said it a million times just do hemp because when you sell hemp bricks they can withstand 200-degree weather and not burn and the old houses used to give you 17 seconds if the house caught on fire to leave the house for safety, now the average house catches fire in 3 seconds.

So, when I say safety I mean it because you can actually sell, no place else in the world could they sell or use something that they guarantee you will never burn down because a hemp brick can withstand 2,000 degrees and still not burn.

So where else can you say, hey, we've got fireproof houses and buildings and it regrows like bamboo, you get three times the yield and the same amount of growth time in a year. So, you can get, you know, four times a yield in six months with hemp and with bamboo, so I'm just saying that.

And things that are disposable like toilet paper can be used with bamboo which is cheaper than clear cutting a bunch of beautiful pine trees. How much time do I have? Okay.

You guys want money, well, that's one thing in the way of keeping logging alive. Another one is tourism; we don't have that. And I've said it before that we have the most beautiful land in the country. I've lived in four other states, three other countries and this land is particularly blessed and beautiful and we should preserve it and make money off it instead of destroying the natural resources and digging things up and blowing things up, no, no, no.

Like I said, the Space Needle has no competition, Portland is dying out, everybody knows Portland is the meth capital of the West Coast and Vancouver take it down with you because we got so many junkies and they want tourism. Okay. Who wants to come see the junkie capital of Southwestern Washington? Nobody.

But who can say that they have a birds-eye view if they build a tram from the Expo Center to, what is it, Ridgefield and make money off the beauty of the land instead of destroying it.

So, I've said it before, instead of building light rail which is a billion-dollar waste, and I've seen it for myself that with The Vine, it's enough, it's appropriate for everybody, everybody loves The Vine, we do not need light rail, period.

We have the Amtrak two miles that way, there's a train station over there underused and from what I see miles and miles of unused train tracks, so we don't really need a light rail when we don't even use what we have.

I'm saying build tourism by building something, a tram that goes from Expo Center to La Center and you will have money coming in instead of just letting money waste out like they said. I was supposed to finish, but I just want to finish, money leaking to Portland, keep it here in Vancouver.

JOHNSON: Thank you, ma'am, for your comments.

HOLLEY: How do you spell your name?

JOHNSON: Is there any more comments for something that is not on the agenda? Go ahead, sir.

HOLLEY: Hello? Hello?

ESWARAPPA: Hi. Harsha Eswarappa, we live in the Camas urban growth area. And one thing that myself and my neighbors would like to learn more about, and it's I'm not sure on the agenda with the potential rezoning of my property and our neighbors to commercial from residential what does that mean for the folks who currently live there and bought their land as like a forever home, will they be allowed to remodel, renovate their house, add ADU's, when would the transition to commercial take place, just more details around that.

JOHNSON: Thank you. One of the things I can add to many of you tonight is that --

HOLLEY: Karl.

JOHNSON: Yes.

HOLLEY: I need people to spell their last name. I don't know who that was who just testified.

JOHNSON: Come back up and please spell your last name.

ESWARAPPA: Last name, E-s-w-a-r-a-p-p-a.

JOHNSON: Thank you. Sorry about that. Really quickly, a lot of these questions like that, I would really encourage you to take advantage of our staff, the staff here could really address some of those questions and help you understand the minutiae of things like that, so thank you. Jose, no, there are many, they can get you in the right direction, so thank you. Yes, go ahead, ma'am.

HALL: Hi. My name is Kathy Hall, H-a-l-l, and I just wanted to bring up the subject of the ADU's on properties. Currently they are allowed in the city or in the rural areas if there's an exception for like an elderly parent, I would like to see the county allow ADU's in situations where families nowadays because the housing costs are having their younger adult children living with them and it would be really nice to be able to put an ADU on acreage that you own with your home so that any family members can live in those. Thank you.

JOHNSON: Thank you for your comments, ma'am. Are there any more people that would like to come up that are speaking on something that's not on the agenda?

DELAPENA: I don't see any raised hands, but we do have someone online. Caller, we have sent you a request to unmute. Please unmute and speak your name for the court reporter and go ahead with your testimony.

TENKLEY: Sure. Thank you. My name is Reid TenKley. I'm just looking at the agenda, is this the time for public comments or is it later in the agenda?

JOHNSON: It's later in the agenda.

TENKLEY: Okay. I'll wait for that. Thank you.

JOHNSON: Thank you. Any more, Jeff?

DELAPENA: That's it for online.

JOHNSON: Okay. With that said --

GOHEEN-ELBON: Hello. Should I spell my last name, sir? Kimberlee Goheen-Elbon.

DELAPENA: Yes, go ahead.

GOHEEN-ELBON: Kimberlee is K-i-m-b-e-r-l-e-e. Goheen is G-o-h-e-e-n and Elbon is E-l-b-o-n, noble spelled backwards. Thank you. God bless.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEM

Preferred Land Use Alternative for the 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.

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

JOHNSON: Thank you for clarification. Okay. With that said, we can now move into, Jose, the Preferred Land Use Alternative for 2025-2045 Comprehensive Plan Update. Jose.

ORJIAKO. Yes. Good evening, Planning Commission Chair and members of the Planning Commission. I will also like to say good evening to Chair Marshall and Councilors. I know that the County Manager is online, Kathleen Otto, so good evening, Kathleen, and good evening, Ms. Chris Cook, our Chief Civil Deputy Prosecuting Attorney. Chris represents Community Planning on issues related to GMA.

This will be a joint presentation of I and Jose Alvarez, Jose is the Program Manager in Community Planning, and like I said, my name is Oliver Orjiako, O-r-j-i-a-k-o, Community Planning Director.

Before I proceed, I would like to just make a few remarks. I see some of my staff who are here in person and some that are online, I would like to sincerely thank them for the work they have done to date on the periodic update, this is a great team to work with. I also want to extend sincere thanks to our, both our internal and our external partners, I'm not going to name the partners or individuals, throughout this periodic plan update. Let's go to the next slide.

So, this is our presentation overview. I will start initially with some background, talk briefly about the connection between SEPA, State Environmental Policy Act, and the Growth Management Act, and then I will briefly talk about the selection of the Preferred Alternative.

This is a joint hearing process, so I'll speak a little bit about that and then talk about the next steps. Next slide, please.

Before I go through this slide let me, Jeff, go back to the previous slide on the background. For those that are new to the Planning Commission and Council, this is just where we are in the overall comprehensive planning process and then I will get into more specifics regarding the UGA expansion or identification or selection process and then speak briefly about the ag study. Let me focus on as part of the background on the connection between SEPA and Growth Management Act.

Before or because of the integration of SEPA and GMA, land use action such as comprehensive plan

update requires that before certain actions are taken, the lead agency must ensure that planning or decisions reflect environmental values and assessment of impacts prior to making informed decisions.

Clark County completed a scoping notice before we even contemplate doing the DEIS, the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, on three land use alternative that had been selected by the County Council and the Council will also complete or the County will also complete a Final Environmental Impact Statement on the preferred land use alternative before the Council makes the final decision, that is really the connection that as we are going through this process, the lead agency, in this case the County, is identifying and in coordination with the public when we did the scoping what are the issues and things that we should be concerned or study.

So, the Preferred Alternative which will also be selected by County Council will lead to the development of capital facilities plan in terms of the process. We will also prepare a capital facilities financial plan and also a directed transportation analysis. This will all require again with the selection of the preferred, it will require review and update of the Comprehensive Plan Policies and related development regulations. On the -- you can go to the next slide.

You have seen this before, but we try to repeat it often. The Planning Commission and Council and as well as the public have seen this chart and it is on our website, this is a high-level overview of the components of the periodic update process, and we studied this process with the project initiation.

You know, time flies, we started this process in early January of 2023 and to organize the complex process of updating the plan we started by dividing the essential element into four phases and each phase has distinctive tasks and activities that are planned to engage community members and key stakeholders in identifying issues, developing policy concepts and shaping the final recommendation plan that will be considered by the Council in June of this year.

And, you know, throughout this public process policymakers have been making decisions and providing direction to staff. Our local jurisdiction, in this case the Cities within the County, are also engaged in a similar process in parallel.

I'm not going to go into details on each phase because you've seen this several times, but I'm just going to highlight the key things we have completed. All the check marked areas or tasks have been completed, we are now in the review and refinement of the plan.

When we started checking or tried to shape the plan, the first thing we did was to prepare a checklist and that checklist is provided by the State Department of Commerce Growth Management Division. The County and the Cities are required to complete that checklist to ensure that any recent changes in the State legislature or legislation have or will be addressed in the update, policy and code changes.

Similarly, the population and employment forecast, the population allocation they lead to the question of how the 20-year growth going to be allocated and whether there is sufficient land to accommodate that growth within existing urban growth boundaries, and if not, should those current urban growth boundaries be modified, that is where you get into the shaping of the plan.

Now, review and refinement, you are looking at if we're expanding boundaries, we need to look at different options and come up with a Preferred Alternative to do the environmental and this is why also considering infrastructure as I mentioned, capital facilities needed to accommodate that growth and how much that will cost.

When you get into the adoption process you are really taking the preferred plan and updating your policies and code amendment through the legislative process where refinement can also be made for final adoption. As you can see on our final adoption, we have modified this schedule progress report or progress chart often.

You can see that the legislature by statute required Clark County and among other counties what we call 2025 adopters to adopt a plan by December 31st, but we have modified this a couple of times, this is the latest schedule that we are on, and I will repeat I would like us to stay on this schedule, any deviation I think we're already out of compliance if anybody were to challenge us.

The County has begun to look at the adoption process. The first thing on that column is Washington Department of Commerce 60-day review submittal, which means if we are going to meet this schedule, the County needs to submit for Commerce 60-day review submittal by the end of March this year. Let's go to the next slide.

So, this slide provides an overall decision that have been made to date. As I said earlier when we started this process as required in growth management you have to prepare a Public Participation Plan, how to engage with the community to provide you input, see what you are doing and participate through that process, that was the first thing that the County staff prepared and the Council approved that Public Participation Plan and the preliminary scope of work in a Resolution No. 2023-03-05, that was adopted March 31st, 2023.

The County also had a series of work sessions that the public participated in, and local jurisdiction planning partners also participated before the Council chose a 2045 population projection of 718,154 forecasted and that was adopted by Resolution 2023-05-03, adopted 5/2/2023. That population that the Council adopted represent a population growth rate of 1.4 percent annually over the 20-year planning horizon.

The Council also adopted by Resolution No. 2023-08-01, that was adopted on 8/8/2023, the 2045 employment projection of 269 jobs forecasted at the end of 2045.

Similarly with the population, choosing the population and employment, we engaged the Council and the community in the 2045 housing and employment allocation by growth, urban growth area. Several work sessions, several meetings, several hearings, the Council finally adopted by Resolution No. 2024-05-05, that was adopted 5/21/2024.

The selection of alternative to be studied in the DEIS, again several meetings, there were actually two resolution that related to this item, the first one was adopted January 23rd, 2025, and that is Resolution No. 2025-02-11 and the second one was modified or amended, that number is 2025-04-02, that was adopted 4/25/2025. All these directions provided us the guideline of the work that we have

done to date.

On the ag study, I'm not going to dwell on that, all I can say is that the conversation and accumulation of issues that were raised lead the Council to direct that we commence an Ag Land Study.

The County went through a procurement process, issued an RFP and Council approved the contract for ECONorthwest to conduct the study. The study was completed and presented to the Council at the November 12, 2025, work sessions. We have shared that report with the Planning Commission, at least a highlight of the report, it has been reviewed by the Agricultural Advisory Council or Commission that the Council appointed.

What I will add without going into detail about the ag study is that you can read it, we provided opportunity for the public to read that and provide comment, some of the comment that you have seen some related to the outcome of the ag study and some related just to individual site-specific requests depending on the property owners' interest, there is a staff report that provides you criteria for choosing a Preferred Alternative.

I'm not going to go through that staff report, I know I believe you have read that, so for the interest of time I won't go through that. There are a number of factors addressing the staff report that needs to be considered in developing a Preferred Alternative. In addition, you have all the issue papers and resolutions adopted by Council that I mentioned as part of the periodic plan update.

Before I turn this over to Jose, I want to also mention that or identify that you can go to our website, when I talk about public participation, our website lists all the outreach that we have done so far from going to NACCC, various neighborhood association, the business community, Vancouver Chamber of Commerce, Clark County Realtors, BIA, various neighborhood and some that I was not able to go to but my staff was able to and then our website is complete on the list of outreach that we have conducted to date.

Finally, before Jose takes over in going into detail on the Preferred Alternative, staff mailed out postcard notices, approximately 10,000 property owners on potential changes in land use zoning, so 10,000 received postcard identifying that there's likelihood that their property may change depending on where they are. So next slide.

So, with here I will, Jose will take it from here. Thank you. If you have questions I'm here to answer before Jose continues if you have questions for me.

ALVAREZ: Can you zoom in on that, Jeff, on the capacity issue. Can you go to the residential one. Okay. That's great.

So, my name is Jose Alvarez, I am the Land Use Program Manager, Community Planning. I wanted to just give some background framework for as Oliver mentioned the work we've been doing is based on some of the decisions that Council has made choosing population and we need to plan for that 20-year population growth.

What we begin with is what our existing capacity is and what this chart shows is the target for growth in terms of housing that we need to accommodate in the next 20 years. So, the -- you can see that Housing Target, the number at the bottom of the first column, 103,695 housing units is how many housing units we're needing to plan for over the 20 years of growth.

The Alternative 1 Housing Capacity is sort of our No Action if we didn't make any changes other than what the State's requiring for three jurisdictions to do, we have the capacity of about 99,000 housing units, so really, you know, looking to add capacity for about 4,000 housing units.

The other element that the State has required that we plan for housing at various income bands and we have a very large deficit of that type of housing, below 80 percent of the median income, and so a lot of the proposed changes are looking at upzoning property throughout the unincorporated area and in jurisdictions to try to reconcile and balance and have housing that could meet that income band targets.

So a lot of the decisions on -- we received a lot of site-specific requests for either expanding urban growth boundaries or changing zoning, so when we reviewed those requests they were sort of framed along those kind of two criteria, do we need the existing capacity and/or do we need that type of development, so if we received requests for upzoning or higher density we were more likely to support that.

And you can see here in the total for Alternative 2, that's showing about 142,000, that's 39,000 housing units over what we're required to have. We are limited by the population, the maximum growth, well, not, yes, population target of about 791,000, we're planning for 718,000, that 142,000 would put us well over that limit, that's State, set by the State, we have to plan for within the range of population that the Office of Financial Management provides us. So just for some context on that on the housing. Go to the next, the employment.

So similarly, you know, we're overall we're planning for about 88,000 jobs. The other thing that I would point out is that the jobs and housing we're trying to get a balance of new employment with the same number of households.

The household figure is higher because the State has a formula that they've put out that requires us to plan for a six-percent vacancy rate and they've also made a calculation for a deficiency of housing that we currently have, folks not being housed or the expensive housing where people are doubling up, so we are planning for more housing than just the growth.

So, there's people that are already here that are lacking sufficient housing, so that's the need for that excess beyond that 88,000.

Again, the job target that requires land overall is about 66,000, the job capacity in the baseline is about 61,000. In Alternative 2, that's about 69,000. So, again, to provide some context of the decisions that were made in some of the alternatives and getting into the preferred. All right. Let me -- okay.

The Preferred Alternative Table. So, what I'm going to go through is this Preferred Alternative Table,

but I'm going to show you that through the maps. So, for each one of these we'll show you the corresponding mapping if it's appropriate.

BARCA: Pardon me, Oliver, may I make a question here. What you showed with the different alternatives in that direction, is that going to reflect what you're proposing?

JOHNSON: Is your mic on, Mark, or I mean Ron?

BARCA: Sorry. Maybe I'm not close enough. Is what we saw going to be reflective of your proposal or was that the full alternative from the jurisdictions without any alterations?

ALVAREZ: This is the -- this is what was studied in the DEIS, so this is what we received from the jurisdictions, and we have not altered it, and, yes, that's correct.

BARCA: All right, thank you.

MONTGOMERY: And may I ask a follow-up question about the prior slides.

ALVAREZ: Sure.

MONTGOMERY: So just seeing that Alternative 1 has shortfalls in both, but then Alternative 2 at least on housing had an excess that was significantly larger than the shortfall numbers.

So, my question is, if Alternative 1 was selected, does the County have the authority under the GMA with the periodic monitoring to go make changes later to address like actual shortfall issues or is it locked in with no changes?

ALVAREZ: So, the Alternative 1 essentially since there aren't any changes it wouldn't meet the second criteria of providing sufficient or housing that meets the income bands. So that's really, even though it's very close to the capacity, the ratio of housing that's affordable is out of whack with what's required. Did that answer your question? Okay.

MONTGOMERY: Yes. Thank you.

ALVAREZ: Let me share. Okay. So essentially this is Alternative 1, the existing UGA with no boundary changes. So, this, the first item, I won't dwell on this.

For Alternative 2, we'll start this is, and I'm going to give sort of high-level overview since all of the jurisdictions will be coming up to testify and providing more detail, but I'll just give you a sort of high-level.

The proposal here from Battle Ground is expand to the west, remove this areas to the southwest from their urban growth area and add a little area to the north, so overall that's a net expansion of 157 acres.

For the Camas UGA, they're looking at expanding to include the Grove Field Airport and that's approximately 82 acres that would be added to their urban growth area.

In La Center, there's an expansion here at the Junction, the C-1, and then to the south and then across I-5 for light industrial and combined that's 121 acres.

So, in -- for both Battle Ground and Camas we're supportive of their, the jurisdictions actions. La Center, these areas are also designated agriculture based on the Agricultural Land Study and the capacity we don't see that that's something that could be supported at this point.

In Ridgefield, again this is a 240-acre expansion just west of I-5 for employment and mixed use. Again, because of the Ag Land Study and the capacity issues we are not supportive of this expansion.

COOK: It's not just the Ag Land Study, is it, Jose? These are currently designated for agriculture.

ALVAREZ: Correct. Yes.

COOK: Okay. Thank you.

ALVAREZ: And Washougal there's no expansion request; they will talk about some changes in zoning from some of the subarea plans that they've done. Again, there's no change in Woodland. And, again, we are supportive of the Washougal and no change for Woodland.

In Yacolt there are two requests, the areas for residential we're not supportive of. The areas for light industrial to the south we are supportive. The property just to the east is currently designated for employment.

The study is looking to purchase that for park land, so given that we are supportive of the expansion for employment to replace that, and that's, let's see, the expansion for employment is about 14 acres and the residential is about 76 acres, so 90 acres overall.

In the Vancouver UGA in Alternative 2, we looked at expanding roughly 350 acres just south of Duluth, 219th along I-5 and 10th for employment lands, and then east of 50th on the backside of WSU, again for business park, this would be a total of 350 acres. Given the excess capacity that the City of Vancouver has in employment and the public comments that we received it made more sense to not expand in these areas and just since the employment it's still within the Vancouver UGA with that excess capacity we are proposing not to expand in those two areas.

JOHNSON: Sorry, Jose, that was I? I'm trying to follow.

ALVAREZ: Sorry. That's 2.I.

JOHNSON: 2.I. Okay. Thank you.

ALVAREZ: Sorry.

JOHNSON: That's okay.

ALVAREZ: So, 2.J -- let's see. Okay. So, the areas highlighted in black are the existing multi-family zones in the unincorporated Vancouver UGA, these are currently designated from R-12 to R-43, OR-15 to OR-43.

What we're proposing is a bulk sort of upzoning of that multi-family to now be from, in the DEIS it was staying with five different zones, R-24 to R-50, we are working with a consultant that's suggesting that we consolidate those five zones into three, so that would be R-24 through R-50, R-24, R-36 and R-50, and in the handout here it references those three zones, but in the maps it still has the zoning that was used in the DEIS. Go ahead, Kyle.

FADNESS: Can I just ask, I know we discussed this during a work session, does the proposed zoning here, does that exclusively exclude single-family housing as we had discussed during that work session?

ALVAREZ: That's the proposal, yes. And so, the areas in red is, 2.K, which we are proposing for an increase sort of upzoning of areas adjacent to existing multi-family for the most part that are currently primarily single-family zoned, and in some cases, there was, yes, that are all single-family zoned.

There was one area that I'm going to show that was commercial that went to OR-22 but there's some special considerations for that, so that's what the red is showing.

2.L are properties in yellow that we are proposing to upzone from R1-20 or R-10 to R1-7.5, R1-5, and then on the east side these three areas to R1-6, R1-7.5 and R1-7.5, these are all R1-10 currently. Let's see.

2.M is referring to changes that we will make in how we treat mixed use properties in our Vacant Buildable Lands Model. Currently we assume that 50 percent of these properties will develop as residential, 50 percent as employment, our code allows for 80/20, what we've primarily seen is 80 percent residential, we require 20 percent commercial.

What we are seeing is that the development of the commercial has not happened, so a lot of the times the residential is built, the commercial is waiting to be developed and as part of this process there are I think three properties that are proposing to change the zoning from mixed use to multi-family because the multi-family has been built out but the commercial hasn't materialized, so we're supporting those changes from the remainder of the mixed use that was supposed to be nonresidential to multi-family.

And so, in our model this will decrease our capacity for employment because we're going from 50 percent to 20 percent, and then as part of our code updates we're looking at actually making it 90/10 in our code because of the difficulty that the development community is having with the commercial and these are the areas of the mixed-use zones.

So, again, 2.N is related to our Highway 99. This is an area that there's a subarea plan that allows for

residential development on what is currently has an underlying zoning of commercial. Our Vacant Buildable Lands Model it was never updated to account for residential development that's allowed, we're starting to see that, so we're proposing to have that reflected in the model. I think we are looking at a split of, we're still assuming the majority of the land will develop for commercial, but 20 percent would develop for residential and so that's just reflecting that.

So, 2.O, these are the site-specific requests that we're recommending approval. This is the Salmon Creek Fire Station has three different zones and so wanting to just make that all public facility.

This is 2.P, the property owner wanted to change the zoning from R1-10 I believe to R-12 but with the new upzoning that would be R-24 and we're proposing to recommend approval of that as well, it has proximity to WSU and the park nearby.

2.Q is also a proposal to upzone. I believe the original proposal was either R-12 or R-18 and the zoning here showing is R-32, I think we're saying to R-36.

2.R are the Baptist Church has a proposal for, the proposal originally was for general commercial. We thought that since the existing commercial around this intersection was community commercial and the proximity of Prairie High School some of the general commercial uses might not be compatible, so we're supportive of making that community commercial.

2.S is the properties here that are currently zoned community commercial. There are issues with access off of 503, I think this came before Council a number of years ago, staff supported it, Council did not at the time. The recommendation would be to go to, yes, R-36.

So, 2.T, again is this, the mixed use currently where you see the development has already occurred, but the commercial pad hasn't developed, and the request was to go from mixed use to multi-family and we're supportive of doing that to R-36.

Again, the two parcels to the south in 2.T and 2.U, also the same situation where the development has already occurred and the pads just hasn't developed as commercial.

2.V is currently a mixed-use area just south of the fairgrounds. There was a request for a lower density, it was multiple across on this site, there were some issues with the site in terms of being able to support commercial on this site due to some of the constraints on the site, so we wanted to at least keep the multi-family and we're supportive of having that be R-36, or I'm sorry, R-24 consistent with what's being proposed around it.

2.W is a site where there was an annual review request in 2022 that Council approved to change the site from commercial to OR-22. We contacted the property owner to see if they wanted to take advantage of the new zoning for a higher density, they declined and preferred to stay with whatever's closest to the R-22 that was approved, the OR-22 that was approved, so we're supporting that being OR-24.

ORJIAGO: (Inaudible) supposing that to be OR-22?

ALVAREZ: No, OR-24. So, the -- right. And so, we're not we're recommending any of the changes in Alternative 3, I have that information but if you -- so we're not going to, just in the interest of time we'll skip that and I think Oliver is --

FADNESS: Jose, can I ask a quick question. When we were looking at all the numbers with the deficits and the surplus, it showed for the housing that a majority of that was in the Vancouver City, not within the Vancouver UGA, but we didn't touch on any of that for Alternative 2 here, could you maybe speak on where that extra, I think it was 20,000 housing units comes from surplus.

ALVAREZ: So, a couple of things. We are -- the City can speak to it. They are -- have done their own EIS, they're not expanding the boundary and the increase in capacity that as shown in the Vacant Buildable Lands Model is based on just a complete change in their zoning structure. So, I'd prefer to let the City speak to that and then we can follow up if you have questions on that.

COOK: And I would add, this is Chris Cook, that the changes in zoning that are internal to the City will not be reflected in the County's Preferred Alternative because the City is doing its own EIS, the capacity numbers are the capacity but they're not part of the Preferred Alternative which I think is what we are looking at tonight as trying to get a recommendation for a Preferred Alternative for the County if that makes sense.

ORJIAKO: Commissioner Kyle, this is Oliver, we are still going to be having additional discussion with the City because, as I have stated earlier, we have decisions that the Council have made in terms of population and employment and our plans are supposed to be internally consistent, so we're all going to, regardless of the fact that the City is doing their own EIS, the plans have to be internally consistent.

I know they're recommending Alternative 2 with some additional changes, so we're going to continue that dialogue. Whatever the Planning Commission recommends to Council I think there's going to be additional dialogue just to make sure that we are not exceeding the overall County target because it is going to be more comprehensive plan for the entire county regardless of which city, so that's where we're going to be having additional conversation with the cities to understand some of their assumptions they made in coming up with the capacity that they did.

I agree with Jose that they're looking at a different potentially form-based approach to development in the future, I will commend them, but we are going to continue to have a dialogue on how to reconcile to make sure that our numbers is on target. Go to the next slide, please.

So, I thank the Planning Commission for inviting our Councilors to have this joint hearing. We have been doing it in the past, you know, this is I will say if you count the 2024 plan update that continued into 2027 (sic), this will be my fifth plan update with the County and when we have this joint hearing the purpose is to have one hearing and take public testimony so that the Council are hearing the same testimony.

And often in the past, it's not a criticism it's just an observation, some will skip the Planning Commission and go directly to the Council, that deprive the Planning Commission the same

information before you make your recommendation, so this is an excellent way to have our Council sit and listen to the same testimony.

The Planning Commission will deliberate separately. If there is time tonight you can continue your deliberation. If there are no time tonight, we have reserved a date for you to begin your deliberation and then making a recommendation to Council.

We will allocate time to our local jurisdictions, and I will ask the Planning Commission as well as the Chair of the Council to give some deference to the cities. I see some of their mayors and elected official, give them ten minutes to give their presentation or present their materials to you. They may not take the entire ten minutes; we have staff that are monitoring the clock.

And then also give because the County appointed the Ag Commission, Advisory Commission to advise them on ag related issues, so give the representative of the Ag Commission ten minutes, he or she may not use the entire ten minutes, that is my ask, that is how this will work. So, let's go to the next slide. Go to the next one.

So, when you make your recommendation, we are going to have a work session with the Planning Commission or with the Council to review the PC recommendation. And then as I stated, the Council will have their own separate hearing, that's when they will be sitting as the dais, they will make a different decision whether to take additional testimony or those that didn't have opportunity to be here tonight.

The comment on the whole process remains open until the final gavel comes down, so there is still opportunity for public comment to be coming in. I'm sorry, there is still opportunity for folks to comment, those that couldn't be here can still submit written comment unless tonight you close public comment, that will is yet to be seen, but we are required to leave the record open and continue to receive public participation through comment and both written preferably so, and it will go into the record.

You won't believe it, my department, and Chris can attest to this, we compile every comments that come in and it's indexed. The reason for that is that it's no secret every time we do this we are challenged and we have to provide that record for those that because a list of folks who are testifying to have standards, of standing, excuse me.

So I have excellent staff that are keeping great record, we have been recognized at the Growth Board as the best department when it comes to record of process, so I thank my staff and I thank Chris for all the advice in helping us prepare our record adequately and I believe the land use attorneys that participated in the process will agree that we have the best index of record.

Often you hear that my record is not, they don't see it, but you go to our where we have public record you will find that your record is in there unless it didn't come to our shop. I know that I'll give kudos to the Council Office every time the record gets comment they send it down to us and we input that but let me stop there. This is how the next step will work; you can begin taking testimony. Thank you, sir, unless the Planning Commission have question for me and Jose.

JOHNSON: Is there any questions from the Planning Commission? Okay. Hearing none, we will now go to the presentation by the City jurisdictions and the Ag Commission. So, I'll just start and go down the list. Is there a representative from Battle Ground here?

HARROUN: Did you want to take a break before you go on with this?

JOHNSON: Let's get these done. Make sure you state your name and all the stuff for --

OVERHOLSER: Good evening, Planning Commissioners and County Council. My name is Eric Overholser, newly appointed mayor of the City of Battle Ground as of Monday so this is exciting for me. To spell my name E-r-i-c, last name O-v as in Victor e-r-h-o-l-s-e-r. Just thank you for the opportunity to comment and be heard here.

On behalf of the City of Battle Ground please accept the following testimony regarding the Comprehensive Plan Update. Battle Ground is supportive of Growth Alternative 2 as represented in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

For Battle Ground this growth alternative provides reasonable measures to add capacity within our city limits and the existing planning area. One of Battle Ground's primary goals in this process is to expand its urban growth area to Dollars Corner, the area just to the west of us for the purpose of accommodating employment growth.

In 2021, Battle Ground completed a land use master plan to better understand its growth needs and the study found that Battle Ground is deficient in employment lands. Data studied on home locations for Battle Ground workers and where they work supports the perception that Battle Ground is a bedroom community.

In 2021 the top three places where Battle Ground residents travel to work are Vancouver, Portland and Battle Ground in that order. To reverse this trend Battle Ground's plan will create more jobs close to home.

The expansion to Dollars Corner would add approximately 450-gross acres for job growth. The existing Dollars Corner commercial center would be added to the Battle Ground UGA. This area has already received significant State transportation infrastructure investment, and its location minimizes traffic impacts related to shipping and freight in Battle Ground City Center.

Our request also removes approximately 330 acres from the Meadow Glade area in the southwest of the current UGA. Existing development patterns and lack of infrastructure make this area unlikely to develop within the 20-year planning horizon. Removing this residential area will help focus residential growth more compactly into the rest of Battle Ground's planning area.

The letter submitted in the record provides a visual of our proposed UGA. While Battle Ground is supportive of Alternative 2 it is asking for two minor modifications to the requested UGA expansion resulting from community visioning and as recommended by our planning commission and city council.

The requested modifications are related to city infrastructure and utility needs. One involves bringing in three parcels into the UGA to help complete a city street and intersection. The other parcel houses our city water reservoirs. Our letter provides further details and technical reasons for these modifications.

Battle Ground understands the gravity and complexity of the 20-year countywide growth plan. Since the County and partner cities are currently outside of the GMA time frame for compliance, we encourage you to move through this process as quickly and efficiently as possible.

Thank you for your collaborative leadership you and your staff have provided. We look forward to our continued partnership in assisting in bringing this effort across the finish line. I am available for any questions that you have, but I've also brought with me our City Planner, Sam Crummett, to answer the actual real questions that you might have. Thank you.

JOHNSON: Any questions gentlemen, ladies?

BARCA: I have a question. This is Ron Barca. Can you tell me again how many acres that you describe there as coming into your urban growth area?

OVERHOLSER: Yeah, we have, let me find it here, I know that we're removing 330 from the area of Meadow Glade and we're adding approximately 450-gross acres for jobs.

BARCA: Okay. So, Jose, then does that describe the 157 acres that you gave earlier in the testimony? You got to turn your mic on.

ALVAREZ: The additional two properties to the north I think that's what was in the DEIS.

BARCA: So, we're in sync?

ALVAREZ: Yes.

BARCA: All right. That was my question. Thank you.

OVERHOLSER: Thank you, Ron.

JOHNSON: Any other questions? Go ahead.

HARROUN: This is Commissioner Harroun. What's the impact to I guess the land over, the area that you're proposing removing from the UGA, is that currently, explain that to me, is that currently in the city or is it part of the UGA?

OVERHOLSER: I think Sam will better answer this.

CRUMMETT: The area as described as Meadow Glade generally or a portion of Meadow Glade, the

area is within our existing UGA, this is characterized by low-density residential development. So, we don't see that area as developing or urbanizing. We've done extensive public outreach, we haven't had any protests on removing that from the UGA, so we just see that as an area that we'd like to retract and grow where it makes more sense.

HARROUN: Is it currently developable in its current state and it's like if a developer went in there, right, could they develop something and then you're going to be removing that ability or is it just, it's just not going to be?

CRUMMETT: Not likely because it's mostly parcelized into kind of large lot residential development. A lot of one-acre or five-acre parcels where many of the residents want to just have that stay as is.

HARROUN: Okay. Thank you.

HOLLEY: Who was talking, please?

CRUMMETT: Sam Crummett, C-r-u-m-m-e-t-t, City Planner for City of Battle Ground.

JOHNSON: Thank you. Any more questions? Okay. Thank you, gentlemen, appreciate it.

OVERHOLSER: Thank you.

CRUMMETT: Thank you.

JOHNSON: Let's go with, do we have a representative from Camas?

ORJIAKO: He's online.

JOHNSON: Is he online? Go ahead and make sure you say your name and spell it.

PETERS: Yes. This is Alan Peters, A-l-a-n, P-e-t-e-r-s. And good evening, Chair Marshall, Chair Johnson, and members of the County Council and Planning Commission. Again, my name is Alan Peters, I'm the Community Development Director for the City of Camas and bringing greetings to you tonight from our Mayor and City Council and here to convey their request to you all as you determine the Preferred Alternative.

First off, thank you for holding this hearing. This is a critical step in doing the periodic update forward and brings us much closer to adoption of our 20-year growth management plans which as we understand are already passed our deadline but are moving forward.

First off, I did want to recognize that you have a letter submitted to you by the other cities in Clark County. I've reviewed that letter and will not, while Camas was not a signatory of this letter, we do support the request of each of the cities and many of the arguments made by the other cities in that letter.

As we, and Camas reviewed the three alternatives, we agree that Alternative 1 cannot meet the housing and jobs needs of the next 20 years. Countywide Alternative 3 also creates surpluses of jobs and housing that exceeds our needs for the next 20 years. So, from our perspective the right path forward lies somewhere between Alternative 1 and 3, one that balances targeted upzoning with reasonable and strategic UGA expansion. So, I want to talk a little bit about the two expansions that are included in Alternative 2 and 3.

So, on the screen here in Alternative 2 we do propose to increase job capacity by adding about 84 acres of not private but publicly owned land owned by the Port of Camas-Washougal in Grove Field out in Fern Prairie.

Additionally, Alternative 2 includes targeted residential upzoning that includes high density and multi-family and mixed-use zoning throughout the City of Camas. That zoning would occur both on vacant buildable lands as well as site-specific redevelopment potential. So that upzoning plus the now and in fact changes related to middle housing needs use will provide capacity for all needs and incomes in Camas.

Additionally, we're proposing to increase job capacity through mixed employment and mixed-use zones in the commercial hubs throughout Camas, again as well as this 84-acre expansion in Grove Field.

I do want to talk about Alternative 3 a little bit which mirrors Alternative 2, there's one change and that is an additional UGA expansion of approximately 160 acres along Camas's eastern boundary. So, you can see it there on the map.

So, this property known as the Nevin property, it's located about two miles from downtown Camas, about a half mile east of Camas High School and you can see there it's contiguous with our urban growth boundary and very near Washougal's urban growth boundary. Under Alternative 3, which was submitted to Clark County over a year ago, the property will be designated for multi-family use.

Earlier this week the Camas City Council held a workshop to discuss these alternatives. We went through Alternatives 1, 2 and 3, a majority of our council does support inclusion of both Grove Field and the Nevin property in the County's Preferred Alternative. Grove Field presents a unique opportunity to bring in public/port property that would be committed fully to job creation, this is again a public property, the Port exists specifically to develop a niche of public facilities that support commerce and economic vitality, so including Grove Field in the UGA would help do that, it would provide the zoning and infrastructure needed to advance their goals while helping us in Camas meet our employment targets.

The site's contiguous with our North Shore subarea where it can complement other planned employment lands and would be the first Port owned property within the City of Camas or the Port of Camas-Washougal currently all its landownership is either within the City of Washougal or unincorporated Clark County and so this is an important first for them and for us and so we would definitely ask the County to select an alternative that brings Grove Field into our UGA and we'd commit to collaborating with the Port on the future of that site.

Nevin, again which is shown here on the screen, as you can see it's located in proximity to urban development and infrastructure to both Camas and Washougal. There's been a lot of homes developed over the past decade, I believe over 800, perhaps close to 1,000 homes within a couple of miles of that site. While this property is largely zoned agricultural and undeveloped, it's 160 acres includes 17 lots that are five acres or less in size, so half of that 160 acres is parcelized into five-acre lots that are currently undeveloped, you can see that on the map here, and that's what makes this particular site unique, and I think why our council does support inclusion of it into the UGA.

Under the current County zoning each of these parcels could be developed with single-family homes despite the agricultural designation. And, in fact, there's been several large homes already constructed on nearby parcels, very nice homes, and so our council is concerned that continued low-density fragmented development would occur in the near term if this property is not added to our UGA with this periodic update cycle and that would make future urban development much more difficult and less efficient if it were to be considered, you know, in the next plan update in 10 or 20 years or so.

While Alternative 3 does identify Nevin as being for multi-family use, Camas would today support a regional commercial designation on this property, that would reduce the housing surplus but add capacity for about 1400 jobs on this site, and so there's a real opportunity for a major employment center for east county here.

And finally, I wanted to briefly address our housing capacity surpluses. We've been allocated in Camas of about 4200 units, both of our alternatives do have housing surpluses, there's a couple of reasons for that.

First, I want to point out if you look at Alternative 1, which is the No Change Alternative, you'll notice that we already have a capacity of a surplus of about 1500 units to begin with, so we're starting at a surplus already and that's due to some subarea zoning in North Shore that added residential capacity which wasn't captured in the original VBLM.

So, either way there's going to be a surplus, but a lot of the additional surplus in Alts 2 and 3 is the result of new State housing requirements that require upzoning in order to meet the housing needs of all of our community, so all income levels.

And then there's also a little bit of housing in these mandates which again are already in effect in Camas and so again starting with a surplus and then the necessity to upzone results in a greater surplus and I think it would be very difficult, if not impossible, to entirely avoid a residential capacity surplus countywide, so I did want to point that out.

But also, just wrap things up to state that we're committed to working with your staff, with the other cities, to further refine some of the assumptions and perhaps adjust growth allocations where appropriate.

I also want to make a request that we be given, you know, some reasonable allowance to make reasonable adjustments within the boundaries of the council as the alternative and given it's been over

a year since these alternatives were first submitted, we ask for some flexibility to continue refining the Preferred Alternative with minor mapping adjustment as the process moves forward.

Thank you for your time and consideration and I'm also happy to be able to answer any questions.

JOHNSON: Questions from the Commission? No, there is no questions. Thank you very much for your present- --

MARSHALL: I have a question.

JOHNSON: Oh, go, Sue. Right on.

MARSHALL: Alan, this is Sue Marshall, and I had a question about the Nevin property, and I was wondering if it had been subject to cluster development if that is why there's all those five-acre parcels?

PETERS: I do not know the answer to that, that question. What I can say is that of those 16 parcels only 1 of them currently has a single-family home on it, but I don't know the mechanism by which they were divided previously.

MARSHALL: Are there individual owners for each of those properties?

PETERS: I believe there are a couple of owners within the boundaries of this request, but they are mostly one owner.

MARSHALL: Oh, thank you.

JOHNSON: Any other questions? Okay. Thank you again Camas. Up next, La Center, do we have a representative from La Center? I'm turning everywhere. Oh, here we go. Okay. Don't forget to state your name and all that good stuff.

KAST: Thank you. Good evening, Planning Commission and Council, my name is Bryan Kast, B-r-y-a-n, K-a-s-t, representing the City of La Center this evening. I also have with me Planner, Angie Merrill.

In 2023 when the City staff of La Center began the work on the Comprehensive Plan Update, we were looking forward to a smooth and collaborative process with the County. As we started the work to update the VBLM to determine the City's current capacity for jobs as well as for housing as well as the allocations for job and population growth that was going to be directed to the City, City and County staff initially worked closely together. Unfortunately, as the process continued the coordination diminished.

In February of 2024, when County staff released the final job and housing allocation numbers for all cities, La Center was surprised to see that the City's allocations that had been developed in coordination with the County for months had dropped by 470 jobs and 301 housing units without any discussion or coordination with the City. At the same time, the city's capacity from the VBLM jumped

up by 247 jobs and 775 housing units. I testified about these discrepancies at that time; however, no revisions to these numbers have since taken place.

The projected capacity numbers that have been provided to you this evening do not reflect the topography and critical area incumbrances that much of La Center's undeveloped areas have, and they also do not reflect the subarea plans that have been adopted by the City or the land within the city that has been taken into trust by the Cowlitz Tribe and is essentially now outside of the City's control.

When the VBLM model was updated at the City's request earlier this week to reflect these changes, the City's job capacity was further reduced by nearly 400 jobs. As La Center has been developing the Comprehensive Plan Update, City leaders and staff have repeatedly engaged the public and the stakeholders to hear their vision for what La Center should look like.

Through this outreach we have heard several consistent messages. 1, residents want to maintain the small-town charm and feel of La Center. 2, growth should be focused near the I-5 Junction where there is adequate transportation network and other infrastructure available to support that growth. And 3, that family wage jobs should be provided in the city so that the city does not become a bedroom community.

With these goals in mind the City Council unanimously adopted a preferred alternative that includes targeted rezones within the existing UGA to provide a variety of housing types as well as moderate targeted urban growth area expansions primarily focused on job providing land around the Junction with I-5.

The preferred alternative includes our downtown and Timmen Landing subarea plans that bring some additional density, a variety of housing types and jobs to these areas as well as -- well, excuse me. So, the City, the preferred alternative closely aligns with the County's Alternative 2; however, there are those changes to include the minor job producing lands to bring those into the La Center UGA.

La Center understands and supports the need to preserve productive agricultural lands but shares the concerns that have been raised regarding the Agricultural Land Study and the many criteria of WAC 360-190-050 that have been disregarded by the study.

Much of the area proposed by the City for the urban growth area expansion has an urban reserve overlay that has identified it for future growth and is also adjacent to the urbanized areas of the City and the Cowlitz Tribe Reservation.

The soils underlying these parcels are silt loams that are generally not suitable for crop production and none of these properties have water rights for irrigation. Additionally, none of these parcels that are proposed for expansion are currently being used for crop cultivation and most are currently being used for nonagricultural use.

The City is eager to partner with the County and other cities to develop innovative methods such as a Transfer of Development Rights program to allow productive agricultural land to be preserved while still allowing for needed growth and expansion of the smaller cities in Clark County. We believe that

such a program would be a win/win providing farmers funds to support agricultural production and providing cities with needed area to meet growth demands without over densification.

The small-town charm of La Center is what's drawn many residents to this area and forcing the City to densify to meet growth allocations without expanding the urban growth area will permanently alter the feel of our community.

We have a couple of slides here and exhibits to share this morning if we can pull those up, please. So, this area shows the, so it's focused on the La Center Junction area, it shows our existing urban growth area in black and the proposed urban growth area expansions in red. Also shown here are the Cowlitz Tribal areas that are in trust currently.

I want to note that the critical area shown on this they come from the County GIS Environmental Constraints Layer, which is fairly conservative so the constraints may not be as extreme as shown here but they at least give a good indication. Next slide, please.

This area or these two pictures show the urbanization that has occurred in the Junction area. In our recent history you can see on the left there in 2015 it was fairly rural still and in 2023 with the developments of the Cowlitz Tribal Lands and the ilani Casino it is now significantly urbanized. Next slide.

This exhibit shows La Center's adopted preferred alternative. You can see within the existing urban growth area those areas in gray sort of in the north and central parts of the town are those targeted upzoning from low density to medium-density residential as well as the areas out near the Junction that are targeted towards job lands, and we'll go through each of those areas out in the Junction based on the numbers here, so next slide.

So, on the north area of the city for the proposed urban growth area expansion this will be an area proposed for mixed use, the total area of 53.6 acres, 18 of that is unconstrained again per the fairly conservative layer on GIS. Based on the 53 acres, there could be 150 potential jobs, but based on the constraints that may be closer to 68. Next slide, please.

The Childs and Caldwell UGA expansions in the very south area of the city, this would be the area proposed for light industrial, it's 26.3 acres that potentially could create 237 jobs based on the VBLM; however, there's only 4.4 areas that again according to GIS are unconstrained which would mean you'd get closer to 45 jobs. Next slide.

Next is the TRC and TRO UGA expansion. Again, this would be proposed for light industrial, 17.7 acres that could potentially create 180 jobs; however, there's a lot of constraints on this so the job numbers would be significantly less. Next slide.

And finally, the McClean UGA expansion, again light industrial would be the proposed zoning here for the 16.1 acres, could potentially create 150 jobs; however, with the constraints again that job number would be significantly lower.

I'm happy to answer any questions. I appreciate the opportunity to testify before you this evening. Thank you.

JOHNSON: Thank you. Any questions from Council or the Commission? Okay. Thank you very much. Whoop. All right. Go ahead. No, go ahead.

YUNG: This is going to be a question maybe I'm not sure who's going to answer it whether you guys are or our staff, I'm wanting to know so I'm understanding so looking at this image here and you see the parcel --

HOLLEY: Who's talking?

YUNG: Whoop, excuse me. Sorry, Cindy. This is Councilor Yung. So, I'm looking at this and what this is showing me is a parcel and what the little, the gray little sliver there is the actual area that is developable because of environmental constraints.

KAST: Correct. That's right.

YUNG: Right. And this is directly from the GIS?

KAST: The green area there is from the environment constraints layer. So, again, it's fairly conservative, it's a very high-level look. If site-specific, you know, if development was occurred here, they would do a site-specific study and, you know, actually identify what potential areas were critical, wetland, habitat, et cetera, and it would likely be less than what is shown in the green. The green is a conservative --

YUNG: Okay. And so, then my next question would be when we're looking at 150 potential jobs versus 12 jobs, obviously that's based on the amount of land that's developable, so my question would be when we are modeling this, what number are we showing coming out of the VBLM for a parcel like this? Is it that 150? I don't know where that 150 comes from.

ALVAREZ: No, it wouldn't be the 150. Typically, the critical lands originally deducted all critical lands from our model and there's assumed no development would happen.

Over time we've tracked this and observed that about half of the land that's actually designated critical, and as Bryan was saying, it's at a high level, there's no delineation that's done, but the model overestimates what's critical, and so what we're seeing, and I think what's in the model is about half of it is assumed to develop.

YUNG: Okay. Thank you. So just it would be nice if you could get us just, I mean this is just kind of a case study and it's obviously like the worst-case scenario, but if you could get us what VBLM says, you know, that we would get out of this parcel that would be great.

HARROUN: This is Commissioner Harroun. So, question, I know in some of, a portion of the land I think was in area C-1 was recently purchased by the tribes?

KAST: So, if we can go back a few slides to show the, I guess it's probably the first slide that would show the areas that have taken into trust.

HARROUN: So, once it's in trust it will actually, if the City has it, does it still go into trust and it becomes tribal land --

KAST: Yes.

HARROUN: -- after that? So, then it becomes --

KAST: The tribe can purchase property and own property, it doesn't necessarily mean that it's in trust, and part of the tribal reservation they have to go through a process with the U.S. Government to actually take that land into trust and then once that process is completed, it actually becomes basically part of their jurisdiction and comes out of the city's jurisdiction.

HARROUN: Right. So, is there, because the tribe owns it now, is that that land, would that land still be being calculated within your jobs numbers?

KAST: If the tribe owned it but it's not taken into trust I believe it would be however, I'm not aware, and you can speak to this, of any land within the city limits or the urban growth boundary that is owned by the tribe that is not yet currently taken into trust.

They purchased those areas that are sort of in the top center of the screen and then they took those into trust about a year or year and a half ago and there may be like one other small parcel that was a right-of-way along I-5 that they have not yet taken into trust but I believe most of the area that they own has been already taken into trust in La Center.

HARROUN: Okay. But I'm aware of a pretty large, I think it was 17 acres within your UGA request that was just purchased and closed I think December 23rd.

KAST: Okay. I wasn't aware of that.

HARROUN: Right. And so, my question then is so that will eventually be coming, you know, the assumption would be it would come into trust and then those job numbers that you're being calculated for would then disappear because and it goes off of your tax roles and then it all goes to the tribes; right?

KAST: Yes. Once it goes into trust, that's correct.

HARROUN: Right. And even though it's like agricultural currently, if the tribe owns it, it doesn't matter because they're a sovereign nation.

KAST: Correct.

HARROUN: So I guess my question for staff is like I mean, as even it's been dynamic, right, I mean you have the tribe especially is kind of a, you know, a great community member but an unknown quantity when we're talking about land development and they have very unique abilities being a sovereign nation, and so I guess my concern is as La Center starts to get hemmed in, and this is my comment, I won't speak for the City of La Center, but I see some of that stuff going and I'm like, well, then how is this affecting La Center, if they get hemmed in then how do they provide their jobs because all those jobs are off the tax roles and all those sorts of things, so...

KAST: And that's a concern that we have. You know, we work very closely with the Cowlitz, we have a great relationship with them, but, you know, it does make the math and the allocation difficult to, you know, when you have property --

HARROUN: Yeah. And in no way was that a dig on the tribe at all, I mean I think they're a great community partner, it's just kind of the reality of it.

KAST: They have their own ability to do --

HARROUN: Right. Of tax basis and all that, so... Yeah. I guess, so I guess kind of my, like how are we capturing some of that, how are we capturing for future city growth especially if you're hemmed in because you have to be contiguous and, yeah, so that would be my concern.

ALVAREZ: Just to answer the questions about the modeling. So, the numbers here based on the VBLM run 2023, so it was before the land was taken into trust, which was done last year, so when that happens then that land is taken out of the model.

The other thing that I would mention is that when we're doing the sort of allocation and distribution, it's based on, you know, the capacity in the Vacant Buildable Lands Model, so the loss of land would mean the allocation wouldn't have been the same to the City either so, but the issue about the City being hemmed in is definitely a unique situation for the City of La Center. I know part of the land that was taken in trust is within the city limits.

KAST: That's correct.

ALVAREZ: And so, I don't know if that was to preserve the ability to, to any movement, but, yes, it's a new issue that the County's aware of. Chris.

COOK: I was just going to mention that the -- it -- it -- it depends on where the land is I think as to how easy it is to take it into trust, and I could be wrong there, they could -- so they could purchase land in say Yacolt and take that into trust. Okay.

Well, if it's approved by BIA which the County has no control over in any event, so we could throw up our hands and say we can't do anything at all about this or we could plan for the land under GMA.

MARSHALL: I just want to follow up, so I'm sure I understand. So, land that is within a city's growth boundary can be purchased by the tribe and taken into trust, is there, and it's just the BIA that makes

that decision, the City has no say?

COOK: It's a Federal decision, yeah, totally.

MARSHALL: Okay. And then I had a question about the -- of the, I think the previous slide that was constrained and there was just that sliver that could be --

KAST: It's probably the last slide. I think we went back to the very first.

MARSHALL: Oh, okay, well, wherever it is. There we go. Is that one property owner or multiple property owners?

KAST: I believe this is one property owner.

MARSHALL: One property owner. So, there would be no way to just take in the land that could be developable so as to avoid the constrained land?

KAST: The other challenge would be that the urban growth boundary is to the east so it would --

MARSHALL: It wouldn't be contiguous.

KAST: not be a contiguous piece over there, yeah.

MARSHALL: Got it. Thanks.

JOHNSON: Any more questions or comments?

BARCA: Yes, Chair, I have a question for Bryan. Every one of the examples that you showed us are they all currently designated as agriculture?

KAST: Yes.

BARCA: Okay. So, each one of the examples with the constraints on them, they're all designated as agriculture at the moment?

KAST: That is correct.

BARCA: Thank you.

JOHNSON: Any other comments?

KAST: Nope. Thank you so much.

JOHNSON: Thank you very much. Next up, do we have a representative from Ridgefield?

HOLLEY: Karl, I'm going to need a break here pretty soon.

JOHNSON: Okay. Let's try to do Ridgefield here and then we'll take one at 8:30 or so, 8:35, okay. Is that all right, Cindy?

HOLLEY: Yeah, that's fine.

JOHNSON: Okay. Thank you.

STUART: Good evening. Thank you, Chair Johnson, and members of the Planning Commission and the County Council. We appreciate this opportunity to testify before you this evening. I am a special kind of sick, this is my fourth Comp Plan Update, and we get excited for this because truly this is our opportunity to talk about our vision for the future together, how are we going to grow, and vision is what it's all about.

BARCA: Name, please.

STUART: Say again?

BARCA: Name.

STUART: Oh, sorry. My name is Steve Stuart, I'm the City Manager in Ridgefield, S-t-u-a-r-t, thanks, Cindy, and I have my Planning Director Claire Lust with me as well. Thank you, Commissioner Barca, good to see you.

So, the City of Ridgefield has a longstanding vision, be a high quality, unique, full-service community. We understand that because of our location and of our quality of life we were, and we will continue to grow. The challenge is how, where, how do you do it in a way that best preserves the small town feel and the connection with the natural environment that draws people in the first place and makes them want to stay.

The community has come together with plans for that, comprehensive plans, subarea plans, master plans to see that vision come to life in three dimensions where they make sense. Mixed use master plans like Pioneer Village, a City led master plan that embraced increased density, supported an urban village of small shops and tied it together with pedestrian paths and a ten-acre park with enhanced wetland complexes as you see here.

Neighborhoods like this one which is actually just north of Pioneer Village, it blends density in neighborhoods to minimize the negative impacts of density to infrastructure and quality of life while maximizing the compatibility, also keeping the connection with the natural environment clear. You can see here the greenbelts that have been preserved. Every new subdivision in Ridgefield sets aside 25 percent of their acreage for parks and open space.

And planning for jobs, a regional hub for commerce, increasing employment opportunities and sales tax producing commerce, supporting our residents and the region, this is (inaudible), but now we look

forward.

Envision Ridgefield 2045 as our community's next step.

Our current Comp Plan Update has included 19 community conversations, 2 community-wide open houses, 5 online surveys which drew 510 total responses, 5 planning commission meetings and 10 City Council meetings, no offense.

From all of the community input in March of last year the City Council finalized the preferred alternative which closely mirrors County DEIS Alternative 2 plus the Jones/McPherson expansion area which was sent to County staff on the 9th of April of last year but not included in Alternative 2.

The preferred alternative builds on the communities vision. Targeted densification to provide affordable housing options as part of mixed-use hubs in areas where they make sense, on the waterfront like Clark College and areas in between where we already have the infrastructure, the services and amenities to support it.

Annexing our UGA with subarea plans sustaining what's special about them. Limited expansion in the three areas characterized by urban growth, these are areas where property owners you'll hear from were asked by the County what they wanted. Property owners asked to be included in our UGA. After studying it, the City Council agreed these areas were characterized by urban growth and appropriate to include in the Ridgefield UGA. Claire.

LUST: Again, Claire Lust, L-u-s-t, Community Development Director. To build on what Mr. Stuart just shared with you; in order to best implement the vision, Ridgefield supports a slightly modified version of DEIS Alternative 2. Next slide.

Why will Alternative 2 work? Ridgefield has grown rapidly over the past decade. It's continuing to grow and will continue to grow due to opportunity. The DEIS allocations shown on the right side of the screen are considerably constrained proportionate to observe growth over the past decade.

In fact, DEIS numbers now show more capacity now than in 2016 for housing in the same boundary despite massive growth in that period. This is one of the discrepancies we identified in our DEIS comment letter contributing to the appearance of an excessive surplus of housing capacity in Ridgefield.

The other discrepancies are shown on the left-side table. After poking around in the DEIS it was only fair to look towards our own assumptions with a critical eye as well and through this process we identified more fixes to bring Alternative 2 into compliance shown in the right-side table.

Fixing these discrepancies and errors corrects artificially high capacity in the Ridgefield UGA thereby contributing to reducing the countywide capacity below that OFM high number.

It also demonstrates the need for target and mixed-use hubs within the UGA and limited targeted expansion to accommodate both affordable housing and jobs, this is all achieved through a modified version of Alternative 2.

This direction shared is reflected in the joint letter submitted by the cities' planning directors, which among other points calls for adoption of Alternative 2 with some local modifications and critically asked for continued collaboration between City and County planning staff to make the numbers work under the solid framework of Alternative 2.

Alternative 1 as planned would not have sufficient land capacity to accommodate all the additional housing and job growth projected for the next 20 years. Alternative 3 as mapped could not be legally adopted as it includes disjointed UGA expansion proposed not physically contiguous to any existing or proposed UGA boundary. Therefore, Alternative 2 with appropriate modifications achieved through continued collaboration is the right choice to move this process forward efficiently.

STUART: So, we know we have a track record, we know we have a need, we also know that we need targeted expansions to meet that need, but with that we know that the lands that we are talking about are zoned ag.

The questions for the three expansion areas, they are all ag zoning. We are also surrounded in the City of Ridgefield almost completely by ag zoned property, so it's really hard to avoid the conversation completely, that's why we were grateful that the County Council commissioned a countywide ag study last year to analyze what truly is and is not farmland of long-term commercial significance throughout the county.

The 2025 study contains a lot of essential information that could help guide these decisions in Clark County, looking at all the relevant criteria, 14, not 3, starting with a mandatory question under the law, is the land characterized by urban growth. If it is, under GMA it cannot be zoned ag.

Land like the Maul property, if you go back one, sorry, so the Maul property is 2a on the bottom, it's hard to see because it's completely surrounded by city. If you go to the next one.

So, the Maul property, under the law, land located in relationship to an area with urban growth on it as to be appropriate for urban growth is under the law characterized by urban growth. The Maul property is surrounded on all sides by incorporated city limits, it's adjacent to urban services including water, sewer, traffic and schools and it's not in current use.

Zooming back out, the City is also requesting an area on the north side of Ridgefield, 11 on this map if you can see it, that it be brought in as a master planned mixed use hub the way we do with 777 affordable housing units and 1200 jobs.

And if you zoom in, the property itself has been characterized by urban growth by the County with an urban reserve overlay on it for 30 plus years since 1994. It's adjacent to urban services including water, sewer and traffic infrastructure and it's surrounded on three sides by the Ridgefield urban growth area and just south of the Cowlitz Tribal Reservation, all realities that warrant approval of the property owner's request.

Finally, the City is requesting Area 12 on this map to be brought into the UGA for missing middle

housing opportunities adjacent to the new elementary school that's opening this fall. The land is characterized by urban growth with residential, commercial and school development on the west and south sides. The property is adjacent to urban services including water, sewer, traffic and schools.

So even though the areas that we just detailed are not long-term commercially significant ag land, there are places in Clark County that are, they need help, our City sees an opportunity to partner with the County to do just that.

Transfer of Development Rights, you've heard a little bit tonight, we heard about it yesterday at the County's Council workshop. Transfer of Development Rights is an innovative method to preserve high value farmland while focusing density into areas where it makes sense like those we just detailed. It sends development rights from the farms to the urban areas through voluntary transactions between property owners.

It's been recognized as a possible tool for preserving farmland by GMA, legislature, courts, the Ag Commission and our County Councilors. It's been implemented elsewhere, talked about several times in Clark County, but why isn't it here, because mainly there's no market of voluntary buyers of density in Clark County using the existing model.

We're proposing a model that will work and we're proposing it using a method that's allowed under the law that can be integrated into this comp plan process without delaying it. How? An Interlocal Agreement between the City and the County.

If, if areas meet the GMA and WAC requirements for de-designation and inclusion in the UGA, the County does that, but with an Interlocal Agreement that guarantees they cannot develop until or unless the property owners preserve high value farmlands elsewhere, paying the farmers the full value of their land which the farmers would still own but they can reinvest.

For the first time you'll have property owners who will want and need to buy that density because the biggest increase you will ever see in value is between ag and urban and the County benefits by adopting an innovative method. The City benefits by creating a place for needed jobs and affordable housing, there's details that need to be ironed out.

JOHNSON: Can we start to wrap it up, Steve.

STUART: Sorry.

JOHNSON: You're over ten. All right.

STUART: The Interlocal Agreement gives time for that work. You lock up the land until the transaction occurs, you have time to develop the details. If it doesn't work, the next time the Comp Plan Update comes up, the County removes those properties from the UGA which is also allowed under GMA, but it will work. It will create an opportunity to implement a shared vision for Clark County's future and that's what it's about, it's about vision. Thank you. We're happy to answer any questions.

JOHNSON: Thank you. Any questions from Council or Commission?

FADNESS: This is Commissioner Fadness. I didn't catch during the presentation, I know that the Gee Creek area, Area 6 is a large area, was that included in what you guys are recommending or was that excluded?

LUST: Thank you. The Gee Creek subarea is currently in the urban growth area, so part of Alternatives 2 and 3 is to assume annexation of that area over the next 20 years; however, it is currently in the UGA.

FADNESS: Okay. Thank you.

MONTGOMERY: LeDuc Montgomery. I'm hearing you about, you know, there's a lot of growth, have there been instances where developments haven't been approved for the maximum capacity that they're zoned for or have there been other opportunities for redevelopment or in-fill that haven't been pursued affecting that capacity issue?

STUART: Certainly not in the decade that I've been there. What we've seen is actually the opposite. We've used mixed-use overlays to increase the density allowed for parcels. Pioneer Village is a great example where it actually had a 16 per acre zoning on it, but by applying the mixed use overlay we were able to do 28 units per acre, thus creating an opportunity for 300 units of affordable housing as part of a mixed use overlay with the services and the park to serve it, so it was integrated, not isolated, so actually we've been very successful in doing the opposite.

And if you look at our plan over the last planning horizon the countywide planning policies identified 6 units per acre as our target, we've achieved 7.8 units per acre since 2016.

LITTLE: Chair, this is really interesting because I was talking about TDR's yesterday and so can you describe a little bit about how the Interlocal Agreement would work in this context like say for the Maul property and how quickly could that happen?

STUART: So, the second question --

HOLLEY: Who was that?

LITTLE: Matt Little.

STUART: Sorry, Cindy. So, the second question first. As far as the question of how fast could it be done, there's a Draft Interlocal Agreement in the packet that I handed out that we put together in conjunction with our city attorney to show how it can be done.

Interlocal Agreements are actually a very expeditious item that can be done between jurisdictions that are authorized in RCW's. So, a draft is already there, it just takes us talking it through, having public conversation about it and bringing it to adoption which could occur within one to two months, it does not take much time for an interlocal if we have agreement.

With regards to how it would work for say the Maul property, for the Maul property it's about 15 acres, 13 acres, that would be if that was determined to be able to be de-designated and included in the urban growth boundary, then the owner of that property, that property we brought into the urban growth boundary, but it would be locked in urban holding by agreement by both the County and the City, locked in urban holding until or unless they can purchase development rights from a farmer in an area determined to be significant by the County Council, and ultimately in conjunction with folks like the Ag Commission and other stakeholders, that process may take time, but the interlocal locks it up while that process is occurring.

And what it does is it locks up your buyer of that density, that buyer of density who needs the density to be able to develop is waiting for the opportunity to pay that bill. The bill itself, the full value of an assessed acre of ag land on average in Clark County is about \$30,000 an acre. The difference between ag zoned land and urban land is between 30,000 and 200,000 per acre.

Not a bad deal for someone coming into the boundary that is still making, that has the ability to retire to make the revenue that they're looking for and actually preserve farmland elsewhere and that would be a voluntary transaction between them and farmers.

LITTLE: Okay. Thank you. I mean, I was thinking about growth 100, 200 years from now when we're all gone and the growth boundary is going to be larger of course, but there's nothing in the GMA that provides mitigation for the loss from that development and this is a transaction that would allow equal, it will facilitate development as well as preserve farmland, so I'm super interested in this. Thank you.

STUART: That's certainly the idea. And the simpler the better and I think an acre for acre transaction simplifies the credit allocations because that's one of the things that gets in the way of getting this done and that if it's just acre for acre it's \$30,000 for 13 acres minus the structures on it if they had to go somewhere else and that ends up creating significant revenue for farmers in an area to reinvest in their business.

YUNG: This is Councilor Yung, Cindy. You speak really fast and so I may have missed something. I wanted to check to see is there anything in your preferred alternative at this point that wasn't studied in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement?

LUST: Everything in like, this is Claire Lust if you need it, everything in the City Council's preferred alternative was studied amongst the three alternatives in the DEIS. Thank you.

YUNG: Great. Thank you.

HARROUN: This is Commissioner Harroun. So, correct me if I'm wrong, so are you proposing that any of the land that you would take in all is subject to a TDR?

STUART: Given the fact that the three areas for targeted expansion are currently zoned ag, then yes.

HARROUN: And is that driven I guess from a County Council policy, a desire to preserve ag land or is it driven more from a hedging your bets thing as far as getting through, getting the land in but providing an alternative?

Like I guess the question is, is this your preferred method, would you just prefer not to have to do a TDR as an option if that was an option that we recommended and said we think they need the land and, you know, or is it a value of the county, of your City Council that are like, no, we actually want the TDR requirement because what you could actually do internally even if, you know, does that answer the question?

STUART: That makes perfect sense. So, from our City Council's perspective there are two pieces to this. Again, Steve Stuart speaking. The first part is the policy aspect of this, our city both benefits and is hemmed in by the agricultural lands that surround us.

Our City Council sees value in the lands but also understands that a lot of the urban dwellers are simply seeing the lands directly against the boundaries that are not, that are laying fallow and not being used, they just see it as extended open space, but they do see the value of having ag, productive ag land elsewhere and that we value, that we actually benefit from that and he have benefited from it for many many many years, so there's a policy aspect that they're actually supportive of.

Then there's the legal aspect. The legal aspect is it's not about the area coming into the boundary, it's what are you doing to actually make the case that, a, that it should be de-designated, that the lands that are being brought in are not suitable for long-term commercially significant ag, that's the first piece of it, but the second piece of that is what are you actually doing to preserve ag elsewhere.

After the 2016 comp plan, when there's a lot of considerations by the County Council for creating smaller ag zones, one of the things that the courts said that they actually hit the County on is you don't have a TDR program in place, you have no innovative methods that help preserve farming activity in your county.

These kind of innovative methods are necessary to be able to prove up that not only are you doing the right thing in including areas that can provide affordable housing and jobs but what are you also doing to help farmers because just locking up their land isn't doing it and it won't do it.

JOHNSON: Okay. I'm going to try to do this. Any other questions? All right. Sounds good. Thank you.

STUART: Thank you very much. We appreciate your time.

JOHNSON: Thank you both. Thank you. Okay. What I'd like to do right now is give Cindy a break, I'd like to make it five minutes because we're going to be pushed on time, so let's shoot for a five-minute break and just get back in here as quick as you can.

(Pause in proceedings at 8:47 to 8:53 p.m.)

JOHNSON: I'm going to address the public and such from here so I can look at you for one second.

Could we all come in and have a seat, please. Mark Boldt, can you please sit down. You can hear I've lost my teacher voice today. That's the one I need. Okay. In the back can we come in and have a seat, please. Steve, come on. There we go. Okay.

Hey, here's our challenge, we have about three or four more cities and of course the ag people and we want to respect your time, there's 40 people that want to speak which is great, that's awesome, we want to make sure you get your three minutes to speak. Usually in the old days we let these things run but it wears me out and I teach 6th Grade and so that's a challenge in itself, not to mention when you haven't slept.

So, I would like to do this, I want to leave the -- the Commission and the Councilors, I would like to leave testimony open and ask those of you who sacrificed your time tonight that cannot make it next week when we come back again that you people that can come back just don't testify. Those of you that say, look, I got a babysitter or something tonight, come on up, we'll get you through.

I want to close this thing at 10:00, just not close the meeting but just go tonight, we'll shut it down, and then -- and I've got -- I haven't talked to all the Councilors, but I talked to one of them and I think kind of generally that's what we're speaking.

It was already noticed that we were going to do some type of way, I was hoping to get through all the public testimony. So, what we're going to do tonight is we're going to go to about 10:00, I really encourage you not to repeat testimony or go over your three minutes, which certain cities already have, Steve Stuart, okay. All right. So, thank you and we'll get going here right now. Thanks. Okay. Do we have someone from Vancouver here? Come on up.

MCENERNY-OGLE: Good evening. I'm Anne McEnery-Ogle, M-c-E-n-e-r-n-y hyphen O-g-l-e, Mayor for the City of Vancouver. Thank you so very much for the opportunity to speak tonight and for all your efforts for the last three years on this issue.

Vancouver, like the other cities have been very busy during this time engaging our community just as Ridgefield has, developing new plans, we've been overhauling our current system in favor of something simpler and more flexible and making more choices for property owners.

We're going from 22 zoning districts down to 10 with increased but not unlimited options for locating housing in the most of the commercial zones and vice-a-versa. Through this countywide process we've also weighed in about the Vancouver UGA and recently participated in a productive County Council workshop on the potential future annexation, but for tonight's hearing as our letter was dated January 8th elaborates we recommend you select Alternative 2 with minor modifications.

Alternative 2 with modifications is the choice of the communities that are ultimately responsible for serving that long-term growth in Clark County and we've been developing that through extensive local processes. The County's own data shows that Alternative 2 has more than enough land to accommodate the growth, the long-term growth forecasts adopted by the County three years ago.

The County's own data also shows that Alternative 2 provides for a balanced growth with ample

ownership as well as rental opportunities. Two-thirds of existing housing units countywide are single-family according to the DEIS. In Vancouver half of our current housing stock is comprised of single-family houses most of which will still be here in 20 years.

The DEIS also shows that Alternative 2 provides more than three times as much countywide land zoned for low-density residential than it zones for a high-density residential and mixed use combined, in Vancouver it's twice as much.

There are also new State laws allowing for unit lot subdivisions and lot splitting options which will further facilitate additional opportunities along with existing tools like the cottage clusters. To ensure these opportunities get built, Vancouver and other communities are taking a flexible approach to allow but not require more affordable housing options.

Vancouver's two primary residential zones are envisioned to have minimum density requirements of 8 to 16 units per acre respectively which are densities being built right now. We do have two small recommendations for Alternative 2.

First, as recommended in the County staff report remove the two Vancouver UGA expansion areas proposed for employment that were added very late in the process on sites with extensive parcelization and critical lands. It also had very limited local property owner support for employment development. And, secondly, add some employment zoning in the existing UGA at one or more of the 17 possible sites that we identified over a year ago.

As we look at Alternative 3 or anything close to it, it just doesn't seem practically or legally defensible. As mapped, it couldn't be adopted since it has, as was pointed out earlier, disjointed sites not connected to an urban growth area. Even a reduced Alternative 3 would still require significantly increasing the previously adopted countywide population forecast probably beyond the legally allowed OFM range. A significant amount of the County DEIS would probably also need to be redone as well.

And because of these questions about land capacity and because they're so important going forward we have Bryan Snodgrass here from our staff to touch on some of the technical points. Thank you.

SNODGRASS: Thank you. I'll be really quick and available to answer any questions about this. There was a question that came up about Vancouver capacity, it's obviously an important issue so we wanted to respond to that.

The capacity estimates that we're discussing tonight are from the County VBLM model. One of the many assumptions in that model is one that the County appropriately under the law turned to the cities and that was the density, housing density per zoning in different zoning districts. All of the other assumptions in the model about critical lands and so forth are all the County model, we have not had any input or direct input in the same manner into that.

We're now in the pro- -- in looking at -- we are doing our own planning of course for our own area and as part of that we're continually trying to refine our assumptions for that area and we think there are some ways that we can make some adjustments, justified adjustments to the Vancouver capacity

number which would bring that down a little bit.

Vancouver, I think this was observed earlier, the surplus in Vancouver is over 20,000 housing units, so it's about, there's a countywide surplus, it's not just Vancouver, we're the big city, so about two-thirds of the surplus is in the City of Vancouver. So, among the things we're looking at now are what is the potential dampening of expected growth in single-family neighborhoods because of existing covenants and restrictions, we're trying to make an estimate for that.

We're also relooking at some of this information that we provided the County about the density per zone about a year ago, we're relooking to see if some of our subarea plans downtown and elsewhere were a little bit optimistic, so... We do think that we're looking at those and we're working with County staff on this that that capacity surplus in Vancouver would be less, it's not going to go away, there probably still would be a surplus.

In terms of overall the -- at least the residential side of the County model has gotten a lot of scrutiny and a lot of review in this the last five years essentially, it's probably in our view reasonably sound. We do appreciate the work in looking at that continually and the recent study of the BIA Johnson study and we do appreciate that some corrections for some Vancouver sites were made on that, the big concern that we have with drawing any wide conclusions about that that the entire VBLM is significantly underestimating capacity is that that study just looked at in the Vancouver and VUGA high-density zones it only looked at the plats.

In the last five years during which the study was conducted Vancouver's probably permitted around or built around 7500 apartment or multi-family units I should say, about a third of that number has been built in the Vancouver UGA. I don't know if any of those are captured in the study because they only looked at land divisions, not apartments, so...

Again, we applaud the effort, but I think it's hard to draw conclusions about the VBLM or even the high-density zones in the VBLM given the skewed nature of what was looked at.

On the employment side of the model, there's less of a surplus. The concern here is that there, it has not undergone the same level of scrutiny that the residential side has. There are the original advisory committee spent a short time on it relatively and there wasn't the kind of data that there was on the residential side to look at that.

We're somewhat concerned about this because the two sites that were added or are now I think appropriately recommended by staff to be removed from the Vancouver UGA were on inappropriate sites and they were just done to make the math work just based on the model.

So, if there is to be future changes in the job forecast or changes to the VBLM there's some pretty outstanding issues on the job side and our letter identifies those, I won't go into detail, top of that list is the work at home assumptions which are an old assumption that's four times less than what the EIS says the actual number is.

So going forward if there are to be some changes on the job side I think that's something that we would like to see addressed, so...

With that if there's any questions either tonight or if the record's open that we'd be happy to respond to about both our plans as a City and also the capacity issue.

BARCA: So, this question is primarily for staff in response to the City. It feels like there's a significant discrepancy between what the City's analysis is and what we are proposing here, so I'm going to go back to the idea of on our land use alternative comparisons by capacity for both housing and jobs, we haven't had time to pull the City's letter in and to analyze it, is that a correct statement?

ALVAREZ: No, I don't think there's a discrepancy. We recognize that there's both the way they calculate and the way our model is showing excess capacity, there's no dispute.

BARCA: Two different ways. So, it's not a discrepancy, it's just two different ways?

ALVAREZ: Correct.

BARCA: Okay. Maybe my terminology's bad. We're moving forward with our analysis, and the City has an alternative.

ALVAREZ: I think the City's looking at making some adjustments that would impact the capacities in our analysis, identifying additional lands that we currently count as re-developable and revisiting some of the assumptions that they've provided us in terms of density and so we're still having discussions about that to potentially bring down that.

BARCA: Okay. So, the dialogue is ongoing. So perhaps would we expect to see anything different in what's presented to us by next week or is that wishful thinking?

ALVAREZ: It might be wishful thinking.

BARCA: Wishful thinking. Okay.

HARROUN: Bryan, I have a question on the employment capacity that the City's come up with and I've seen like Washougal is trying to take some employment capacity or transfer employment capacities and different things I've read, was that when we started this process a couple of years ago was there a baseline number that we started with and that we realized in the city that we had a whole lot more or is it just two different modeling types?

I was just kind of surprised because like -- because the City is making a recommendation of removing the land north of 199th Street and then west of the WSU Campus or east of the WSU Campus, what shifted, what was the, where did those numbers come from?

SNODGRASS: Well, first of all, unlike the residential side, on the employment side the model is entirely under the County's numbers and assumptions, and we've had influence on that, but it hasn't been the case as it is with the residential that they have asked what is your zone, what is your capacity, what is your density by zone, that's not been the case on the job side.

So I think with the original allocation either, I can't remember if it was 2024 or '23, there was always a job surplus in the City of Vancouver as there were in some other places as well and so we appreciate the County staff recommendation to remove these sites which as we said are not on not appropriately located and are only put in there for the math because there is that excess capacity and that change isn't just for those two sites, it's also the City of Washougal, that's also part of what we discussed tonight, had some that we also, they wished us to absorb the excess capacity and we're capped, so...

HARROUN: And then when we look at excess capacity, are we looking at all at job types versus, I look at some of the larger areas like north of 199th where you have like larger areas for maybe construction companies or for employers that need larger pieces of land, is that considered or it's just pure job numbers of like how many office workers versus how many industrial workers or industrial sites type thing, is that a factor?

SNODGRASS: Well, two things. One is the parcel north of 199th is heavily parcelized, or not the parcel, the area, the 150 or 200 acres, is pretty heavily parcelized in addition to critical lands, so that was part of our thinking, but it doesn't have a lot of big sites. But to answer your first question it was just the number of jobs that it was just sort of a model change.

HARROUN: All right. Thank you.

JOHNSON: Okay. Thank you very much Vancouver. Do we have a representative by any chance from Woodland? I didn't think so. Washougal is next. Washougal.

KNEIPP: Yes. Can you hear me?

JOHNSON: Yep. Go ahead Washougal. Make sure you state your name, please.

KNEIPP: Yes. Thank you very much. My name is Mitch Kneipp, M-i-t-c-h, K-n-e-i-p-p. Thank you very much, Chair Johnson, fellow Commissioners, Chair Marshall and fellow Councilors. I am the Community Development Director for the City of Washougal; I've had the pleasure of serving here for over 20 years now and I'd first like to thank Oliver and Jose and the County staff for the considerable amount of time and effort put forth to keep this process moving forward.

As was noted earlier, the City of Washougal has signed a joint letter with Battle Ground, La Center, Vancouver and Ridgefield in support of Alternative 2 with some modifications and I also provided a separate comment letter on behalf of Washougal.

Washougal supports the DEIS Alternative 2 with the minor adjustments as noted by the other cities. As a community much like the county and the other cities, Washougal had numerous public gatherings, meetings, advisory and technical advisory committee meetings which provided us with multiple opportunities to listen to the community and for the community to be heard in the preparation of our preferred alternative plan.

Ultimately our planning commission unanimously recommended to our City Council who unanimously

adopted our preferred alternative in April of 2025. The plan has sufficient capacity to meet Washougal's housing allocation, and it accommodates 2,125 jobs.

However, the City of Washougal adopted subarea plans in our northwest and northeast urban growth areas in 2016 that removed business park designations and replaced them with residential designations. Unfortunately, not all those changes were inputted into the VBLM before it was used to generate and establish land capacity which created a job surplus in Washougal.

So, yes, we do have excess jobs which we have noted previously, but early in this process we approached the City of Vancouver to see if they were willing to accept our job surplus and they were and that fact is noted in your hearing materials as the County staff is recommending that the surplus jobs allocated to Washougal can be absorbed by Vancouver. However, more work is still needed between the jurisdictions to bring the maps and capacity into better alignment.

Washougal does have a surplus in housing capacity, but it is largely due to State housing legislation which requires two middle housing units on any residential lot as well as two accessory dwelling units on any residential lot and not to mention the requirement to provide housing units across all the different affordability levels.

Our development assumptions only assume 2 to 10 lots out of every 100 will develop with middle housing ADU's in our residential zones, and even with these conservative rates housing capacity exceeds the allocation. We can't further reduce these rate assumptions without seriously impacting our ability to provide the housing needed at the different affordability levels. However, like the other cities, we are committed to finding solutions to address these concerns as we work with the County staff to make the final adjustments.

Regarding the Agricultural Land Study, I'd like just to emphasize a point that the City's joint letter made and that that study is not used solely as a basis to exclude UGA expansions.

Again, as La Center and Ridgefield noted, the study does not consider important designation criteria such as urban adjacency for example when identifying the agricultural land base. As a result, the Agricultural Land Study presents an incomplete or skewed picture of the agricultural land base with the exclusion of many of the designation criteria.

Again, Washougal is in support of DEIS Alternative 2. It is the only alternative with sufficient capacity to accommodate growth and contains only contiguous UGA expansions. It also generally reflects the preferred growth plans for each city, again the ones ultimately responsible for managing and servicing urban growth in Clark County and selecting something else would ignore all the extensive public involvement that has occurred in the communities as the local level over the past year.

Commissioners and Councilors, I appreciate the opportunity to speak with you this evening and thank you for your consideration and I am available for any questions that you may have.

JOHNSON: Thank you. Questions for Washougal?

YUNG: I just had one question for our staff. When we talk about the jobs numbers and just kind of passing back and forth, does that affect the climate element in the Comp Plan Update?

Because you're essentially, I mean the goal is to have people working where they live but we're kind of exporting those jobs over to a different jurisdiction.

ALVAREZ: So, I think that in the case of Washougal the, you know, the changes that they made as part of their subarea planning in 2016, you know, it wasn't reflected when we allocated them.

We, you know, we allocated them employment based on the old zoning that had, they had more land for jobs, and so with that change they, you know, they should have gotten a reduced amount of allocation, that would have been reallocated more than likely to the City of Vancouver because they made up the bigger percentage of where the jobs are located. So, they're still trying to match their housing jobs balance within each jurisdiction.

With the City of Vancouver and the Vancouver unincorporated area we're still, the Vancouver UGA, so it's still within that same geography, we just break it out to show the differences because we are the two biggest essentially entities in the county, so it's still within that jurisdiction.

ORJIAKO: Councilor Yung, I will also add that there are, if some of this job numbers, and I know it's numbers, are located or reallocated to the City of Vancouver, you touched upon climate, there the City also has -- is required to plan under the GMA or the Climate Bill that passed, I'm sure you're aware that they studied that, their climate action plan much much earlier, they will have to make some changes whether it is, you heard Bryan talk about assumption and work from home and other strategies that they will be employing to reduce vehicle mile travel to provide other options for those folks working within the city.

So, allocating additional employment to them will not deprive them of making changes that also address climate concerns, there are options, reduction in vehicle mile travel, commute, reduction in commute trip travel, there are just varying options that they could use to still mitigate for climate issues.

YUNG: Thank you.

JOHNSON: Any other comments for Washougal? Okay. Hearing none, thank you very much for your testimony. Next up, how about someone from Yacolt. Is Yacolt on the line? Okay. Seeing none. See none. Okay. Yacolt's not here.

I think that is the last of the cities. The last person that I'd like to get up that is, do we have a representative from the Ag Commission? Yeah, come on down.

VAN DER SALM: Good evening. My name is Ruud van der Salm, v-a-n, d-e-r, S-a-l-m. I'm here to represent the Clark County Agricultural Advisory Commission's recommendation on the Agricultural Land Study to the Council and to the Commission.

I'm a co-owner of Our American Roots, a second-generation family farm. I have worked on our family farm since I was a teenager and have made it my career in 1999 or '95. Clark County is my home; farming is my profession.

Our American Roots is a continuation of our family farm that has been located in Clark County since 1980. We are located in the northwest of the county in the quiet corner away from developments and housing encroachment. We employ 15 or more people full-time and ship flower bulbs and bare root perennials throughout the United States and into Canada.

Our largest customer base are the growers from the Farmers Market. Many of these growers are local, the majority of them are in the Northwest, we are part of local agriculture, and we supply local agriculture.

As a Commission, we come from a wide range of agriculture and agriculture-related fields and businesses. At our first meeting of the Clark County Agricultural Advisory Commission, we were told our first task was to provide the Council with our recommendation on Agricultural Land Study.

After four meetings of information gathering, familiarization, discussions, a subcommittee met to write up the framework for the recommendations. In December our Commission went through this document point-by-point and apart from one abstention voted unanimously to accept these recommendations which I will soon provide.

We are very aware of the difficult balance that the Council and the Commission must strike between development, housing and conservation. We know that there is no way to create new farmland. Much of our designated agricultural lands lie in the periphery of our towns and cities. Once farmland has been developed it cannot be replaced.

Washington State's agricultural production value in 2023 was \$14 billion. There are around 1900 farms in Clark County which is the third most in the state after Yakima and Spokane Counties. Agriculture is a huge industry in all three western states.

Quick addition to my written, Mr. Stuart from Ridgefield mentioned the Transfer of Development Rights, our Commission would be in favor of such a plan; however, we would want it to be designed at a County level.

On to our recommendations. They are as follows: 1, maintain existing agricultural designations. No de-designation of current agricultural land until there is a process for designating agricultural land. The Agricultural Commission recommends that Clark County maintain all currently designated agricultural resource lands during this comprehensive land update.

To ensure consistency with RCW 36.70A and applicable WAC provisions, the Commission recommends that Council refrain from de-designating agricultural lands based solely or primarily on proximity to urban growth or nonagricultural development.

Due to past annexations, urban growth boundary expansions and rural development patterns, most

remaining agricultural lands, are now located near urban or nonagricultural uses. Reliance on proximity alone is not a reliable indicator of long-term commercial agricultural significance and risks undermining the County's obligation to conserve agricultural lands.

Avoid conversion of lands designated as agricultural resource lands to nonagricultural uses unless supported by defensible criteria based analysis consistent with GMA requirements. Clark County has experienced substantial agricultural land loss over the last several decades. The Commission urges Council to act cautiously and deliberately to ensure that remaining agricultural lands are conserved consistent with statutory intent.

Consider the impacts of de-designation on farmland affordability and agricultural viability. Past de-designation has contributed to land speculation and rising land values limiting access for working farmers. Maintaining designation stability supports long-term agricultural use and investment.

2, develop a forward looking designation and de-designation process aligned with the GMA. The Agricultural Commission recommends that the Council prioritize resolution of agricultural land designation challenges by directing staff, in partnership with the Commission, to develop a transparent, data driven and GMA compliant designation process.

Recommended actions would include review and evaluation -- review and evaluate agricultural land designation frameworks used by other Washington counties, incorporating best practices that have withstood legal scrutiny and aligned with WAC 365-190-050.

Adopt a temporary moratorium on re-designation or upzoning of rural lands that meet legal criteria for agricultural designation including cluster development provisions for a defined period, 36 months for example.

The purpose of this moratorium would be to allow the Agricultural Commission and County staff to evaluate these lands and develop a legally sound designation framework. Such a moratorium would be narrowly tailored, time limited and consistent with RCW 36.70A.390.

Develop clear criteria for designation that evaluate lands for long-term commercial agricultural significance, including but not limited to, soil quality and agricultural productivity, water availability and water rights, parcel size and configuration, current and historic agricultural use, enrollment in agricultural current use tax programs, proximity to other designated agricultural lands and agricultural infrastructure, proximity to markets and ecological benefits.

Conduct a countywide review of rural lands that meets statutory criteria for agricultural designation but are not currently designated. Prioritize evaluation of lands that are actively farmed, have willing landowners, possess water rights or are located within established agricultural areas.

Ensure that designation decisions are supported by documented analysis and findings to promote consistency, transparency and legal defensibility. Pursue Transfer of Development Rights, Purchase of Development Rights or other programs targeted towards agricultural land preservation.

3, support for farmers and agricultural economy in Clark County. The Agricultural Advisory Commission

affirms its intent to continue this work and to provide ongoing recommendations to the Council consistent with the original design and purpose of the Agricultural Land Study. The Commission emphasizes that the conservation of agricultural lands must be paired with policies and tools that actively support long-term agricultural viability and a functioning agricultural economy.

This includes -- this includes continued consideration of mechanisms such as conservation programs that maintain land for agricultural use, support for farm transition and land access, strengthening the agricultural workforce and addressing fragmentation and underutilization of designated agricultural lands and more.

The Commission offers these comments as part of an ongoing advisory process and anticipates providing additional recommendations as this work progresses. Thank you. Any questions?

JOHNSON: Thank you. Any questions?

BARCA: Sure, I have a question. This is Ron Barca. So, you basically went through your recommendations given to County Council on December 18th, that's what this is I believe.

In relationship to the pursuance of TDR's or PDR's then, am I looking at a plan, so this would be on the recommendations it would be 2.B and go through item 3, 4, and then 5 as the criteria about how to kind of weight rank the importance of the lands and to where to focus TDR's on, is that a fair statement?

VAN DER SALM: Yes.

BARCA: Okay. So, when we get together in the future for the potential discussion of TDR's this would be the framework that the Agriculture Commission is asking to bring forward?

VAN DER SALM: I believe so, yes.

BARCA: All right. Thank you.

JOHNSON: Thank you. Any other questions? Sure.

HARROUN: This is Commissioner Harroun. When -- my understanding is you guys direct the Ag Commission directed the -- the consultant who did the ag study kind of the criteria that you would like them to consider?

VAN DER SALM: Well, we had input on expanding the criteria that they looked at, right.

HARROUN: Why was economic viability not included, economic viability of farmland not included as a metrics that you guys were looking at as far as what was available?

VAN DER SALM: I don't believe it was allowed to be included. There was a limited list of things that could be used as far as to designate what, you know, is considered ag land from what I remembered

during our meetings.

HARROUN: Okay. So, you guys were under the belief that you were not allowed to ask for --

ALVAREZ: Economic viability is not a part of the WAC criteria.

VAN DER SALM: We tried, but...

HARROUN: It's not a part of the WAC criteria, well, it's not limited. The WAC criteria isn't a limiting criteria, it's a guidance.

ALVAREZ: Correct.

HARROUN: Right. So, it was available but we just, the city staff decided not to?

ORJIAKO: And Planning Commissioner Harroun, WAC specifies the criteria, and you cannot deviate from that because that is passed into law.

HARROUN: My understanding was the WAC was not limited to, it wasn't a only these, it was and these kind of things, but you could look at other criteria. Am I incorrect in that?

COOK: Yes and no. Does that help? So, there is language in the WAC that talks about not being limited to. In 2007 Clark County adopted a Comprehensive Plan that included the largest UGB expansion in Washington State history and it remains so, including on to a lot of agricultural land and the Growth Board and then the Court of Appeals and then the Supreme Court overturned a lot of that.

A major part of the reasoning was whether economics was a legitimate factor and what the various appellate groups ruled was, well, it can be a factor, but it just isn't as important as preserving, maintaining, conserving, enhancing and protecting agricultural land. So, although the County argued strenuously to support the economic criteria, it was pretty much shot down.

JOHNSON: Any other comments?

YUNG: Chair, one real quick question. I'm wondering so you have -- you have quite a bit of recommendations in there and I think I must have missed the meeting when you guys made your recommendation, was there, is all of this hoping to be in this Comp Plan Update or is this more of a long-term plan, was there any discussion on what you were hoping to get in this Comp Plan Update?

VAN DER SALM: Well, I mean our power is obviously zero, we just provide our opinion as farmers. Clark County has taken a lot of ag land and continues to do so every time there's an update so hence we ask to pull the handbrake, let's slow things down, let's look at what options there are that could help preserve more farmland rather than just jump straight into this and right away go. I mean, we've, you know, we've only had five meetings for which, yeah, are fully dedicated.

YUNG: And you guys have done excellent work, you guys were really thrown the book right off the bat,

so...

VAN DER SALM: And it is very important.

YUNG: Yes.

VAN DER SALM: And I know this is a long list and it, you know, this is not our mandate, but...

YUNG: So more specifically like the intent behind looking at the lands that the ag study identified that could that met the standards, the minimum standards, and you're recommending that we're looking at zoning some of that ag in the process, was that kind of intent for this comp plan or for a later longer process?

VAN DER SALM: We've learned from Mrs. Cook that the County cannot designate ag land, the only ag, only land that can be designated ag is if the owner requests it, so that's not really, you know, we learned that's not an option for us hence the TDR or other similar programs that other counties in Washington State might be using that help preserve farmland that way because at this point, you know, if you have, if you own farmland and any city moves in next to you and they offer you, you know, 50,000, 100,000 an acre, you know, you can either wait for them to take it the next time there's an expansion or cash in, if you just you can't compete with that kind of money.

YUNG: It is definitely --

VAN DER SALM: It takes that ag land and cannot designate more ag land, it's just gone forever, and currently already the designated ag land we have in Clark County is scattered throughout the county. Water is a huge issue, and some counties have irrigation districts, how could we have irrigation districts when our designated ag land is scattered throughout the county already.

And so, we're just hoping to slow this train down a little bit so that real planning can be made, obviously not to repair what's been done because that's done, but we don't just go barreling forward to make it worse.

YUNG: That's been my feeling of the entire comp plan. But I did notice that Chris shook her head so there may be some miscommunication.

COOK: Yes, I would guess it was a miscommunication. I absolutely did not say that it was not legally possible to designate ag land because it is legally possible, whether it's practical or not, whether it would be appealed and survive an appeal, whether the property owners, you know, would support that, those are all different questions, and I have to say I did suggest kind of negative answers regarding those.

VAN DER SALM: Sorry, you're right, you never said it was illegal to or not, but not possible, it's just very very unlikely that the County's able to force land to be designated agriculture if the owner does not want it to, right.

COOK: Well, the same rules that about de-designating ag land are the rules that apply when you want to designate ag land. And we've been arguing about de-designation now just for this comp plan since the process began and it's been a focus of every Comp Plan Update since 2004, so as well as the first comp plan. So, whether it's a practical thought or not might depend on the land involved, but I didn't say you can't do it.

MARSHALL: I would just like to add that this will be a policy decision and ultimately it will be a decision that the Council makes.

JOHNSON: Thank you. Any other? Okay. Thank you very much.

VAN DER SALM: Thank you.

JOHNSON: Okay. I believe we've gotten through all the cities and the representatives of the Ag Commission and now it is time that we open our public testimony. With that said, just a simple reminder that I said in the beginning, try not to repeat yourself, not that we don't like hearing things but sometimes when you hear things 10,000 times.

Also please stick to the three minutes, I know it's brutal, but we just try to get you out of here. So, with that said, you have the list, can we do not -- can we do this group first. I know we normally do the phone first, but can we flip it and do those people that are here to respect their time.

COOK: And I would ask that you remove the map so that we can see, yes, a timer. Thanks.

JOHNSON: And, again, if you're called up and you can come back next time just say I can come back, but if you're a person that says, hey, I really need to do this this time, just come on up and make sure you state your name and spell your name and speak slowly.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

DELAPENA: Please note to be a 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 January 8th, 2026, they were submitted to the PC members and posted to 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 begin with 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 to the court reporter. If you do not wish to provide public testimony please say so. Robert Nevin.

NEVIN: Yeah. Hello. I'm Robert Nevin, N-e-v-i-n, and this is in regards to the City of Camas request for expanding their UGA and this has to do with the Nevin 160-acre expansion, and we support the

Alternative 3.

And I do like ag land, but our family is -- had five generations who lived and worked in the Camas area and this property was purchased in the 1960s. The property has never been used for farming.

The property lacks water rights and in 2024 Johnson Economic land analysis found that the land is economically nonviable for agriculture and over the past 12 years housing development on three sides of the property added 800 to 1,000 homes pretty much surrounding it.

The size of the property is 160 acres as Alan said from Camas, 75 of these acres are in five-acre parcels and they are legal lots of record. These can and will be sold as five-acre parcels for McMansions; however, both our families do not feel that this would be the best interest for the future growth of the City of Camas or their school districts. Jobs will attract and bring new families to Camas. I urge the County let Camas determine their future expansion for smart growth and the future prosperity to the City of Camas.

And growing up there I can, and my father growing up there and my kids are there now with their families, Camas has done a really good job balancing from a mill town into a, you know, diverse business area for jobs and families for future growth. Anyway, thank you.

JOHNSON: Thank you. Could we remember also to speak into the microphone so we can hear. Next up.

DELAPENA: Mike Pauletto.

PAULETTO: I'll do next week.

JOHNSON: Thank you, Mike.

DELAPENA: David McDonald. Jim Maul.

MCDONALD: Chair, I'm going to give my spot to Ms. McKenna.

JOHNSON: Okay. Yeah. It's okay just line up right there. Just line up. Yeah, just line up.

HALL: I'm sure glad to see you have this kind of organization. I came here 50 years ago, there wasn't any zoning, there was no control, and it was hard for me to find a place, I was used to that, and it was hard for me to find a place where I'd be satisfied to live. I found a place, it's been wonderful. I've had 50 years of really great living, and I appreciate what you're doing. It's nice to have that here.

I only really had one comment and that was that, that my lots as I looked at them in your system kind of got lost. My son found that kind of shows where we were and we have about five lots. I don't do anything with them, I don't plan to do anything with them, but he'll have to do something with them soon.

And the only problem I had is that you showed me two different ways, one way, one of my lots right down through the middle of the whole thing was excluded from whatever you're doing and all the rest of them were included, so it's kind of confusing. We worked it out with the Planning Commission, so anyway, thank you.

JOHNSON: Thank you for your -- Jeff, we're going to run these two right here, she's taking -- yes, just make sure you say your name.

MCKENNA: My name is Mo McKenna, M-o, M-c-K-e-n-n-a. Hello Commissioners, hello County Council. My husband and I own and operate a small family farm in Ridgefield, I also serve as the cochair for the Agricultural Advisory Commission, but I'm here speaking tonight as an individual and the opinions that I'm about to share are my own.

My comments specifically relate to the loss of ag land in Ridgefield and La Center. I just want to share that we actually chose to farm in Clark County. We looked at the entire metro region, and we decided to site our farm here because of the soils, because of the microclimates, because it is an excellent place to farm. We grow just about over 400 acres of flowers on just a couple of acres in Ridgefield and agriculture on really small acreage is not only viable but incredibly productive if you have the right type of operation and a driven farmer.

Our farm sits on a Sara silt loam which is a USDA prime farmland and unfortunately for our farm we were brought into the urban growth area of Vancouver in 2020. It had immediate negative effects on our farm. We lost access to USDA grants for rural farmers through that change. We have our property value on every side of us skyrocketed so we cannot expand our farm operation the way that we hoped and our tax liability increased greatly.

This had nothing to do with us and our, you know, it really negatively impacted our farm and it just had to do with the zoning change. Farms like ours are economic engines of this community. This is an industry, right, so don't forget that when we say it's not farms versus jobs, it's farm jobs, we create jobs, we bring in sales revenue and tax revenue, and we are an industry here. We believe that if we were really supported as an industry we could do a lot more.

I want to respectfully note that some of the testimony submitted in support of the UGA expansions really reflects outdated assumptions on ag viability. We are not going to be commercial commodity crops here, right, we are speciality crops, we are producing for our local markets, and we don't require chemical spraying so it doesn't matter that we're next to a school, right, we're using organic practices, sustainable practices and we can also utilize dry farming so water rights are not nearly as important as many people would have you believe.

The biggest issue of agriculture in this community is ag land speculation due to continued de-designation of ag land. Every time we de-designate, and we don't designate more it drives up the cost of land making it unaffordable for new farmers. I urge the Council and for the Commission to please don't designate any ag land until we have a viable way to designate more. Thanks for your time.

JOHNSON: Thank you. Go ahead, yeah. Make sure you state your name, please.

MAUL: County Council, Planning Commission and staff, my name is Jim Maul, J-i-m, M-a-u-l, I reside in Ridgefield, Washington. My brother and I own property commonly referred to as the Maul property. The property is included in the city's preferred use alternative.

We appreciate the County completing the agricultural land survey, unfortunately the designation of the Maul property as prime agricultural land is not supported by any factual basis. Under Washington State's Growth Management Act lands considered for agriculture designation are based on three core factors, not already characterized by urban growth, used or capable of being used for agricultural production assessed primarily via USDA land capability classifications and soil suitability, long-term commercial significance for agriculture, the property fails on all three core factors.

Characterized by urban growth, the property and surrounding area in character and in character and nature is not conducive to agricultural uses; in fact, most agricultural uses are not compatible with the immediately adjacent and surrounding land use. The property is adjacent to urban infrastructure. The property is a doughnut hole and completely encompassed by the City of Ridgefield. Portions of the property are being considered for public use facilities, for example, a new fire station.

Our property is bounded by and immediately adjacent to existing or planned subdivisions and the Ridgefield combined middle and elementary school campus. The property is located at the intersection of Hillhurst and Carty Roads, both are urban traffic corridors. The property lies adjacent to and is directly influenced by the Carty Road and Gee Creek plateau subarea plans. Exclusion of the property from the thoughtful development considered by these plans is economically and socially detrimental to the City of Ridgefield and surrounding area.

Soil type, the characterization of the property as prime agricultural land is based on map soil characteristics that are only partially present on the property. Almost half of the property is underlaying by dense poorly drain soil, not suitable for crops or grazing. This reduces the viable area for that could be used for any kind of agricultural purpose.

Commercial economic viability, the property is approximately 11 acres. The small size of the property makes it economically infeasible and nonviable for agricultural use. As previously stated, the viable area is even further reduced in size because of unsuitable soil conditions.

I strongly urge the Planning Commission and Council to support the City of Ridgefield's preferred alternative. Thank you.

JOHNSON: Thank you for your comments.

DELAPENA: Gary Boldt.

BOLDT: Gary Boldt, B-o-l-d-t, and I've lived here since 1950. I guess my folks moved here and I bought the place from my dad in about '75 and we've -- we dairied for about 35 years and now are growing vegetables and I'd kind of like to reiterate a little bit about what Steve talked about these here transfer of developmental rights.

We need to do that if you're going to save some ag land, you can't just dictatorship a person that he's going to leave this land and he's going to stay there the rest of his life on this land, he's got to pay the taxes, he's got to pay the insurance, got to keep the land up and you're getting older, shucks, I'm going on 79 years old and I've had half of my body taken out and the other half replaced, so I kind of, I'm about ready to retire, you know, but I love ag and it's always been a great time but too then I think water is the other big thing.

You might say that you don't think water but if you have crops that you raise all summer long we can't do it without water and I have a good friend, Bi-Zi Farms they're trying to get water now for quite some time, got his shut off and the County's not helped, the State hasn't helped and DOE shut him off and he's had to outsource half of his produce and half of his, he raises pumpkins, all of that's been outsourced and it's cost him a great deal of money. And if you're going to have somebody in agriculture you have to have water, so that's one other thing I think you're going to have to think about.

And I don't think that people coming in, and I'm sorry, progress is a good thing because that brings us customers that we need so if you're in farming, so... Thank you.

JOHNSON: Thank you very much.

DELAPENA: David McPherson.

MCPHERSON: Thank you, Commissioners and Council, appreciate the opportunity to speak here. I also want to thank you for all the hard work you put in on this, and we started hearing about this, all this project three years ago and I cannot imagine the man hours put into these Council meetings, so I want to thank you for that as well.

Julie and I moved to this property, this property is in Ridgefield, it's on the McPherson property, it's in their (inaudible). We moved there in 1994 to raise our children in a rural environment. We also believed in the future could be of value towards our retirement. We ask Clark County to be in agreement with what the City of Ridgefield has already approved regarding moving this property within the city limits.

Based on an agricultural resource land analysis prepared in September of 2025 this property does not meet the criteria of ag land laid out by the Washington Growth Management Act. Please understand there's zero ag opportunity on this property, I live there. We like the land, we like living on land, we like having our children growing up on land, but anymore, you know, there's no ag opportunity on this land.

It's in close proximity within a mile around our property is Clark College Campus, Ridgefield School District new elementary school that's being built right now, the Kirkland Senior Living Home, it's a big project right on the cul-de-sac or the roundabout, it's currently being built, there's a giant plumbing outlet right next to, when we'd look at the back when we used to look at nice rolling hills, gives you the back of a big plumbing outlet.

And recently approved as referred to in an article I read a Home Depot like business, that's going to be just north of the electric car station, electric charging station right there at the roundabout, I get to look at that too. This is not even rural anymore.

So, in our 31 years we've paid our taxes on time, and we think we've been very good stewards of this land. Once, again, it makes no sense to me that the County would not allow this or go along with the City of Ridgefield's approval of our application to be included in the City of Ridgefield and subsequent de-designation of ag.

To reiterate, there's no ag opportunity here, this isn't even rural anymore. Highest and best use for this property is supporting much needed residential growth in the area. Again, I know the man hours put into this stuff, I used to do some of this myself but thank you for all the time and effort you've put into it.

JOHNSON: Thank you. I think this will be our last one and we'll suspend I guess is the correct word, not stop the hearing but to continue or whatever.

COOK: It will be continued.

JOHNSON: It will be continued.

COOK: Yes.

JOHNSON: So, let's go one more.

DELAPENA: James Hall.

MARSHALL: He already spoke.

JOHNSON: Oh, okay. Next.

DELAPENA: Diane Dempster.

JOHNSON: Thank you.

DELAPENA: Craig Hoover. Randal Friedman. John Kowalski. Heidi Cody.

CODY: Present. No testimony. Thank you.

JOHNSON: Okay. Thanks.

ABREGO-VIVEROS: Good night everyone. My name is Alondra Abrego-Viveros, A-l-o-n-d-r-a. Dear Clark County Council and staff, this comment is a shortened version of the December 15th letter to the Council cosigned by 12 local groups, many of which are community based organizations of color.

As you consider which land use alternatives to choose we invite you to consider Gresham. Gresham sacrificed its prime farmland for rapid development. Today Gresham is dealing with the consequences, sprawl, traffic and the loss of irreplaceable soils. Clark County does not have to repeat that pattern. We ask you to support and protect farms, forest, open spaces and connected wildlife habitat.

Every Council member voted to require that food security be required, be a required consideration in your Ag Land Study. We now ask Council to accept and act on the findings of that study. Our future food security and climate resilience depend on retaining Clark County's remaining prime ag lands. We ask Council to keep all the county's ag land designated as ag land. We ask Council to designate additional ag lands in the county that were found by the study to meet the legal threshold for ag lands.

State provided data show that all cities within Clark County have enough land to accommodate the growth projections Council's adopted. Please work with Ridgefield, La Center and Camas to find land use alternatives that do not expand urban growth areas.

Maintaining local control of our food supply is important for economic and emergency reasons. Many residents are interested in indigenous food, food, forests and experimenting with reintroduction of beavers and other measures to take care of our lands. These ideas are connected to climate resilience, which is required by the Growth Management Act.

Please honor your Ag Commission whose position is to use your encroaching development as a justification to de-designate land. You would essentially always be chipping away at ag land which goes against the purpose of the ag land designation, the conversation purpose of that. There is no purpose in having an Ag Commission if Council members are simply going to ignore their expertise.

Ag lands are important to birds, wildlife for food, cover and nesting habitat. Habitat lost through conversation, degradation and fragmentation has significantly altered the landscape for birds throughout Clark County. Farms with a mix of crop, livestock operations or those with more diverse landscapes including natural areas tend to support higher bird density and diversity which can be beneficial to agricultural. If we keep building as usual and sacrifice our farmland for private interests who don't need it is fundamentally inequitable. Thank you.

ADJOURNMENT

JOHNSON: Thank you. With that said, what we'll do is we will continue this hearing on the 15th which is next Thursday, yes, and we're not closing comment. If you cannot make it back by any chance, you can send your, you can send an e-mail too, we'll get those and we do, I have a stack of them that I'm still looking at from today, so... Yes.

ORJIAKO: 6:30.

JOHNSON: Oh, the time is 6:30, yes, thank you. With that said I believe we're adjourned.