



Minutes of Public Hearing

Planning Commission Hearing

2025 Comprehensive Plan Update

Thursday, January 29, 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. Good evening, Planning Commission, members of the public and staff members. I would like to call this hybrid public hearing to order for Thursday, January 29th, 2026. My name is Karl Johnson; I'm the Chairman of the Clark County Planning Commission.

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

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

Tonight, the Chair -- well, the Planning Commission will conduct a public hearing tonight. All public comments received before tonight's hearing have been sent to the Planning Commission members and entered into the public record.

As a reminder, this is a continuation of a public hearing which began on January 8, 2026, and was continued on January 15th, 2026. Public testimony concluded at the January 15th meeting and the public portion of the hearing was closed. No additional oral testimony will be taken tonight. Planning Commission will deliberate tonight and will make a recommendation to the County Council.

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

Tonight, do any members of the Planning Commission have any conflicts related to tonight's hearing items? Hearing none, we will look for roll call and any introductions of guests. Jeff, can we get a roll call, please.

ROLL CALL VOTE

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

Staff Present: Oliver Orjiako, Community Planning Director; Christine Cook, Senior Deputy Prosecuting Attorney; Jose Alvarez Program Manager II; Bart Catching, Planner III; Susan Ellinger, Planner III; Amy Wooten, Planner III (Virtual); Suzan Poisner, Planner III (Virtual); Harrison Husting, Planner II (Virtual); Amy Koski, Program Coordinator I (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 29, 2026

JOHNSON: We'll now move on to general and new business. I will look for approval of agenda for January 29th, 2026, can I get a motion and a second.

BARCA: **Motion** to approve the agenda as written.

BERGTHOLD: This is Commissioner Bergthold. I'll **second** that.

JOHNSON: Jeff, can we get a roll call.

ROLL CALL VOTE

HALBERT: AYE
BERGTHOLD: AYE
FADNESS: AYE
BARCA: AYE
HARROUN: AYE
MONTGOMERY: AYE
JOHNSON: AYE

DELAPENA: 7/0.

B. Approval of Minutes for January 8, 2026

JOHNSON: That motion passes. Can we get an approval of the minutes for January 8, 2026.

BERGTHOLD: I'll make a motion, this is Commissioner Bergthold, I'll make a **motion** to approve the minutes for January 8th, 2026.

FADNESS: Commissioner Fadness. **Second.**

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

ROLL CALL VOTE

HALBERT: ABSTAIN

BERGTHOLD: AYE

FADNESS: AYE

BARCA: AYE

HARROUN: AYE

MONTGOMERY: AYE

JOHNSON: AYE

DELAPENA: 6/0 with 1 abstention.

PLANNING COMMISSION DELIBERATIONS

JOHNSON: Motion passes. Okay. Now we will move into the general and new or general business, and we start with our deliberations. Those of you that are in the audience, like I said before, we have already taken all the testimony, kept the hearing open but closed the portion for testimony.

So, with that said, I would like to pose that we do this, I was talking to the vice chair on how we want to go about each of these, we have three alternatives that we have to vote on, Alt 1, Alt 2, Alt 3. 2 and 3 have numerous issues from each city and on Alt 3 we also have the individual requests, the site specifics.

What I would like to do if it is okay is look for a motion to take Number 1 since there's only one item there and I'll just read it off and if we want to make a motion, and then have a talk about it we can and then someone can make a motion, but the idea here is that we can proceed on to some of these, because I think what I'm going to do is go city-by-city on Alternative 2 and item-by-item and city-by-city on Alt 3.

With that said, Alternative Option 1 is the No Action Alternative. This option keeps the existing 2015-2035 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan in place with the inclusion of the required density changes in the City of Camas, Vancouver and Washougal to reflect the implementation of HB 1110. Will there be any discussion and/or a motion on Alternative 1.A?

BARCA: This is Commissioner Ron Barca. I would like to I think break out in the thought process here that this particular alternative is basically the foundation of anything that we're going to be adding on to.

In the past when we've gone and looked at comp plans, no comp plan has been exactly as described as

the alternative that goes forward for the Final EIS.

My concern right now after listening to the testimony, or no sorry, at the work session when we discussed the idea of what makes for a competent TDR program it has to do with the idea of having a constrained land supply creating a marketplace.

So, as we go through these without necessarily regarding to whether it's considered Alternative 1, 2 or 3, I'd like the discussion to also consider the thought process that the more land that we include, the more difficult it's going to be to create any type of marketplace.

So, I'm not opposed to the method, but I think going through Alt 1 the No Action Alternative is still going to foundationally be the basis in which we're going to be adding acreage on to whatever we recommend going forward to the County Council.

MONTGOMERY: This is Commissioner LeDuc Montgomery and also commenting on Alternative 1. I agree it's the foundation, you know, no change, and my understanding is we can recommend additional changes than what alternatives have been proposed.

And if I'm recalling the staff presentation from prior hearings talking about, you know, Alternative 1 didn't quite have the capacity for the population or growth targets but then Alternatives 2 and 3 were resulting in excess for some areas and we're talking about a TDR program potentially helping close some of those gaps, that's kind of where my mind is at as well as almost like building from Alternative 1 how to create some of that capacity.

So, I guess I just wanted to also add kind of a similar thought process as we're going through the other Alternative 2 and 3 is our way to kind of take some of that and build on Alternative 1 I guess is what I'm saying.

HARROUN: This is Commissioner Harroun. I agree with both of my fellow Commissioners there. I think kind of along those lines and perhaps instead of doing 1, 2 or 3 we kind of just do the breakdown of city-by-city and kind of like the major chunk requests.

I think a TDR recommendation or whatever that looks like would be appropriate to look at if we would want to throw that in too because basically we're just sending a bundle of recommendations for the County Council to look at and versus, you know, 1 minus this, 2 plus this, it might just be easier to go Camas, Washougal, you know, that would be my thought process, but...

FADNESS: I'll just say I agree with Bryan (sic) there. I think that, you know, Alternative 1 kind of gives us if we vote, the way I see it is if we vote yes on Alternative 1 that's kind of the end of the recommendations.

If it's no on Alternative 1, then I would think that we should go through like Bryan (sic) is saying on item-by-item here and give a recommendation yes or no for the individual cities or some of the zoning changes and then also to follow that same process for Alternative 3.

JOHNSON: Is there any more ideas here on how we want to proceed on this? Okay. Hearing none, I could take a motion -- the only other thing I might say is that I know we just got the information on the TDRs and that's a big -- this reminds me so much of Alt 4 where at the very end of the last one of these we did, Ron, you might remember this, that something was dropped kind of in our lap.

This is a little bit different, but I would like -- it's going to take time to process that, but I would like to add that possibly we could add something in there on the TDR advancing whatever we do tonight to say, hey, to Council we'd like you to look at the TDR information, the TDR information that was given to us and not as a stipulation by no means because that's a long process from what I understand.

Is that right, Jose, it's not going to be something that we can do tonight; correct? I'm kidding, that was not -- I'm trying to get some humor going here.

What I'd really want to do is just make sure that they hear from the Commission that that is something that we've asked and maybe that they would want to look at if they already aren't or going to.

So that was my only add to that was that the TDR was officially in our language to say, look, no matter what is selected here tonight would you please look at that too, not as a, just as a recommendation, but that was very interesting to all of that.

So, with that said, I would take a motion or I'm just going to proceed in my caveman way here and go about this the best I can. Is there a motion on how we would like to proceed on this as far as kind of wrapping this in?

Would we like to just, I guess it doesn't even have to be official, are we going to just be proceeding with the cities, starting with the cities and saying let's go through each city, so starting with Battle Ground and ending with Vancouver, would that be kind of a good start jump off?

FADNESS: I think maybe the jump off we need to have a motion on Alternative 1 whether we recommend that or not.

JOHNSON: Are you making a motion?

FADNESS: Yes. This is Commissioner Fadness I'd like --

JOHNSON: Yes. Was that you, Cindy?

HOLLEY: That's okay. He said his name.

FADNESS: This is Commissioner Fadness. I'd like to make a **motion** to recommend no on Alternative 1.

HARROUN: This is Commissioner Harroun. I'll **second** that.

JOHNSON: With that said, do we have any more debate on that? We have a motion and a second, can we get a roll call, Jeff.

ROLL CALL VOTE – ALTERNATIVE 1.A, MOTION TO DENY

HALBERT: AYE
BERGTHOLD: AYE
FADNESS: AYE
BARCA: AYE
HARROUN: AYE
MONTGOMERY: AYE
JOHNSON: AYE

DELAPENA: 7/0.

PLANNING COMMISSION DELIBERATIONS

JOHNSON: Okay. So that means Alternative 1 is not something that we are sending forward to the County Councilors. Now, what I'd like to do is jump into Alternative 2, and what I'd like to do, unless there's any objection, is to start with each one of these cities first. Okay.

So, let's look at Battle Ground. And, again, please feel free to stop me if I'm, you want to do something different here as I go along, but I'm going to start with Battle Ground in Alternative 2, not in 3.

Battle Ground UGA they want to expand at Dollars, towards Dollars Corner for additional employment capacity and to the north for residential capacity and they're going to remove the southwest portion of the UGA. Can we put the Battle Ground map up, is that possible.

That just lets you know, and I believe that's known as the Meadow Glade section. Staff, is that right, that Meadow Glade goes they want to expand? You can see that hatched part down there. See where Battle Ground is, that's what wants to go.

And with that said, I'd bring it back to us. And is there any -- does anybody want to speak to the Battle Ground change? That was a recommendation by staff obviously if you haven't, you guys got all your papers you can see what that is. Do we have --

BARCA: This is --

JOHNSON: Oh, sorry.

BARCA: -- Ron Barca. Question for staff. What I'm looking at is the study that was done, land use alternatives comparison by housing, I'm seeing in Battle Ground when we look at Alternative 2 it appears like 390 residences have been taken out of their inventory, just want to confirm that, with the loss of Meadow Glade?

ALVAREZ: I think that's, I think that's correct. But you mean capacity-wise?

BARCA: Capacity-wise, yes.

ALVAREZ: Yes, that seems accurate.

BARCA: So, bringing that to the rest of the Commissioners in the context of housing and the State's priorities I just want to make sure everybody is aware by just following this edict as put down by the City of Battle Ground's request we are actually losing housing capacity with Alternative 2 proposal.

HARROUN: This is Commissioner Harroun. Just so and this is kind of where I get jumping back and forth because in Alternative 3.A it says, "In addition to the request in alternative 2, this alternative includes additional UGA expansion to the east for housing," and I'm not sure if that is indicated on the map that we're currently looking at, but I'm wondering is that, would that alleviate some of those concerns there?

BARCA: This is Ron Barca. It would depend upon once again I guess whether it's a conversion of ag land.

ALVAREZ: So. All right. So, two things. The --

HARROUN: So Alternative Number 3, Alt 3.A, Battle Ground, which is that piece that and --

ALVAREZ: They're proposing expansions on the east side. This is Alternative 2. I can share Alternative 3. So, these are the areas that they are proposing to add in Alternative 3.

And just to clarify on Commissioner Barca's question, they are losing that, but they are making some changes internally and they have sufficient capacity to accommodate the growth that they were allocated.

BARCA: This is Ron Barca. So, after the analysis was published Battle Ground made an additional change?

ALVAREZ: No.

BARCA: No.

ALVAREZ: No. In their proposal and their removal of that area to the south, they're primarily moving to the west for employment. They have done some subarea planning within the city and they're showing that they have sufficient capacity to accommodate the population.

ORJIAKO: This is Oliver Orjiako, Planning Director. I think what Planning Commissioner Ron, your observation is proper. I think what Jose is trying to share is that why they made the change to remove the Meadow Glade area because they see no utility for keeping that area in their urban growth boundary. They made changes internal to their existing urban growth boundary.

What do I mean by that? Upzoning, changing some opportunity to increase density within their

existing urban growth boundary and with that they can accommodate the growth that they're asking for or that was allocated to them and without any further expansion.

And I think if you saw their letter and their testimony they're -- I believe that is consistent with their testimony that they will recommend Alternative 2 and moving towards Dollars Corner and deleting or removing the Meadow Glade area with a very small - Jose, if you can go back to Alt 2. So, you can see what look like to the northeast corner of the urban growth boundary, you may not see it very well unless Jose pulls the map down, you can see that, yeah, right there.

They've also made changes internal to their existing urban growth boundary also with that little addition for extension, so with that they can accommodate the growth that they're asking for. That is Alt 2 without any expansion or any other site in Alt 3, so that is really what they're telling us and they testified to that.

BARCA: This is Ron Barca. So, for the Commissioners, the primary reason I'm bringing this up is the idea that as even as Oliver described it the City of Battle Ground doesn't see a lot of utility in Meadow Glade but it's adjacent to their boundary, it has urban services and indeed to leave it with the County I think does a disservice to the County itself.

And as a County plan and us planning for urban expansions it feels like to me that the Meadow Glade area adjacent to Battle Ground does genuinely and distinctly belong with Battle Ground.

So, I'm bringing this up because I would like to make the motion to actually to keep Meadow Glade within the Battle Ground UGA and give them the Dollars Corner selection that they have asked for.

MONTGOMERY: And then to clarify, what about this residential parcel?

BARCA: Yes, as well.

HARROUN: So, to clarify your motion, so it would be what's indicated in Alternative 2, keep additionally keeping the Meadow Glade area but nothing in Alternative 3 or you would include the Alternative 3 in that motion?

BARCA: As I believe we are only looking at 2.A at the moment.

JOHNSON: We can change how we're looking at it. So, if we, like I said, I was just when you were going through this, sorry to interrupt you, but when we're looking at Battle Ground or any city and we want to look over and say, okay look, what does 3 look like, we can if you'd like to just take care of each city at a time.

It doesn't matter how we do it whether we jump from 2 to 3 or whether we just say, okay, this is what we want to do, that can be written in as a recommendation. So, my point to you is I understand what you're trying to do here.

BARCA: Okay. This is Ron Barca. Under those circumstances I guess that I would make the **motion**

then that the Dollars Corner area as described in 2.A, the residential section also as described as 2.A for addition and keeping the Meadow Glade into it, not including any of the residential area that would be described in, is it 3.A, that would be my motion.

JOHNSON: Do I have a second?

MONTGOMERY: I'll **second**. LeDuc Montgomery.

JOHNSON: We have a motion and a second that would combine Alt 2.A and Alt 3.A but with a part of that that says that Battle Ground does not remove the southwest portion known as Meadow Glade. Jeff, can we have a -- sorry.

BARCA: Oh, point of order. Nothing from 3.A was included in my motion.

JOHNSON: Oh, I thought you said you wanted to add -- sorry, say it again then, I apologize.

BARCA: No. No. So, it would be the Dollars Corner area --

JOHNSON: Exchange for Meadow Glade.

BARCA: -- the residential area described also in 2.A, the inclusion of Meadow Glade and nothing from 3.A.

JOHNSON: So, correction for the record. It will be Alt 2.A only, it will be as written for Battle Ground, and then with the exception that the southwest portion of the UGA stays within Battle Ground's city; is that correct? Okay. With that said, can I get --

HARROUN: Discussion.

JOHNSON: -- oh, discussion. Thank you. Go ahead.

HARROUN: This is Commissioner Harroun. I guess my concern is, I guess my thinking process is I tend to defer to the cities process of what they've asked for, and it was confusing to me why they were pulling out the Meadow Glade area when it was already included in their UGA.

And I agree with you as far as dumping that back on the city or dumping that on to the County isn't really to the benefit of the County. It's like they have it, they asked for it originally, they get to keep it and service it.

I know it's probably a cost; my guess is it's kind of a costing thing, you know, if they can get rid of it, they don't have to provide services for it and then and residential property is expensive for cities, that would be my just assumption.

I look at Alternative 3 wondering why they're -- the additional land, it makes sense from the map of why they're asking for that, and I think it's probably a higher quality residential development, so I

would be hesitant to cut that portion out, I would probably like to include that, but other than that I would, you know, be a strong supporter of the motion on hand.

JOHNSON: Discussion anymore? Okay. Hearing none, Jeff, can we get a vote, please.

ROLL CALL VOTE – ALTERNATIVE 2.A (MODIFIED), MOTION TO APPROVE

HALBERT: AYE

BERGTHOLD: AYE

FADNESS: AYE

BARCA: AYE

HARROUN: AYE

MONTGOMERY: AYE

JOHNSON: NO

DELAPENA: 6/1.

PLANNING COMMISSION DELIBERATIONS

JOHNSON: Motion passes. All right. So, we move on now to 2.B the Camas UGA and this is to expand the Camas UGA to include the Grove Field Airport. Discussion or questions for staff?

FADNESS: This is Commissioner Fadness. I just wanted to kind of express my support for this. I did my flight training at Grove, and I know that this is kind of a big thing for the Port of Camas and Washougal in order to be able to kind of expand the services there.

Right now, it's a very small little runway that it's not really usable for much other than some little Cessnas. So, I would just like to start out and make a **motion** to include this or to recommend yes on this item.

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

JOHNSON: We have a motion and a second. Is there any discussion? Clarification, we have a motion and a second to include the Camas Grove Airfield into the UGA. Do we have any discussion?

MONTGOMERY: Yes. This is Alicia LeDuc Montgomery. I'm just curious if there's thoughts around the fact that the Alternative 2 would create more surplus because we've been talking about constraints, if anybody has thoughts on that piece, although I recognize it's an airport.

JOHNSON: It's just an airport; right? It's just the airport; correct?

FADNESS: Yeah. Yeah.

MONTGOMERY: And maybe I'm just --

ALVAREZ: Yes, that's correct. Alternative 2 is just the airport.

MONTGOMERY: So maybe I'm not understanding the charts where it's like the land use alternative comparison and capacity for employment and housing and when I'm looking at Camas under the Alt 2 it seems like it's increasing the surplus compared to Alt 1. Can you just explain that a little bit.

ALVAREZ: Yeah. Right. So, they've made some changes inside their UGA to increase their density in order to accommodate the less than 80 percent median family income, and then also they're required by State law to allow for duplexes and I think it's duplex, triplexes under a new bill and so that's increased their capacity but they're not proposing any expansion to their UGA, so these are changes internal to them to the existing UGA.

MONTGOMERY: Okay. Thank you.

JOHNSON: Any other discussion? Hearing none, Jeff, can we get a roll call, please.

ROLL CALL VOTE – ALTERNATIVE 2.B, MOTION TO APPROVE

HALBERT: AYE

BERGTHOLD: AYE

FADNESS: AYE

BARCA: AYE

HARROUN: AYE

MONTGOMERY: AYE

JOHNSON: AYE

DELAPENA: 7/0.

PLANNING COMMISSION DELIBERATIONS

JOHNSON: Motion carries. Moving on to La Center UGA.

HARROUN: Chair.

JOHNSON: Yes.

HARROUN: I'd like to make a **motion** regarding Camas.

JOHNSON: Go ahead.

HARROUN: I move that we include Camas's request for Option 3.B for expansion to the east, or excuse me, for the, this says east for housing but it's not housing, it's jobs is what they were asking for in their letter.

JOHNSON: So, we're looking at the orange section on the map?

HARROUN: Correct.

JOHNSON: Okay. We have a I guess an add to combining 3.A -- wait, we have a motion. Check that. This is a separate motion, check that. So, we have an add on 3.B which is in addition to the request of Alternative 2, which we just passed, this alternative includes the additional UGA expansion to the east for housing.

HARROUN: And that's incorrect on here because it's jobs land is what the City of Camas was asking. So, the area that's highlighted in orange is specifically for jobs that the City of Camas was asking for.

JOHNSON: Staff, can you comment to that why it says housing and one says jobs?

ALVAREZ: So, what they provided us and what was studied in the DEIS is housing.

HARROUN: What the City has testified to and what the letters that we've received have been about jobs for that portion of property.

ALVAREZ: They've changed their tune multiple times on this property, and what was studied in the DEIS is for housing notwithstanding their last comments.

HARROUN: So, I would still move to include this into Camas's, the recommendation for Camas's UGA and I have some pretty solid reasons for it, but we can talk about that in a second.

JOHNSON: We have a motion to include Item 3.B into Camas's UGA. Do we have a second?

FADNESS: This is Commissioner Fadness. **Second.**

JOHNSON: We have a motion and a second. Is there any discussion regarding the addition of the Camas Alt 3, or excuse me, 3.B?

HARROUN: Yeah. This is Commissioner Harroun. So, here's my, the biggest thing for me on this land is it's currently zoned ag. It's a great opportunity when we talk about the TDRs and some of that.

But the biggest thing that I would like to point out is there's 17, 18 individual lots, one which is a, you know, half of it basically, the other ones are basically five acre, they're five-acre parcels. We've received testimony that if it doesn't get brought in, they're just going to sell off the five-acre parcels.

Now, from a development standpoint my recommendation to the -- for maximum dollar value for the sellers would be sell them as individual, I mean because they would make the absolute most money by selling those as McMansion plots.

But the family has said, hey, for this, we love the community of Camas and we want this to be jobs land, we think it's the highest and best use is for jobs land for the community and they're actually taking in my pencil math between a 2 and upwards of a \$6 million hit by having it, by requesting that

their land be zoned commercial rather than selling it off as five-acre parcels right now.

And so, I look at it as a, you know, and they've stated multiple times in testimony that they will sell the individual parcels and I don't blame them if it's not, but I think for Camas from a jobs perspective, for the long-term viability of the community and then it's a real gift from those owners to be even asking to do this.

And so, and then on the flip side you overlay that with, if you put a bunch of McMansions on there we get no TDRs out of that, there's no agricultural benefit in the future.

And so, I look at it from an environmental standpoint, from a desire to actually preserve farmland standpoint and as a -- really a gift to the community of Camas. And so that's, yeah, so that would be my advocacy for bringing that in.

FADNESS: I just have a clarifying question from staff. Is this currently zoned ag or was this zoned for -- okay. So how was it able to be split the way it is, is that the cluster development?

ALVAREZ: Clark County has a long and varied history on zoning density in the rural area and so this could have been done before 20-acre minimums were required in the 1994 plan. There's a history of one-acre zoning FX that was predominant and that's what led to most of the parcelization that we have in the rural area going back to the late '60s.

ORJIAKO: Go ahead, Chris.

COOK: This is Chris Cook. This land is zoned for agriculture. There is as we know a ton of criteria required to de-designate agricultural land and it can't be brought into the urban growth boundary as ag land now so it would have to be de-designated.

None of you have mentioned anything about whether this land should be de-designated. So, you don't have to if you don't want to, but I would consider the strength of your decision in the absence of a determination about whether this should be de-designated or not.

BARCA: This is Ron Barca. Jack, I heard you mention the fact that there was the potential with this as being part of a TDR program but none of that is in your motion either.

And as I spoke earlier on this, as we continue to put more land into this EIS, if we don't have some mechanism in place for validating, and to Chris's point, the de-designating, we're going to have such an overage of land brought into the plan that we are not going to be able to support or defend these decisions.

So right now, without any type of discussion about de-designation with interlocal agreements that place protections on ag land, I'm not going to find myself in a position to vote for any piece of ag land in the plan right at the moment.

But I want to really stress that with all of the stakeholders that have come forward, the cities, the Ag

Commission, farmers themselves, all of them talking about the idea of no net loss, no de-designation without a program, I think this has to be part of our recommendation as well.

And so, my concern is we have a motion and a second, but as we're talking about this in further detail, I think we have to have maybe a lot more discussion about what this means for a piece of ag land like this.

HARROUN: Well, --

BARCA: So, I guess I'm going to ask after this discussion if you would consider either withdrawing or rewording the motion.

HARROUN: Sure. And I'm certainly open to, you know, a friendly amendment if that's the -- two things. I would from a personal perspective I'd caution staff on trying to influence the Commission. It starts to feel like staff is trying to direct our decision-making process and I think that time has passed as far as we've received information from staff and I'm -- and unless, you know, we have a specific question, I get really edgy there because it feels like, oh, well, and you're starting to push and I don't appreciate that, and I don't, you know, I'm not saying that's your intent, I'm just saying how it's coming across to me and how it feels.

As far as, and I guess it may have been more appropriate to look at adopting a broader TDR recommendation on any potential ag land that we were looking at bringing in if that would -- because in my mind especially after reading the letters from the cities, you know, all of the cities that are in support of doing a TDR and some of the case law around TDRs or a innovative approach I think is what, you know, is that the WAC states about resource land.

That it's -- I'm in full support of requiring a TDR and urban hold on any land that's brought into the UGA, you know, prior to it being, you know, rezoned I guess. Does that make sense? Is that -- are we on the same page there or is that kind of what you're thinking?

BARCA: That definitely resonates with what I'm getting at, but just to be clear it's not in the motion right now.

HARROUN: Correct.

MONTGOMERY: This is LeDuc Montgomery. And I too thought this particular property or request was sort of like a classic example where we could discuss the TDR potential, right, because maybe in this particular property, you know, there's a lot of compelling reasons to go one way or the other, but it may just as well be the exact same scenario on another property in the future.

And when we're thinking like broader context of the great wealth transfer and boomers, you know, retiring and we heard a lot about, you know, folks having their reasons to sell but then heard a lot of testimony on how difficult it is to become a farmer or to sustain being a farmer in light of the land prices and speculation going on that maybe this is then the opportunity for that TDR and a recommendation of, you know, as if the County is going to implement that program, here's some

particular areas we've identified that may be a good candidate for initial sending or receiving, you know, processes.

And certainly, with the letter coming in from the cities in support, I just wonder how unique that is that we have an opportunity to meet a lot of different needs in a creative but also it sounds like somewhat unanimous way that the community is asking for.

And so I would, I share a concern specifically when we're looking at numbers in Camas where this would maybe just add to some of the surplus and be removing ag land without an equal designation of, you know, sustainable farmland, that would be my concern in voting no on the current iteration of your motion, but if we could maybe get into TDRs and there's something else, I'm not per se against what lands could be good candidates for de-designation within that framework.

HARROUN: Chair, I'd like to amend my main motion. I move that we recommend bringing in the land that's east of Camas as the City has indicated for jobs land as long as there is a mechanism put in place for the preservation of or a Transfer of Development Rights for agricultural, for agricultural purposes.

JOHNSON: Do I have a second to that amendment?

BARCA: I guess I would like a little more clarity, yeah, on what we're really talking about. I think we're going to have to spell it right out, Jack.

HARROUN: Chair, I'm wondering if it -- because I think we're going to run into this same motion issue several times, if perhaps, you know, I'll withdraw my main motion first.

We'll deal with maybe a TDR recommendation for any resource land and if you, if Ron or somebody you have a better way of wording what that would potentially look like, then we can maybe put that as an overlay on any of our discussions. I mean, if that's, you know, will of Council or will of the group.

JOHNSON: So, if I may add to this.

HARROUN: Yeah.

JOHNSON: The challenge that I see, correct me if I'm wrong staff, the TDR is a big lift, it's not something that can be done right away, so it's going to take time and of course it's not something that hasn't been proposed before the County or talked about at least and at the Councilors.

So I just want to make sure when we're talking about doing this it's not like we're going to go let's put some type of, I don't think there is, that we're going to put some type of, hey, let's do a TDR, you know, this year and then these will be, once that's going to happen right away is my point, it's not going to happen, I mean I don't see it happening right away.

So, what I'm trying to get through is, again I'm -- I understand what you're doing, and I probably support it at some level, but I don't know. Like now I'm going, okay, which one of these, we have all this ag land, Ridgefield, La Center, Camas, who else, maybe Vancouver, but anyways, that are going to

fall under this.

And so therefore whatever we put out there regarding TDRs, and maybe I should have started with that first, is going to be something that says, look, this is really really important that we want to advance forward and that if you hear us say for example on this property here that we're only entertaining that idea of de-designation only if that, if that passes legal and all the scrutiny, you know, the lawsuits that are going to follow, I'm not saying they will, I'm just saying that if we don't do anything and said let's bring that in, trust me, you know, we're going to be in court, so...

So, my challenge is making sure that whatever that TDR says let's get it right. So, are you on your motion are you descending your motion?

HARROUN: So, yeah, just for cleanness, I **withdraw** my motion.

JOHNSON: Chris, is that all you have to do in withdrawing a motion just withdraw? Can a motion be withdrawn if there's been no vote? Okay. The motion is withdrawn. Now what I'd like to do is ask for a discussion on TDRs and a TDR motion or a TDR framework that we can send to Council. Okay. Yes.

BERGTHOLD: Karl.

JOHNSON: Yes.

BERGTHOLD: This is Commissioner Bergthold, I've been trying to get a word, you guys are going hot and heavy there. Looking over the staff report and with everything we heard tonight about the TDR I would like to see a recommendation to Council, and I can make a motion if you'd like, the only thing I'm having trouble with is basically the same recommendation that's in the Next Steps slide.

So, it says, "Recommendations to Council may include future study of TDR program with a broad community involvement including reps of the Ag Commission, development community and local jurisdictions."

I'm all for that. The only thing I'm questioning about is future as I would like to put a time limit on when that would begin. Obviously my thinking it would be after we are done with the comprehensive plan, it's all buttoned up, put to bed, then I can see that it would be very helpful and then put this, you know, I agree, it needs to be addressed and a recommendation to look at it.

I think it could be very helpful to the County just from what I'm seeing, but if we can get this on the table, take action on it, then I think that will make the rest of going through the options a lot cleaner, but there's no way as you said, Karl, that we're going to be able to do put a TDR reference or stipulation on any of these options.

JOHNSON: That's -- yeah, thanks. That's kind of why I said let's just kind of put something blanket that we would like this brought up and then proceed on and --

BERGTHOLD: Would you like me to make a motion on that, but is there cement put on time-wise?

JOHNSON: I don't think that's, that's something that staff is going to probably have to work out in my mind, yep.

BERGTHOLD: Well, then I'd like to make a **motion** that we recommend to Council that they do a future study of the TDR program with a broad community involvement including the representatives of Ag Commission, development community and local jurisdictions.

JOHNSON: Do we have a second to that motion? So, the motion **dies**.

BERGTHOLD: Okay.

JOHNSON: No second.

BARCA: Chair, Ron Barca. Let me just say this towards Mark's motion. The reason I can't support it, Mark, is because these parcels as ag land need to be de-designated once they go into anybody's urban growth area.

We have an overwhelming amount of testimony about the idea that we have a surplus of land, we have a populous and many stakeholders that are saying do not de-designate.

If we don't form some aspect of equity, we're not going to be building trust with the community at this moment in time and we have an opportunity I think to bridge that gap, the lack of trust from the different stakeholders.

What I would be looking at is something much more along the line that says any ag land that this Commission votes to bring into an urban growth area, acknowledging the fact that de-designation has to come with it, it would be subject to an urban overlay, a Interlocal Agreement that states clearly a TDR program has to be up and functioning and there has to be equity in that program that allows for an equal amount of land to become designated as ag land at the same time.

So, we end up with a no net loss and a TDR program for the aspect of bringing ag land into an urban area, we're also then going to start protecting future parcels in that fashion.

BERGTHOLD: So, Ron, do you see that as those two motions as being conflicting?

BARCA: Yes, I do because the time is that these particular parcels are subject to a functioning TDR program before any annexation or the aspect of any development could occur on them with the way that I was looking at it as opposed to what I heard you say which would be a future study.

HARROUN: So, this is Commissioner Harroun. I understand your concerns there and I think I lean real heavily on what Ridgefield's proposed and it's basically you have to de-designate to bring it into the urban growth by statute.

However, they can put an overlay or an urban hold on it, and it can't be developed, it basically stays in

its current, you know, state until an Interlocal Agreement and a TDR program is set up and then when that's set up, then that urban holding comes off of that land and then it can be developed.

One of the things that really bothered me about -- from the Ag Commission thing was there should be no net loss of agriculturally designated farm land, that is, that's not workable and the reason for that is we're taking ag land and then we're permanently preserving some additional ag land, but in order to, from my reading, in order to have no net loss, you would have to find non-ag land and convert that to ag land.

Well, that doesn't work in a marketplace because you then have to find like a bunch R-5 property and then convert that into agricultural land and then the economics don't work behind that versus what we're doing is we're going out and finding large parcels, large ag farmland and permanently, you know, paying those existing farmers and then permanently preserving that land but we're not, it's not a no net loss function because there is going to be net loss, you know, from the ag land so that's -- because it won't, if it's a no net loss, it doesn't work in the marketplace if that makes sense.

BERGTHOLD: This is Mark. If we took that off and just said we recommend that Council commission a study of the TDR programs, period, have a TDR program, so it at least gets it on their agenda, gets it on their planning hat, would that be acceptable?

HARROUN: Well, I think the concern is we want to make sure that when we bring this land in that we're taking the opportunity to have the developers purchase, purchase the TDR, the development rights of another farm --

BERGTHOLD: Right. I understand.

HARROUN: -- and then preserving that, so that would be the recommendation. So however, Ridgefield laid it out it was pretty clear as far as, you know, what they were looking at, it made sense to me.

BERGTHOLD: I'm just hesitant, Jack, to say to put that requirement in there, which I agree with you, I think it's reasonable, but without recommending that they even study it. If we just throw something in there that we haven't made a recommendation on before, it just seems like we're skipping a step, that's all.

HARROUN: Ron, what was your kind of --

BARCA: I think the TDR has been studied in Clark County a lot. We've only at this moment in time found the need for it because Alternative 1 and 2, which appear to have an adequate amount of capacity in them are going to meet the necessity to meet the OFM numbers and be defensible.

Right now, the land in the marketplace is constrained, it makes TDRs work. If we put a lot of inventory back into the urban growth areas, there will be no need for us to have any receivers and then there won't be anybody that would be sending TDRs that way. So, it would -- it would break the economics of doing it.

If we don't put this in there that the only way the ag land comes in is to be part of some program that it's up to the Council to put it together. It's also within the purview of the Council to have the time frame that says we will work through an Interlocal Agreement, and have it take the time necessary to put a program in place, that is the only way that we're going to be able to get time certain and the aspect of the protection that we need.

I don't need to go into the aspects of whether net loss or no net loss is important, I think the marketplace would actually drive the value in both ways depending upon how robust the marketplace ends up being for TDRs, but I think the important part right now is every one of these proposals for every piece of agricultural land is adding to the inventory and the capacity and driving down the market decision about whether a TDR program is viable, that's the right word, viable.

And so, Mark, I don't think we can afford to say bring it in and then study it to see if you want to do it because as soon as we bring it in and there is nothing in place, the cities annex it, the capacity rolls over to the UGA and the need to have the TDR program is moot.

HARROUN: Well, I appreciate your point. The City of Ridgefield, the reason that they're bringing the TDR thing in is because they lost at the Growth Hearings Board the last round because they didn't have an innovative approach for doing that, so...

So, I understand your concern; however, I think it's -- they're all going to need it otherwise I don't think it is going to pass legal muster if we don't have a TDR program when it gets challenged.

So that's kind of my -- so I think we're on the same page, I think we just probably need a clean motion as far as how that would look as far as bringing it in with the understanding that a TDR program is going to be, that there will be a urban hold until a TDR program is implemented.

JOHNSON: Let me get some clarification here. I might straighten this up by saying this. Let's go back to what we were doing as far as process here. I'd like to walk through Alternative 2 each one of them then, and we'll go to Alternative 3, and at that time except for Ridgefield and La Center, so when we get to those we will.

So, for right now what I would like to ask for as the Chair is Alternative 2.B I would like to ask for, just on that alone, standalone, that does mean we're not going to look at 3, any of the 3s or anything else, can I get a motion or is there a motion available for Alternative 2.B. Do you understand?

FADNESS: A point of clarification, we already voted on 2.B.

JOHNSON: Oh, I did that again. Sorry. Okay. Can we move on then. And, again, I'm not diminishing the fact that we still have to deal with that piece of property that we were just looking at.

2.C, La Center's UGA. La Center wants to expand the UGA to the north and the south for additional employment capacity on the agricultural resource. Jose, this is just funny. I did that on purpose. Employment capacity on the agriculture resource designated lands.

So, in this case, look, I would either take a motion, an up or down motion on the La Center UGA or I would take a motion that ties somehow a TDR to it. I'm looking at yours, Ron, maybe that's it, I don't know how. What I want to do is just keep going on these as best we can because it seems like we're getting bogged down on this TDR discussion, which can happen, but I don't know if it's going to get us through the night and I'd like to get this voted on by the night's end if that's possible.

HARROUN: Well, yeah, this is Commissioner Harroun. I totally get it. I just wanted to make sure that the fellow Commissioners, I think we're on the same page with TDRs, right, and so, but there's hesitation to vote on anything if there isn't a TDR Agreement done first and that's kind of where, so I don't know if there was something that --

JOHNSON: Looking for a motion on the TDRs then again that would cover the basis as we proceed forward on each of these alternative numbers. Ron, would you like to do that or not?

BARCA: This is Ron Barca. I'd like to make a **motion** that says, "Any ag land considered for UGA inclusion would be subject to an urban overlay and an Interlocal Agreement --

COOK: Urban holding.

BARCA: "Urban holding" thank you. Correction "urban holding and an Interlocal Agreement that allows a time certain for an equitable TDR program to be developed by the County resulting in an equitable solution to ag de-designation and designation in the County."

HARROUN: This is Commissioner Harroun. I'll **second** that.

JOHNSON: We have a motion and a second. Is there any discussion on that?

MONTGOMERY: LeDuc Montgomery. Can we modify that to specify the participation of the Agricultural Commission in that process or is that necessary in your view?

BARCA: I'm not opposed to the modification. It has been seconded. Are you willing to accept the modification of the inclusion of the Ag Commission in the formation of the TDR program?

HARROUN: As long as it would include business interests as well.

BARCA: Can we say all stakeholders?

HARROUN: All stakeholders. Okay.

JOHNSON: So, we have a motion and a second to proceed with the TDR program including all stakeholders, which is very vague, but we'll take that. We have a motion and a second. Can I get a roll call.

ROLL CALL VOTE – TDR PROGRAM, MOTION TO APPROVE

HALBERT: AYE
BERGTHOLD AYE
FADNESS: NAY
BARCA: AYE
HARROUN: AYE
MONTGOMERY: AYE
JOHNSON: NO

DELAPENA: 5/2.

PLANNING COMMISSION DELIBERATIONS

JOHNSON: Motion passes. Okay. So, let's go to 2.C, La Center UGA. Based on the motion that has been made regarding the TDR to expand La Center's UGA to the north and southwest for additional employment capacity on the ag resource designated lands. Is that Washougal, or excuse me, La Center? What am I looking at?

FADNESS: It's La Center.

JOHNSON: So, we're adding, Jose, can you help me out here what I'm looking at.

ALVAREZ: Sure. This is La Center, the C-1 area is the area that's being proposed on to the north and to the south this area that's proposed to be IL and C-1.

FADNESS: So, this is Commissioner Fadness. I'd like to ask a question of staff. I saw that in the public comments received that there was note that we had some discussion on what was brought into the tribe during the last Commission meeting and that there had been actually an agreement between the City of La Center and the Tribe to bring that in, are you guys able to speak on that at all? That was kind of the first that I had heard of that.

ALVAREZ: Yeah, I think that that was the first I had heard of it as well.

ORJIAKO: That was the first time staff was hearing about that. There was some in the past I've read - this is Oliver Orjiako - I've read newspaper accounts of land that the City have maybe allowed the tribe to buy, but the testimony that you heard at the last hearing was the first time staff is hearing about that.

FADNESS: And my understanding is that land that was brought into the tribe was not calculated into the VBLM; correct?

ALVAREZ: Let's see. I think at the time we ran the model we included the capacity because it hadn't been taken into trust yet.

FADNESS: So, did these numbers that we have here does that, is that inclusive? Sorry.

ALVAREZ: It's inclusive of the land that was taken into the trust by the tribe.

COOK: When it was taken into tribe?

ALVAREZ: Yes, because we ran the model before they took it into trust, yeah. And that's --

FADNESS: So, when I look and see for Alternative 2 that there's a surplus of employment of 869 that would mean including that, including that land?

ALVAREZ: Correct.

FADNESS: Okay. Thank you.

HARROUN: This is Commissioner Harroun. Just for clarification, if you look at the C-1 that's listed in red, my understanding that the land that's been purchased, it's the boot portion of that land is now tribe's land, is that -- so there's three parcels there highlighted, the one parcel on the left is now tribe's land. It's not been brought into trust yet and that's a different process, but it is now currently owned by the tribe.

ALVAREZ: That's correct as of December of 2025.

MONTGOMERY: Oh, go ahead.

FADNESS: No, go ahead.

MONTGOMERY: LeDuc Montgomery. I think just in keeping with our prior conversations about TDRs and concerns about creating excess, and I know maybe we've been doing these motions yes or no on exactly how it's worded here, I would be open to a motion that may be no; however, you know, we could suggest that this particular request be like prioritized for review and consideration when, if when a TDR program is implemented so that these types of requests, I mean coming from a space of not wanting to de-designate agricultural land without, you know, some sort of designation or addressing those issues but making room for these requests to get that priority consideration if there is TDR and just be moved right to the front of the line essentially.

FADNESS: Well, I believe that with the previous motion that that's already the case now that where if we vote to include these in the UGA they are now subject to the TDR and so that --

MONTGOMERY: Okay.

FADNESS: -- I believe that may be redundant.

MONTGOMERY: That, okay, that clarifies. Is that everybody's understanding as well? Okay. Thanks.

JOHNSON: Okay. Oh, go ahead.

BARCA: Ron Barca. Taking off of what Commissioner Fadness said concerning the idea that a portion of what we are looking at is now in tribal trust, does it make sense to cleave that?

ALVAREZ: That's not in trust.

BARCA: It's not in trust yet?

ALVAREZ: Correct.

BARCA: Okay. Sorry. I take that back then. Okay. Never mind.

JOHNSON: With that said, we're back to looking for a motion and this motion would include I would assume the language of the TDR amendment.

FADNESS: This is Commissioner Fadness. I make a **motion** to recommend no on Alternative 2.C.

JOHNSON: Do we have a second? Okay. The motion **dies**. Ron?

BARCA: Commissioner, could you give me a little highlight on why you made that particular motion?

FADNESS: My thought behind it is that because the employment around the casino, the tribe and a lot of those businesses there, is not included in these numbers.

That with Alternative 2 we're already seeing a surplus of 869, that does not include any of those jobs that are involved with the tribal reservation there, the casino as well, and so I think that it's inappropriate to de-designate that land, that agricultural land in order to create an even larger surplus of employment in that area.

HARROUN: This is Commissioner Harroun. I actually take a totally different look at the tribe's, the tribe's land, and the City of La Center. The City of La Center was financially devastated when the casino came in because they took basically all their revenue.

The tribes when they purchase land that's ag land or any land they're not subject to any of the laws particularly that we are as citizens of the United States, it's a sovereign nation, and there's nothing wrong with that, it's just they have advantages that our local jurisdictions don't have, you know, they're not subject to SEPA, they're not subject to de-designation, they're not subject to, you know, TDRs or anything.

Additionally, they don't have to be contiguous, where they could go 50 miles down the street, buy a big parcel of land and take that into reserve and start doing development there. The City of La Center has to be contiguous, and they absolutely need jobs land to fund themselves.

So, any jobs land that goes into the tribe all that tax revenue goes to the tribe. And so, as La Center

continues to grow, they need jobs land for the tax base to support their community.

Additionally, they -- we need to get them set up so they're not landlocked because if the tribe puts a ring around them, they cannot expand at all and so then you have this really upside down community with zero revenue and all these services that they need to provide and so, you know, they dissolve and now all that stuff gets down, you know, gets dumped onto the County or we provide that community what they're requesting and give them a fighting chance to survive, give them the tax base so they can fund their services and then hopefully not become landlocked.

That's -- and quite frankly I lean real heavily on each of these communities that have their county councils, their planning commission, their stakeholders that have come up with a plan for their community and I give heavy deference to each of those communities because that's what they're asking us and it's not for me to try to dictate to them, and I'm not saying that's what you're trying to do, but, you know, I'm like, okay, you make a really strong argument, I can support that, you know, because that's what's best for your community and that's what you see, so that's what I'm seeing.

So, I would like to make a **motion** to approve 2.C to allow La Center to expand its UGA to the north and southwest for additional employment capacity on agricultural resource designated land.

JOHNSON: Do I have a second?

HALBERT: Commissioner Bryan Halbert. I'd like to **second** that motion and I appreciate Jack's argument on behalf of La Center.

JOHNSON: We have a motion and a second. Is there any more discussion?

MONTGOMERY: This is LeDuc Montgomery. I'd just note when we're looking at the chart here that if, you know, the Alt 2 would create some surplus but the Alternative 1 of doing nothing or, you know, not approving it would result in the deficit.

And then of course we were just having discussions about if we're looking into really implementing a TDR program La Center was one of the entities that signed on in wanting to create some of that trust moving through that type of public process, you know, this is the one Alt 2 request that seems like it's defensible because if we denied it, it would result in a deficit, so that's my two cents.

JOHNSON: I too, I look at this one like it's the unique one and I've struggled with it the whole time. I appreciate your comments, Jack, regarding the tribe and regarding how La Center is desperately trying to find ways to recover from and their upper limit capacity, but I still just want to make sure that that TDR for the record that's part of this and on each of these so that we're not putting ourselves in a bind that the cart's not before the horse.

So, with that said, we have a motion, we have a second. Is there any more discussion? Hearing none, can we get a roll call, Jeff.

ROLL CALL VOTE – ALTERNATIVE 2.C, MOTION TO APPROVE

HALBERT: AYE
BERGTHOLD: AYE
FADNESS: NAY
BARCA: AYE
HARROUN: AYE
MONTGOMERY: AYE
JOHNSON: AYE

DELAPENA: 6/1.

PLANNING COMMISSION DELIBERATIONS

JOHNSON: Okay. The motion passes. Moving on to the Ridgefield UGA. Ridgefield wants to expand their UGA to the north and southwest for additional employment and housing capacity on agricultural resource designated lands, this would take a de-designation. Would anybody like to make a comment on Ridgefield? Do we got Ridgefield up? Yes, we do.

BARCA: Commissioner Barca. Jose, would you please describe what we're seeing on the map and the parcel or parcels that are part of this.

ALVAREZ: Okay. So, to the north is this blue area that's E-MU-3 was the proposed zoning and then to the southwest I think is the one parcel that's landlocked and surrounded by the City of Ridgefield, it's RMD-MU.

HARROUN: So, clarification. That's the parcel?

ORJIAKO: Commissioner, this is Oliver Orjiako, that piece that Jose is showing you, it is out, is known as the Maul property.

BARCA: And the parcel to the north along the freeway what's the vernacular we give that one?

ORJIAKO: I can't tell you, but I believe there are multiple owners on that, but it's the request that the City have submitted based on some of the property owners requests, but I don't think we have a particular name for that.

The reason I mentioned the Maul because you guys have heard testimony from Maul, it is one piece. Historically that when the City of Ridgefield annexed the majority of the ag property for some reason the Maul property was not annexed, I don't know whether that was their decision or whatever the case may be, but that was left out. So, we've known that as the Maul property just in the discussion and reference. The other piece I cannot tell you.

HARROUN: And just for clarification it was like, I think it's called, I've heard it referred to as the doughnut hole, but it's --

ORJIAKO: That is not the doughnut hole.

HARROUN: That's not the doughnut hole, that's not what they're referring to? Okay. But it's a piece of County property that's stuck in the middle of the City, is that more or less am I right there? It's not City, it's County but it's all the way surrounded by City?

ALVAREZ: That's correct.

ORJIAKO: Yes. The doughnut hole is the piece to, Jose can show that much better what is known as the doughnut hole, you can go up, see where that is, that is the piece known as the doughnut hole that is not yet annexed.

HARROUN: That's the property to the north in the red? I'm not seeing it lining up here, so...

ORJIAKO: The property is just right in the middle, it's not well outlined, but you can see it, the cursor is right on the property if you can look at it, that's what we typically call the doughnut hole. Jose's cursor is right on that property.

HARROUN: I don't see the cursor, so...

ORJIAKO: Jose, can you move your cursor. Can you see Jose moving his cursor, yeah, that's the doughnut hole.

JOHNSON: Okay. Just any discussion on Ridgefield's offer?

BARCA: This is Ron Barca. I have a question for staff. E-MU-3 along the freeway, how much of that is proposed for housing and at what density is it proposed, would you please give me that?

ALVAREZ: One second. So that area is employment mixed use. These are the yield assumptions from the Vacant Buildable Lands Model, so I believe the assumption there is that 25 percent of the area would be for housing, 75 percent for jobs at 28 units per acre for housing and 9 units per acre for employment.

BARCA: Thank you.

ALVAREZ: Yes.

JOHNSON: Any other questions? Comments?

MONTGOMERY: This is LeDuc Montgomery, and this is more I guess a question, comment about just looking at some of the potential surpluses these various jurisdictions are requesting, I don't know if folks have any thought on that in tandem with like our TDR proposal.

I know it's a very vague ask, but I guess I'm just looking at, okay, if we're approving, you know, we're

suggesting a TDR program and then say we vote on some of these things that could be creating more surpluses. Do we want to have a conversation about any of that?

HARROUN: This is Commissioner Harroun. So, I appreciate the conversation about the surpluses. I think there's a lot of issues with a lot of the assumed projections and I know we've kind of fallen in the middle on a lot of that, but when we talk about projected density versus achieved density we're looking at, you know, we've had some letters, you know, they're recently just talking about we're really looking at a 17-year-land supply versus a 20-year-land supply because of what we were looking at, you know, there's a lot of things that have already been developed that we're looking, you know, that were originally counted.

So I'm not worried from a, quote, unquote, oversupply of it's like, oh, my gosh, we're going to have too much land for housing, I don't think that would be a terrible thing and I just don't, I think with some of the, a lot of the environmental constraints on a lot of the developable land the yield is a lot less than was anticipated, I mean kind of the ground-truthing of that. So that's kind of my thinking of that.

It's legitimate for sure, right, we can't just go, you know -- you know we have constraints, but I'm not as concerned with it because I don't think we're too far off the target either way, so...

BARCA: This is Ron Barca. So, Commissioner Montgomery, that was specifically why I asked Jose about what the mix was and because there's a predominance of employment, it runs right along the freeway and at the same time there's some high density housing opportunity there, I think that changes my thought process on it as opposed to if it was primarily all going to be all residential.

MONTGOMERY: Yeah, thanks, I appreciate that. Because I noticed and I get we're changing this somewhat with the TDR aspect, but there was still a deficit in the jobs, you know, growth so, yeah, I appreciate your question.

FADNESS: Yeah, I kind of second what Ron's saying there especially with I know that a lot of municipalities are kind of struggling with having to provide housing for income bands and I think that including these mixed use developments is a smart way to accomplish that.

I also think that the Maul property in the south, you know, it doesn't really make sense that that one is not included in the City at this point as well, it's obviously not agricultural land in the traditional sense.

HARROUN: Can we pull up, because I was thinking Alternative 3 to see if there's, there was an additional ask from Ridgefield. It says in addition to the request to Alternate 2 includes the additional UGA expansion on agricultural resource land to the northeast and additional housing and employment capacity to the southeast, so I'm just kind of wondering which, what parcels that we're looking at there.

ALVAREZ: Yep. So, the area to the highlighted in yellow to the north CNB, CNB-MU to the north, and then to the south there's an RMD mixed use that's proposed, so those are the three areas that are in Alternative 3 that are not in Alternative 2.

JOHNSON: This is kind of one that, you know, Ridgefield is right on, it's growing fast, in my mind the schools aren't keeping up with the growth, the roads are trying their best but it's a zoo, and I understand what we're saying here, but the amount of pushback on this to me is just not sustainable.

That could just be my eye test versus the reality. I understand the de-designation is a tough one especially of course without a TDR, but I just I don't feel as comfortable with this one as I do with La Center just because the amount how this thing is just exploding.

Every time we come with Ridgefield it just (inaudible sound) and somehow we've got to this to a point of where services catch up with its growth and I'm just not sure we're there yet. I could be convinced otherwise, but I just don't feel comfortable.

FADNESS: Karl, could I ask. Are you discussing just Alternative 3 or was that Alternative 2 as well?

JOHNSON: No, I was talking about alternative, I mean I looked at what he said, that was just I was looking at Alternative 2.

FADNESS: Thank you.

JOHNSON: Yep.

HARROUN: This is Commissioner Harroun. I think I understand that especially, you know, from a rural mindset of there is a lot of people out here that have come out here.

I think we can't not look at the impact of what happens if we don't allow Ridgefield to take this in and I mean it's like the doughnut hole, or not the doughnut hole or whatever, the Maul property, that's probably not, but you have the northern portion that Ridgefield's asking, if the tribe buys it, it gets developed and again all of that revenue, all of that work, they by law the City has to supply services to the tribal land and they buy that, they take that into trust, which they will do, and then now all of that tax revenue is not to the citizens of Clark County, it's not to the City of Ridgefield to provide for those services, it's now tribal.

And so, I think there's some real, we need to be real thoughtful about some of the realities on the ground and that the cities are asking for this property and they've gone through their process.

So, again, I mean I'm of the mind to grant them their request or to recommend their request because it will get developed and it won't get developed with a TDR if it's, you know, it's not required to get developed with a TDR if it's not through the County; if it's through the tribe it's not. So that's kind of my take.

And, again, I go back to the City, the City had a process, it's what they want for their community and if they, you know, feel that their traffic is, you know, needs to be improved, then their citizens should take care of that, but that's my thing.

So, with that, I would like to make a **motion**, I move that we approve, where's the, 2.D for the City of

Ridgefield along with 3.E.

JOHNSON: We have a motion. Can we get a second? I do **not** hear a second.

BARCA: Mr. Chair, I'd like to make a **motion** that we adopt 2.D properties E-MU-3 and RMDU (sic) in the alternative proposal.

FADNESS: Ron - this is Commissioner Fadness - would you be open to an amendment to not require a TDR for the Maul property?

BARCA: No. We already voted on a motion that said any ag land to be brought in.

FADNESS: Okay. Thank you.

JOHNSON: Do we have a second for 2.D?

MONTGOMERY: I'll **second**. LeDuc Montgomery.

JOHNSON: We have a motion and a second. Is there any more discussion on the Ridgefield UGA Alternative 2.D? Hearing none, Jeff, can we get a roll call, please.

ROLL CALL VOTE – ALTERNATIVE 2.D, MOTION TO APPROVE

HALBERT: AYE

BERGTHOLD: AYE

FADNESS: AYE

BARCA: AYE

HARROUN: AYE

MONTGOMERY: AYE

JOHNSON: NO

DELAPENA: 6/1.

PLANNING COMMISSION DELIBERATIONS

JOHNSON: Motion passes. We move on to a rather simple one hopefully.

BARCA: Mr. Chair --

JOHNSON: Yes.

BARCA: -- I'd like to make a proposal that we take 2.E, 2.F and 2.G and bundle them.

JOHNSON: You read my mind, Commissioner. So, we want to take 2.E which there's no expansion. Woodland, which is 2.F which, is no expansion. And what was the other one?

BARCA: Oh, I said 2.G but what I actually meant to say was the one that was 2.H where the staff recommendations on all three were yes.

JOHNSON: Yeah, so those are yes. So, do we have a -- the only one of those that is expanding into the UGA is Yacolt; right?

BARCA: So, excluding 2.G. I would say that my **motion** is 2.E, 2.F and 2.H.

JOHNSON: Okay. Would you please repeat that just so I can remind it. 2.E.

BARCA: 2.E, 2.F and 2.H where staff has recommended yes.

JOHNSON: Do we have a second on those, on that motion, excuse me?

BERGTHOLD: This is Commissioner Bergthold. I'll **second** that.

JOHNSON: Thank you. We have a motion and a second. Is there any discussion on adopting 2.E, 2.F and 2.H alternatives? Hearing no discussion, can we get a roll call, Jeff.

ROLL CALL VOTE – ALTERNATIVES 2.E, 2.F, & 2.H, MOTION TO APPROVE

HALBERT: AYE

BERGTHOLD: AYE

FADNESS: AYE

BARCA: AYE

HARROUN: AYE

MONTGOMERY: AYE

JOHNSON: AYE

DELAPENA: 7/0.

PLANNING COMMISSION DELIBERATIONS

JOHNSON: Motion passes. Moving on to Alternative 2.G, the Yacolt UGA expanding for additional housing capacity. Discussion or questions.

BARCA: This is Ron Barca. Staff recommendation is no on these 76 acres. I recall going through that. I want to review whether this was constrained through capital facilities or their ability to serve, was that part of the no recommendation?

ALVAREZ: It was primarily on the need, but they do not have sewer service also.

JOHNSON: Any other questions for staff or discussion? I'll take a motion, if not.

BARCA: This is Ron Barca. I'd make a **motion** to uphold staff recommendation to deny Yacolt the expanded additional housing capacity.

JOHNSON: Do I have a second for that motion?

FADNESS: Kyle Fadness. **Second.**

JOHNSON: We have a motion and a second. Is there any additional discussion? Hearing none, Jeff, can we get -- oh, did I hear something? Jeff, can we get a roll call, please.

ROLL CALL VOTE – ALTERNATIVE 2.G, MOTION TO DENY

HALBERT: AYE

BERGTHOLD: AYE

FADNESS: AYE

BARCA: AYE

HARROUN: AYE

MONTGOMERY: AYE

JOHNSON: AYE

DELAPENA: 7/0.

PLANNING COMMISSION DELIBERATIONS

JOHNSON: Motion passes. So now we get to 2.I which is the first of the Vancouver expansions to the north and northeast. This is for additional employment capacity. This expansion includes a site-specific request and is not contiguous with the UGA.

Discussion or questions? Is that one up? Can you point to that for me, Jose. Move it. Okay. There we are. Okay. So, we're only looking at --

ALVAREZ: So, there's two locations. The first is here along 10th getting to 219th and then the second area is along N.E. 50th east of the University.

JOHNSON: Why was -- and what was the one on the second one? Say that again. That's the blue one; right?

ALVAREZ: Yes, the business park, the proposed business park.

JOHNSON: Questions or comments from the Commission?

HARROUN: Yeah. I -- this is Commissioner Harroun. I kind of look at these as two completely separate, I would look at these as two separate votes quite frankly.

The one, can we scroll back over to the one along the freeway, so it was curious to me that the City of

Vancouver didn't want this brought in and it was, we had it on the map, we've had it on the map for, I don't know, a year and a half or whatever.

And it was this property in particular it's along 10th; it's between two major exits, it has sewer service to -- to I think it's like 20 acres just on the left side just below the BP there, it is Washington State's Transportation land, they have a 12-inch sewer main that is serviced there that was brought in with future intent of servicing this whole section.

This was designated, it's been under an urban hold since I think I want to say 1996 and it was identified as the Discovery Corridor or part of the Discovery Corridor for land development.

So, when I see the City of Vancouver want to pull that out and one of their comments was it's not close to anything which to me meant it's not close to them which means that they can't annex it, that's always kind of hmm, but I think from an employment land standpoint it was identified over 30 years ago is that this is where we want to grow as a county.

Again, we get to, I'm kind of going back to the tax base issue, our county needs a solid jobs tax base. We're looking at, you know, potentially losing, you know, parts of the Highway 99 corridor to the City of Vancouver and it creates additional deficits for the County from a tax base standpoint.

I look at, you know, Clark College just opened up their Advanced Manufacturing Training Facility just outside of Ridgefield and I look at like, well, where are those guys that come out with advanced manufacturing like where are they going to start opening their businesses. I really think this portion needs to be brought back into the map for the urban growth boundary.

BARCA: This is Ron Barca. Commissioner, whose urban growth boundary?

HARROUN: The County's.

BARCA: Do you have an urban growth boundary?

ALVAREZ: No.

BARCA: Okay. Whose urban growth boundary is it?

ORJIAKO: It will be Vancouver's urban growth boundary, but it will be unincorporated.

BARCA: So, you are a big believer in cities being able to create their own destiny and you give them a wide berth on them knowing what they want to do and plan. Don't we think we should include Vancouver's wishes in that?

HARROUN: Yeah, I would, I would agree with that, that statement.

BARCA: Okay. So, we do need a recognition I think that you're saying that the County needs a mechanism for being able to create jobs lands but is it the right way to go about doing it by giving it on

to Vancouver who has asked to not do it I guess is my question?

HARROUN: Yeah, I definitely see your point there. I disagree with the, well, I would say this, I would -- I'd probably need a little bit better understanding on how that tax structure works because I know that that's a serious concern even if it's in Vancouver's UGA that the way the taxes flow are different.

And so I'm really looking at it from a revenue source for the County and funding the County because we're in this perpetual shortfall versus, you know, versus the City where the, you know, the City wants to develop theirs internally first even if they do eventually take it, but I think it's, I think it's a really important consideration, and it was identified, you know, a long time ago as, you know, so in a non, and I'll say this, in a very nonpolitical way.

They're like, hey, this is where we got to do it, they developed the sewer services for that, that was, you know, like a two-decade project, you know, to get the sewer services in that area, so I would recommend specifically bringing that in, so...

JOHNSON: Any other comments regarding the Vancouver expansion?

BARCA: This is Ron Barca. Commissioner Harroun had said at one time he was interested in voting on these separately.

JOHNSON: We're talking about separately as in two the letter or separating the two parcels apart?

HARROUN: There's the section, no. No. This is one section; the other section is the property to the east of --

JOHNSON: The site-specific --

HARROUN: -- WSU. It's not, yeah, it's the whole business park.

JOHNSON: Let me make sure I know what I'm talking about here. Well, we can do that. So, which, what is this one called, Duluth?

HARROUN: I guess Duluth, the Duluth property.

ALVAREZ: So, I think the way I wrote it up is expand to the north which is Duluth and the northeast is the other.

JOHNSON: So, if you'd like to make a motion to split those, expand to the north and then expand to the northeast.

HARROUN: Yeah. I **move** that we recommend expanding to the north to the Duluth properties and bring that into the UGA.

JOHNSON: We have a motion. Can I get a second? I am hearing no second. Motion dies. We'll go to the one, expand to the northeast, which is the other property by the University, by WSU; correct?

ORJIAKO: Yes.

ALVAREZ: That is correct.

JOHNSON: So, the other one, can I get a motion for that one? Either staff recommendation which is no or change it.

FADNESS: This is Commissioner Fadness. I **move** to recommend no on both items under 2.I.

JOHNSON: We have a motion. Do we have a second?

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

JOHNSON: We have a motion and a second to follow staff recommendations on 2.I which would be a no. Is there any more discussion? Hearing none, can we get a vote, Jeff.

ROLL CALL VOTE – ALTERNATIVE 2.I, MOTION TO DENY

HALBERT: NAY

BERGTHOLD: So, an approve if I say AYE it's a vote for no; correct?

JOHNSON: Yes, that's correct.

BERGTHOLD: AYE or AYE

FADNESS: AYE

BARCA: AYE

HARROUN: NO

MONTGOMERY: AYE

JOHNSON: NO

DELAPENA: 4/3.

PLANNING COMMISSION DELIBERATIONS

JOHNSON: Okay. Motion passes on the Vancouver, the first Vancouver VGA expansion. Cindy, if you're still there, in about, oh, ten minutes we'll get a break here for you.

Then we go to Vancouver UGA, we're on Alternative Number 2, letter J. Vancouver UGA: Amend the zoning in the urban medium and urban high residential districts from five residential and office residential districts to three residential and office residential districts.

BERGTHOLD: Karl, this is Commissioner Bergthold.

JOHNSON: Yes.

BERGTHOLD: Kind of on the lines of our bundling before, I'd like to make a **motion** that we bundle 2.J through 2.W for approval.

JOHNSON: Is there any objections to that from --

HARROUN: I'll **second** that. Commissioner Harroun.

BARCA: This is Ron Barca. I would like to discuss the density increases of 2.J as a separate item. I am in favor of 2.K through 2.W but I would like to break 2.J out.

JOHNSON: Okay. With that said, unless there's any objection, we'll go vote on 2.K through 2.W and then we'll come back to --

BARCA: Wait, Karl. Karl. It was seconded and then you asked for discussion.

COOK: Yes, that's the motion.

JOHNSON: Was there a second on the motion?

BARCA: Yeah, Jack.

JOHNSON: Sorry, Jack.

BERGTHOLD: Can I amend my motion then?

JOHNSON: Yes, you may.

BERGTHOLD: Okay. I'll **amend my motion** to approve Alternatives 2.K through 2.W.

JOHNSON: Do we have a second for that motion?

HARROUN: This is Commissioner Harroun. I'll **second** it.

JOHNSON: Is there any objections? With that said, can we get a roll call please, Jeff.

ROLL CALL VOTE - ALTERNATIVES 2.K THROUGH 2.W. MOTION TO APPROVE

HALBERT: AYE

BERGTHOLD: AYE

FADNESS: AYE

BARCA: AYE

HARROUN: AYE

MONTGOMERY: AYE

JOHNSON: AYE

DELAPENA: 7/0.

PLANNING COMMISSION DELIBERATIONS

JOHNSON: Motion passes. Now we'll move back up to 2.J. and, again, as repeated the Vancouver UGA: Amend the zoning in the urban medium and urban high residential districts from five residential and office residential district to three residential and office residential district. Discussion?

BARCA: This is Ron Barca. Looking at the information that the County supplied about different projects that they had done and the amount of densities that were actually gained in those, it appeared to me that there was somewhat of a trend where we got better results at the lower density projects hitting their maximums than at the higher density projects, that's kind of the way I interpreted what was sent out by County.

And I have a bit of a concern if we are building some of our housing success on going to the R-24, R-36 and R-50 model that I don't know that we will be able to be as successful hitting those densities and I am wondering about whether or not we should be maybe reducing them somewhat modestly, backing off a bit and trying to ensure that the densities that we're hoping for actually take root, so that is what I wanted to put on the table.

I'm trying to remember if we had any OR examples that were in those projects that you sent us and I have it in front of me somewhere in my pile of papers, but I'd have to look right now.

FADNESS: Yeah. I'd like to echo Ron's statement there where I definitely have concern when you're upzoning in a R-30 to an R-50. When you're starting to talk R-50 I mean you're starting to get much more dense with parking requirements and other requirements, it's very difficult to achieve that density.

And then as mentioned in the work session that these new zones would also include new minimum density requirements on these parcels as well, that greatly limits the ability to develop these to more middle housing, cottage development, townhouses, rowhouses and things like that.

So, I have a hard time supporting amending the zoning here mostly on the basis of introducing those fairly strict minimum density requirements.

HARROUN: I would actually agree with that. The developers will develop to the highest density that works on a spreadsheet and then they stop developing and I think some of the quality of product drops, so I would not upzone that section.

JOHNSON: So, you're talking about all of the, all of them, the 12, the 24 basically all six of these you would not do any of these, is that what you're saying, Jack?

HARROUN: Correct. I would -- I would recommend no on 2.J.

JOHNSON: Okay.

BARCA: This is Ron Barca. I was looking at something more along the line of where we're saying R-43 to R-50 sticking with the R-43 knowing that actually if we do indeed develop a TDR program this would be one of the places that could actually be receiving bonuses for the idea of buying into density.

The R-22 to R-36 and the R-12 to R-24 I think we will be hitting somewhere in between the min and max what I was looking at on what was already supplied. A lot of it is in the 60 to 80 range percentage of maximum, so I think there's still a lot of potential there. It was really just going into that R-43 to R-50, I don't have a lot of good examples of us being successful in that.

So, I'm not in a position of saying I wouldn't be willing to let the County upzone some of the area, I just think the peak of that maximum is too high for it to be something that we're going to be achieving.

HARROUN: So, this is Commissioner Harroun. I think my biggest thing here is don't change the minimum densities, you can increase the maximum densities, so you give the developer the choice.

So, depending on how the code is written, it's like you're not required, you know, if it's, you know, OR-15 to OR-24, you leave it OR-15 up to OR-24 if that makes sense.

You know, like so if there's the opportunity a developer comes in there or maybe like a nonprofit developer that's using other people's money, they can do a higher density, you know, type scenario, maybe they're doing more efficiency units or something, so... Jose, do you have some clarity for us here?

ALVAREZ: Yes. Yes. So, what we currently have and what you've seen from what the BIA submitted on the development that we get in these urban medium and urban high zones, when you plat it, and you can only plat it, they can only meet the minimum density.

And so we've amended our single-family zone to allow for the middle housing, we did that last year in the anticipation that we were going to upzone these areas and increase the sort of baseline to this 24 because what we are seeing is that, as you noted, what in those areas where there's plats, we hit the low end of the spectrum, and if there are apartments, site plans, we're hitting the middle to the high end of that.

When you get into the R-43 we have such a broad range, the minimum is 20, that goes from the urban medium of R-18, R-22 all the way to the maximum we have, it's the broadest range we have.

If you want to create any type of higher density, it doesn't make any sense to have it span such a wide spectrum that's why we're proposing this change and you're not going to be able to meet any of the goals that are set out by the State to meet that low income threshold without these changes.

BARCA: This is Commissioner Barca again. That being said, and it sounds like you've addressed what Jack was concerned about, the minimums are being carried along with this proposal, it's only the upper end of the maximum?

ALVAREZ: So, for, so R-24 would be 18 to 24; R-36 would be 24 to 36; and R-50 would be 36 to 50.

FADNESS: And can you speak on what the current minimums are.

ALVAREZ: R-12 is 8 to 12; R-18 is 12 to 18; R-22 is about 15 to 22; R-30 is 18 to 30; and R-43 is 20 to 43.

ORJIAKO: And this is Oliver. Echoing what Jose have just indicated the middle housing code that when the Planning Commission and Council approved, you can get up to 22 units an acre in the single-family districts, so with that whether you agree or not we are beginning to see some of that coming online.

So, leaving R-12 or even R-18 you have to have some graduation where you have to move up and some of this we will be monitoring to see what is coming online, there are some areas where this will be more practical and more visible.

Commissioner Harroun mentioned there Highway 99. I believe that if the BRT were to go in there you're going to see a very drastic change in the land value and what could occur. Whether the City annexes that area, that's irrelevant, but I think what we are looking at is how do we adjust for the fact that now you allow up to 22 units to an acre in the single-family zone, you have to find a way to graduate up and part of this proposal as well to get to the AMI issue that we have to prepare our housing element to accommodate, it's necessary that this change be put in place.

You were talking earlier, Commissioner Ron Barca, about TDR, if and when that program is put in place, there might be opportunity to provide that incentive to make some of this happen.

BARCA: This is Ron Barca. So, after hearing this, Jack, I think I'm satisfied in understanding the minimums as in the residential 18 to 24, 24 to 36, 36 to 50 as opposed to having these be like the dictation or the minimums that they're going to be looking at.

HARROUN: Yeah, I appreciate their goals and some of it seems like a little bit of a math exercise as far as trying to hit the numbers. I, again, I kind of, my default is, is developers will develop generally the highest density that makes sense for the project.

The -- by -- I have a project downtown that we're, that we're looking at, the City's looking at doing a new overlay on and if we upzone, if it's upzoned, it makes our project infeasible, so they have a required amount of density, then all of a sudden you can't do it.

And so, I guess that's always my concern when I'm looking at this and you really have to look at individual parcels and product and all kinds of things, but I tend to like more flexibility than, hey, we really need you guys to have 40 units an acre here. So that's my concern there, but yeah.

JOHNSON: Looking for a motion for 2.J if we're done with discussion.

BARCA: This is Ron Barca. I **motion** to accept staff recommendations for 2.J.

JOHNSON: Could I have a second?

MONTGOMERY: LeDuc Montgomery. I'll **second**.

JOHNSON: We have a motion and a second. Is there any other discussion on Alternative Number 2.J? Hearing none, Jeff, can we get a roll call.

ROLL CALL VOTE – ALTERNATIVE 2.J, MOTION TO APPROVE

HALBERT: AYE

BERGTHOLD: AYE

FADNESS: NAY

BARCA: AYE

HARROUN: NAY

MONTGOMERY: AYE

JOHNSON: AYE

DELAPENA: 5/2.

PLANNING COMMISSION DELIBERATIONS

JOHNSON: Motion carries. With that said, would we like to take a five-minute break here for our court recorder? Any objections?

BARCA: Only five?

JOHNSON: Five. Okay. Cindy, you got five minutes.

HOLLEY: Thanks, Karl. I'll make sure I run fast.

(Pause in proceedings.)

JOHNSON: Okay. We are returning back after a quick break, and we are now into the Alt 3 section. What I suggest we do really quickly is Alt 3.F and G, that's Alt 2, so we already -- do we have to even vote on this? I don't think we have to. So, Alt F and G are out.

So, we're really just working on A through E. So, with that said, let's look at 3.A, the Battle Ground UGA: In addition to the request in Alt 2, this alternative includes the additional UGA expansion to the east for housing, which we looked at before if you can zero in on that real quick just to make sure we have a reminder, that is that section in Battle Ground there to the east. Yes. There we go.

FADNESS: So, Karl, to clarify, I believe that the motion before addressed 3.A --

JOHNSON: Oh, so we --

FADNESS: -- when we voted on 2.A, and maybe we need Cindy or you guys to read back.

JOHNSON: So, if we want to just for -- are you saying we already voted on 3.A for Battle Ground?

FADNESS: Yes.

JOHNSON: So, 3.A has been voted on. We now go to Camas which is 3.B.

FADNESS: Yes. And --

JOHNSON: We did that one. We did not.

FADNESS: We tabled that one.

JOHNSON: So now we're going to go to Camas UGA: In addition to the request in Alternative 2, this alternative includes an additional expansion to the east, that was that one there, right there.

So, bring it back to us. Is there any discussion on Camas? As a reminder so we don't, this would all be of course with our TDR amendment kind of attached to it or sub-attached to it or however that looks. Any questions on this?

FADNESS: This is Commissioner Fadness, or I guess I don't need to introduce myself, I'm too used to it. I think we discussed this one pretty extensively, so I'd just like to make a motion to recommend 3.B.

JOHNSON: So, you're going to recommend the staff recommendation which is no; right?

FADNESS: Incorrect. I would like to **recommend yes** on Alternative 3.B.

JOHNSON: Is there a second to that motion?

HARROUN: This is Commissioner Harroun. I'd **second** that.

JOHNSON: We have a motion and a second. Discussion on that?

BARCA: This is Ron Barca. I think just looking at the housing capacities and looking at what the County has put forward Alt 3 that takes them up to 3375 additional housing units and I just think the amount of capacity that we're building in is detrimental to us keeping a tight market.

FADNESS: This is Commissioner Fadness. I just want to maybe address that. I think this is kind of similar to what we were seeing up in Ridgefield where the income bands need to be required and seeing as this is multi-family, a higher density zoning, I think it's appropriate where Camas right now is mostly all single-family houses and it's hard for them to meet those income band requirements.

I think that this is -- we have competing interests here where we can't have too much of a surplus, but we also have to meet these requirements and it's hard to balance those two.

HARROUN: Again, I would just go, a, I think and I'm not a hundred percent sure from they're saying it's jobs or the stuff I've seen from the City was jobs land or maybe it's mixed use, maybe that's how they're looking at it, on here it looks like more multi-family.

I kind of get back to, you know, opportunity versus consequence and you're going to have 17 McMansions there and then you're going to have another plot of unusable ag land, or we can get some transfer development out of it and then make it, you know, productive for the community of Camas versus 16 or 17 houses, and so I would, I'd recommend it, so...

JOHNSON: I am concerned about capacity too and just keeping that in our brain is something that we have to pay attention to. Is there any other comments? I would, with that said, we have a motion and a second for the Camas UGA. Jeff, can we get a roll call.

ROLL CALL VOTE – ALTERNATIVE 3.B, MOTION TO APPROVE

HALBERT: AYE
BERGTHOLD: NAY
FADNESS: AYE
BARCA: NAY
HARROUN: AYE
MONTGOMERY: NAY
JOHNSON: NO

DELAPENA: 3/4.

PLANNING COMMISSION DELIBERATIONS

JOHNSON: Motion fails. All right. Moving on to the La Center. This is the La Center, the north is it, did we do this one or is this in addition to that?

This is the UGA to the north for additional housing and employment capacity and southwest for additional employment capacity on agricultural resource designated land, Alt 3.C. Do we have any discussion on this one?

HARROUN: Can I ask for clarity on --

JOHNSON: Is that the cross-hatched one?

ALVAREZ: Yes.

JOHNSON: Sorry, Jack.

HARROUN: Yeah. No, that was my question. It's the R1-6 is the hatched, is that what we're looking at?

ALVAREZ: The R1-6 is the hatched and then to the south the eastern most two properties and then this property here to the south also that was not included in Alternative 2.

So, these were site-specific requests essentially that were added to Alternative 3. The City of La Center did not request these; they were just included in Alternative 3 when the Council wanted to expand those we just included those because they were site-specific requests.

JOHNSON: Any discussions?

BARCA: I'm willing to make a **motion** that we accept staff recommendation for 3.C and say no to these expansions.

JOHNSON: Can I have a second?

BERGTHOLD: This is Commissioner Bergthold. I'll **second** that.

JOHNSON: We have a motion and a second. Is there any more discussion? Hearing none, Jeff, can we get a roll call, please.

ROLL CALL VOTE – ALTERNATIVE 3.D, MOTION TO DENY

HALBERT: AYE

BERGTHOLD: NAY

FADNESS: AYE

BARCA: AYE

HARROUN: NAY

MONTGOMERY: AYE

JOHNSON: AYE

DELAPENA: 5/2.

PLANNING COMMISSION DELIBERATIONS

JOHNSON: Motion passes. We go to 3.D, La Center UGA: In addition to the UGA expansion above, are these site specifics, are these different ones?

ALVAREZ: So just to clarify. So, what you just voted on I think was the opposite of what you voted on for 2 which is just those, 3.C was the City's proposal, 3.D are the site-specific requests.

JOHNSON: So that was 3.D that we approved. So now we move to 3.C, the La Center UGA, this is the one where we're expanding to the north for additional housing.

ALVAREZ: So, no. No. I think you intended to vote on was those expansions beyond what the City requested in your last motion, but that's actually 3.D.

JOHNSON: So, 3.D we just voted on. Yes or no?

ALVAREZ: You did just, yes.

BARCA: My motion I believe was 3.C.

ALVAREZ: I know but you had already did that and it's the same as what you voted on for 2, there was a conflict because you voted to expand that.

JOHNSON: Thank you. So, we're now on 3.E.

ALVAREZ: Well, you need to, I think you need to clarify that the --

JOHNSON: That we voted on both 3.C, we had already voted on 3 --

ALVAREZ: No. The intent was to vote on 3.D which was those areas in addition to what the City's requested, the site-specific requests, those are 3.D.

JOHNSON: Okay. So that just a clarification for the record that we had voted on the expansion of site-specific requests for the additional expansion on to agricultural resource lands and that was passed 5/3; correct? Okay.

So now we move on to 3.E because we already did 3.C. Ridgefield UGA: In addition to the request in Alternative 2 this alternative includes additional UGA expansion on agricultural resource lands to the northeast for additional housing and employment capacity and to the southeast for additional housing and employment capacity.

Where are we at here, Jose? Ridgefield, there we go. Okay. Oh, that's the ones on the east.

ALVAREZ: On the east side. North and then southeast.

JOHNSON: So, we had talked about these before but not voted on these. So, these are, are these site specific? No?

ORJIAKO: Yes.

JOHNSON: Yes, they are. Okay. These are site specific too. Any discussion?

HARROUN: A point of clarification. These are site-specific requests but they're not the City's requests; is that correct?

ALVAREZ: No, the City included those.

HARROUN: The City did request these.

ALVAREZ: Yes.

HARROUN: Okay. And then we're looking at not the E-MU-3 but the 3 to the right, the RLD-6 --

ALVAREZ: Yes.

HARROUN: -- and then the one to the south that's, yeah.

ALVAREZ: Yes.

HARROUN: Okay.

JOHNSON: Discussion on these? Thoughts?

BARCA: This is Ron Barca. I'm just going to reiterate my discussion about the idea of trying to keep the capacity tight enough to make the market work for any kind of TDR program.

MONTGOMERY: Yeah, I echo that concern. I think I've raised capacity several times and a lot of the Alt 3's that's what I'm seeing here.

FADNESS: This is Commissioner Fadness. I make the **motion** to uphold staff recommendation for 3.E.

JOHNSON: We have a motion. Can we get a second, please.

BARCA: Ron Barca. Second.

JOHNSON: Hearing a motion and a second, is there any other discussion? Hearing no discussion, Jeff.

ROLL CALL VOTE – ALTERNATIVE 3.E, MOTION TO DENY

HALBERT: AYE

BERGTHOLD: AYE

FADNESS: AYE

BARCA: AYE

HARROUN: NO

MONTGOMERY: AYE

JOHNSON: AYE

DELAPENA: 6/1.

PLANNING COMMISSION DELIBERATIONS

JOHNSON: Motion passes. Now we go to, so we have done 3.H already, right. 3.I is Vancouver UGA: In addition to the request for Alternative 2, this alternative includes all the site-specific requests to expand the UGA in the following categories:

Request for UGA expansion not contiguous with the UGA;
Request for UGA expansion on rural lands;
Request for UGA expansion on ag resource lands;
Request within the UGA not included in Alt 2, and there's probably a lot of them.

Thoughts? Bringing it back.

HARROUN: This is Commissioner Harroun. I think my struggle with the site-specific requests, they've been piling up for three years now, we're required every year to look at them and except if you're in the comp planning plan process is my understanding and so then we, they get all stacked up and then the challenge is it then becomes overwhelming to give each of these sites an honest look.

So, I mean, so there's part of them surely in 172 requests there's a handful that are probably really worth seriously taking a look at and including, but I don't know quite how to do that. So that's --

JOHNSON: We're not doing that tonight that's for sure.

HARROUN: No, I don't want to do that tonight. I mean, and it's a lot more resource and time and I think I'm afraid that they weren't really given their honest due and I would certainly like, you know, like maybe a little more comprehensive look at some of those.

I know there's one, you know, that is brought up off 162nd, you know, that's, you know, an old dairy farm that will never, you know, most of the land has been given to – I think – Department of Natural Resources and there's a section that they want to bring in.

So, some of those things that I look at, and I go, okay, I mean is this the best forum for it right now to dig into every single one, I don't think that is realistic, but I also don't want to write them off completely either so -- that's my musings I guess.

JOHNSON: Is there any thoughts about these? I knew these were going to give us trouble, those are bigger headaches.

BARCA: This is Ron Barca. I guess the only thing I can say at this moment in time is Vancouver hasn't come forward and stood up for any of these and I think that being said we have annual review opportunities for those that do want to continue to pursue it and I do genuinely agree with you that each parcel really needs the due diligence of looking at it and seeing how it fits within the framework of the comp plan and how it would benefit to make that type of change.

I don't think with the capacity numbers that we're already seeing that it would be something that we could do in a blanket and not get away, we wouldn't get away with it looking at what the numbers say right here. So, my thought process is for those that genuinely want to pursue it coming through in the annual review process is the only appropriate way.

JOHNSON: Did any of these come forward during testimony? Were there any owners here? One or two, I just can't remember.

ORJIAKO: There was, yeah, there were quite a few, Commissioner Jack Harroun mentioned the piece which is the Andersen Dairy piece. There are a couple of other ones ag to go to something totally different.

But, yeah, there were a couple of these that are property owners did speak up about and some of them were requesting the rural area that wants to come into the UGB.

These ones are focused on the UGB expansion and then there are some as we indicated here, I don't know if staff can go to the other map that I asked be sent to the Planning Commission which is the site-specific map that has dots so that they can see that some of these are not contiguous to urban growth boundary.

What do I mean by that? You have to pass the other intervening properties before you can even consider bringing them into the UGB. Do you have that map of the site-specific requests that we can put up so that we can show where these are? But that's all I can add.

So, you can see Jose can explain this better, but in terms of the coloring, you can see which ones that are requesting to come into the UGB that are not even contiguous to the urban growth boundary, so there is no way, you're going to create an island in my opinion, and then some are very far away, not only that to also consider coming into the urban growth boundary by themselves alone.

So those were some of the rationale and I share the concern that some of this property owners made the request and it is always a challenge during the periodic review to consider site-specific requests because of the challenge that they provide because you never know what properties owners ultimately are going to request, but with that really makes sense.

We looked at this all of these and came to the rationale that for the various reasons that staff have indicated we're not recommending that they move forward, but, you know, your call.

You can see, Jose, can you better explain this, you can see by the color the ones that wants to come into the UGB that are not contiguous, some that wants to, even though they're, not only under this request, they're also designated as ag, so I'm not sure what you're going to do there.

I'm not sure whether the TDR option you voted earlier will apply to some of this, I have no idea, it's something that we have to look and deep into to make a rationale decision as whether they will apply, but, yeah, this is part of the reasoning why staff made this recommendation and that will be the same when you get to the rural site-specific requests, you can also see that in 3.G some of the reasoning for staff recommendation, you're not there yet, but it's very similar.

We have come up with what the rural capacity is even though we don't extend the Vacant Buildable Lands to the rural area, we can be able to with the help of GIS come up with anticipated capacity in the rural area.

In 3.G there are some, and I've shared this with the Planning Commission before and Council, there are

some of this that are requesting to go to one acre or two and a half just because their neighbors properties are one acre or two and a half.

Jose talked about the history of parcelization in the County. We do not allow one acre or two and a half standalone, nowhere in the County is that now allowed except if you're in the rural center, what is known as limited area of more intensive development, that is where the County allow for one acre and two and a half.

So, if you're not out -- if you're outside the rural center we couldn't provide you with one acre and two and a half, you'll be creating a new rural center, and we have gone through the creation of rural centers. If you'll recall we did looked at Duluth, we looked at Proebstel and none of that qualified to be become a rural center, so I'll stop there.

JOHNSON: Any comments? I would take a motion if you have one.

BARCA: This is Ron Barca. I'll make a **motion**. I would like to bundle 3.I and 3.J together and accept staff recommendation for a no.

JOHNSON: We have a motion that bundles I and J and accepts staff recommendation on the site-specific requests and the Vancouver UGA. Do I have a second?

BERGTHOLD: This is Commissioner Bergthold.

FADNESS: Kyle Fadness. **Second**.

BERGTHOLD: Okay. Go ahead.

JOHNSON: Kyle Fadness got it as a second. Bring it back, is there any other discussion on that motion? Hearing none, Jeff, can we get a vote, please.

HALBERT: (No response.)

BERGTHOLD: I think he may have dropped off.

JOHNSON: Bryan is not on.

ROLL CALL VOTE – ALTERNATIVES 3.I & 3.J, MOTION TO DENY

BERGTHOLD: AYE

FADNESS: AYE

BARCA: AYE

HARROUN: AYE

MONTGOMERY: AYE

JOHNSON: AYE

DELAPENA: 6/0.

JOHNSON: Motion passes. Okay. With that said, I believe that's the end of those. Yes? Is there any other comments or questions regarding any of the alternatives that we have gone through 1, 2 or 3 or the TDR?

MONTGOMERY: LeDuc Montgomery. I do have some comments just about TDR in general. I do appreciate, you know, we got the letter from the cities and there's a proposed Interlocal Agreement.

And so just a couple of things in my kind of digging into TDRs that I wanted to raise are things, just considerations for this going to County Council and, you know, the community looking into this program, things that would build in a little bit more certainty around the quality of farmland that would be preserved whether it's, you know, active farms or soil quality or some sort of qualifications to help prevent maybe some sort of incentive of go for land that might qualify as agricultural but is, you know, the lowest cost or lowest quality or something to expedite development so that we're meeting the true goals of allowing development in certain areas but also truly conserving valuable farmland.

And, you know, there could be a variety of incentives or, you know, for density, et cetera, you know, that can be built into something like that, I think that's just one piece.

And just making sure things like I think the Interlocal Agreement proposed using assessed value, is that necessarily the way to value the ag land if that's like an older valuation or something like that so that the farmland that is conserved isn't bearing some of the like negative risk I guess associated with the transaction, so just thoughts like that that I wanted to include.

JOHNSON: That, yeah, I hear you. It's -- I hope it's something that we do like we said had a lot of groups, stakeholders as we got a shaking head from our Counsel when we put that in there, but you get what we're looking at, so... Okay. Quickly, good job on that.

Is there any old business? Is there any new business?

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None.

NEW BUSINESS

None.

COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION

JOHNSON: I would like to just thank Ron and Alicia for jumping right into the fire. Ron, you've been through this many times, but, Alicia, this is probably, I'm just glad you have the knowledge and I think

your questions were great. And then were there any more comments in general?

JOHNSON: Thank you, staff, for staying late for three times while we get through this. I know there was a lot of consternation and some of you have better things to do than wait on your Planning Commission but thank you for being patient with us. With that said, we'll adjourn.

ADJOURNMENT

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

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

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

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

Minutes Transcribed by:

Cindy Holley, Court Reporter – Holley Court Reporting

Jeffrey Delapena, Program Assistant – Clark County Community Planning