



MEETING SUMMARY

Clark County Buildable Lands Project Advisory Committee

Meeting #4

5/1/2020, 2:00 – 4:00 p.m.

Members Present: Jim Malinowski, Bryan Snodgrass, Ron Barca, Jamie Howsley, Rian Davis, Stephen Abramson, Jeff Swanson, Ryan Makinster, Jerry Olson, Eric Golemo, Jennifer Baker, David McDonald, Marjorie Ledell

Staff and Presenters: Jose Alvarez, Clark County Community Planning; Bob Pool, Clark County GIS; Oliver Orjiako, Clark County Community Planning; Colete Anderson, Clark County Community Planning; Chris Cook, Clark County Attorney; Bob Parker, ECONorthwest; Becky Hewitt, ECONorthwest; Margaret Raimann, ECONorthwest

Welcome and Status Update

Jose Alvarez welcomed the committee and thanked everyone for their flexibility in participating in the virtual meeting. (This meeting was held virtually due to emergency public health policies related to COVID-19.)

Meeting 3 Summary

Jose Alvarez and ECONorthwest invited clarifications and corrections. Becky Hewitt asked for objections to approving the meeting summary. Jeff Swanson moved to approve and Ron Barca seconded. There were no objections.

Process Discussion

BLPAC members Jamie Howsley and Jerry Olson expressed concern over taking formal committee votes in a virtual meeting environment. Jamie Howsley submitted an email to Jose Alvarez outlining this concern before the meeting. Both BLPAC members stated preference to hold off on reaching consensus until in-person meetings are allowed.

ECONorthwest and County staff responded with an understanding of the challenges of the virtual setting. They reminded the BLPAC that the purpose of consensus at this stage is to give preliminary recommendation for assumptions to adjust in the model. After running the model, the BLPAC will be able to see the results and make final recommendations.

The remainder of the meeting summary is organized by topic as covered in the meeting. BLPAC members had the opportunity to provide open-ended comments on each topic. Following this discussion, each PAC member provided structured feedback on their support for or opposition to the recommendations as captured by the Project Team, as well as additional refinements suggested by other PAC members during the discussion. The results of that structured feedback are detailed in each subsection. Note that three topics that were included in the meeting materials were not covered due to time constraints—market factor, redevelopment, and residential in commercial areas.

Residential Land Classifications

The second and third meetings of the Buildable Lands Project Advisory Committee focused on land classification. Clark County staff and ECONorthwest took the committee's questions raised during the last meeting and presented updates, followed by proposed recommendations for the BLPAC's confirmation.



Residential: Lot Size Threshold for Vacant / Vacant Platted Lots

Discussion

- BLPAC members discussed the 1,000 sq. ft. threshold that was proposed as the lower bound for the new Vacant Platted Lots classification. Some members noted that the smallest viable lot sizes at present are closer to 1,500-1,700 sq. ft.
- One BLPAC member asked about lot sizes for tiny homes and whether they would be smaller than the 1,000 square foot threshold.
 - City of Vancouver is aware of the interest in tiny homes, but has not seen platted lots less than 1,000 sq ft, though it could happen in the future.
 - County staff can check the code for minimum parcel size for tiny homes
- Some BLPAC members questioned why use a 20-year time frame and expressed concern that it would miss older land divisions.
 - Project Team members noted that the assumption is that these lots are relatively currently platted and these platted patterns will hold. The purpose of this threshold is to pick up lots currently missed in the model.
- BLPAC members discussed potential for lots between 0.5 and 1 acre to be replatted and generate more than 1 dwelling unit. Some BLPAC members suggested applying 10% “redevelopment rate” (to assume some replatting) to lots between 0.5–1 acre.

Feedback on Support or Opposition

The table below provides a summary of BLPAC members’ structured feedback and comments on this recommended update to the VBLM model. This is not a final vote on the recommendation, but intended to provide guidance on whether to proceed with including this assumption in the preliminary VBLM model run.

Name	Support / Opposition	Comment
Jim Malinowski	Support with modifications	Assume lots between 0.5–1 acre generate more than one unit. Skeptical about 20-year limit.
Bryan Snodgrass	Support with modifications	Assume lots between 0.5–1 acre generate more than one unit, and apply 10% redevelopment rate to lots 0.5–1 acre
Ron Barca	Support with modifications	Assume lots between 0.5–1 acre generate more than one unit
Jamie Howsley	Support with modifications	Increase lower threshold to 1,500 or 1,600 sq. ft.
Rian Davis	Support with modifications	Some hesitation, but not willing to hold up the process for this. Would like to see increase of lot size threshold to about 1,500
Stephen Abramson	Support with modifications	Assume larger lots generate more than one unit, starting with lots slightly below 0.5 acre
Jeff Swanson	Support	
Ryan Makinster	Support with modifications	Increase lower threshold to 1,500 or 1,600 sq. ft.
Jerry Olson	Oppose (process)	Process objection. Concerned about setting threshold less than 0.5 acre for lots that would generate more than one unit.
Eric Golemo	Support with modifications	Would support either way, but if considering modifications, would support setting lower threshold to 1,500
Jennifer Baker	Support with modifications	Increase lot size threshold to 1,500–1,600 sq. ft.
David McDonald	Support with modifications	Assume lots between 0.5–1 acre generate more than one unit and apply 10% redevelopment rate to these lots. Would prefer this modification, but can support either way.
Marjorie Ledell	Support	If modifications, agree with adding assumption for lots between 0.5–1 acre generate more than one unit, and apply 10% redevelopment rate to lots 0.5–1 acre
Total	2 support as written; 10 support with modifications; 1 oppose for process reasons	

Residential: Value Threshold for Vacant

Feedback on Support or Opposition

The table below provides a summary of BLPAC members' structured feedback and comments on this recommended update to the VBLM model. This is not a final vote on the recommendation, but intended to provide guidance on whether to proceed with including this assumption in the preliminary VBLM model run.

Name	Support / Opposition	Comment
Jim Malinowski	Support	
Bryan Snodgrass	Support	
Ron Barca	Support	
Jamie Howsley	Support	
Rian Davis	Support	
Stephen Abramson	Support	
Jeff Swanson	Support	
Ryan Makinster	Support	
Jerry Olson	Oppose (process)	Depends on approach to market factor.
Eric Golemo	Support	
Jennifer Baker	Support	
David McDonald	Support	
Marjorie Ledell	Support	
Total	12 support as written; 1 oppose for process reasons	

Residential: Lot Size for Underutilized

Discussion

- Bryan Snodgrass noted the information provided in a memorandum he submitted in response to the meeting materials. He recommended adding low density lots to this assumption, with a 5% redevelopment rate for these lots.

Feedback on Support or Opposition

The table below provides a summary of BLPAC members' structured feedback and comments on this recommended update to the VBLM model. This is not a final vote on the recommendation, but intended to provide guidance on whether to proceed with including this assumption in the preliminary VBLM model run.

Name	Support / Opposition	Comment
Jim Malinowski	Support with modifications	Agree with adding Bryan Snodgrass' recommendation for low density.
Bryan Snodgrass	Support with modifications	Agree with adding Bryan Snodgrass' recommendation for low density.
Ron Barca	Support with modifications	Agree with adding Bryan Snodgrass' recommendation for low density.
Jamie Howsley	Support	
Rian Davis	Support	
Stephen Abramson	Support	
Jeff Swanson	Support with modifications	Agree with adding Bryan Snodgrass' recommendation for low density.
Ryan Makinster	Support	
Jerry Olson	Oppose (process)	Would like to see cumulative results before agreeing to any specific assumptions.
Eric Golemo	Support	
Jennifer Baker	Support	
David McDonald	Support with modifications	Agree with adding Bryan Snodgrass' recommendation for low density.
Marjorie Ledell	Support with modifications	Agree with adding Bryan Snodgrass' recommendation for low density.
Total	6 support as written; 6 support with modifications; 1 oppose for process reasons	

Employment Land Classifications

Discussion

- Jim Malinowski asked about how the model deals with area along the Chelatchie Prairie Railroad and the mill site, and asked for rural areas to be included in employment capacity.
 - County staff noted that the model uses adopted comprehensive plan. Legislation allowed for development along the rail line is partially completed and can be updated in the next comprehensive planning process. The model is focused on employment land in the existing UGAs for this process.
- Jennifer Baker asked for clarification on acreage of vacant industrial land, as it seemed high. She asked if the model is taking into account larger vacant properties (e.g., Port land) or areas in floodplain. Some lands are zoned industrial, but they are not practically buildable. There is land that has sat vacant for the last 20 years. Want to know more about methodology to come up with these lands.

- County staff noted that these lands are net industrial acres and the Port areas are considered separately.
- Ron Barca noted that the building value assumption is low, but indexing it will help.

Feedback on Support or Opposition

The table below provides a summary of BLPAC members' structured feedback and comments on this recommended update to the VBLM model. This is not a final vote on the recommendation, but intended to provide guidance on whether to proceed with including this assumption in the preliminary VBLM model run.

Name	Support / Opposition	Comment
Jim Malinowski	Uncertain	Don't know enough to comment on recommendation. Buffers/critical areas--taking the restrictions into account. Strong recommendation to not just consider urban areas.
Bryan Snodgrass	Support	
Ron Barca	Uncertain	Can support in principle, but building values are low. Commit to idea of indexing going forward
Jamie Howsley	Support	
Rian Davis	Uncertain	Would like more time to dig in on real time data. Not going to hold up process, but would support more dialog along points brought up.
Stephen Abramson	Support	No issue as written, but need to make sure nothing included is below floodplain--treat as constrained
Jeff Swanson	Support	
Ryan Makinster	Uncertain	Would like some "real time data" but don't want to hold this up
Jerry Olson	Oppose (process and method)	Major issues with this recommendation. Need to recognize shortage of usable industrial land. Would like to see overlaid and ground truth this. Issues with jobs per acre on the port. Not ready to approve.
Eric Golemo	Support	Would like to note CREDC issues
Jennifer Baker	Uncertain	Generally OK with recommendation, but want to review methodology and issues with land that have severe challenges.
David McDonald	Support	
Marjorie Ledell	Support	
Total	7 support as written; 5 uncertain/need more information; 1 oppose for process and method reasons	

Infrastructure Gaps

Discussion (PAC)

- Jim Malinowski: Staff didn't consult city of Yacolt. More to it than city limits. Potential to move boundaries out. 1 acre lots can handle septic. PUD provides water. Don't see a reason for this.
- Bryan Snodgrass: guidance recommends using capital facilities plan.
- Ron Barca: no targeted densities. If sewer preventing densities from being hit, don't have those densities yet. Some areas held up due to lack of infrastructure. Yacolt doesn't have a moratorium, just don't have a density target.
- Ryan Makinster: What are the planned urban densities?

- Eric Golemo: if there's an area without infrastructure to support urban density, should exclude, but not enough information.

Feedback on Support or Opposition

The table below provides a summary of BLPAC members' structured feedback and comments on this recommendation. This is not a final vote on the recommendation.

Name	Support / Opposition	Comment
Jim Malinowski	Opposed	Opposed to Yacolt approach
Bryan Snodgrass	Support with modifications	Use capital facilities plan, as described in written comments provided before the meeting.
Ron Barca	Support with modifications	Need to establish density targets first.
Jamie Howsley	Uncertain	Would like to hear public comment first.
Rian Davis	Uncertain	Would like to hear public comment first.
Stephen Abramson	Uncertain	What are Yacolt's plans for providing needed infrastructure to achieve density targets? Plan for timeline of accommodating sewer?
Jeff Swanson	Uncertain	Would like to hear public comment first.
Ryan Makinster	Uncertain	Would like to hear public comment first. What are the planned urban densities in Yacolt?
Jerry Olson	Uncertain	Would like to hear public comment first.
Eric Golemo	Uncertain	Not enough information yet. In general, if area does not have necessary infrastructure and not plan, then it shouldn't be included.
Jennifer Baker	Abstain	
David McDonald	Uncertain	Would like to hear public comment first.
Marjorie Ledell	Uncertain	Would like to hear public comment first.
Total	2 support with modifications; 9 uncertain/need more information; 1 oppose; 1 abstain	

Public Comment

- Mayor of Yacolt (Katie Listek): CCCU brought to attention that being excluded without their knowledge. Wanted more information on what this would mean for future. Would like to use RR more, would like schools to be a priority. Curious how this would affect those things. Many people commute out. Opportunities for economic growth without sewer, would like to move forward with that.
- Herb Noble - enjoy country living but could expand, need help from County
- David Ridenour - Yacolt has been working on affordable housing issues. Makes own urban capacity assumptions. Have ability to provide water, electricity. Sewer is on-site. How committee and recommendations might affect decisions in the future.
- Oliver Orjiako (Clark County): Don't think recommendation changes the status quo. Countywide planning policy calls for no density assumption / requirement for Yacolt because of lack of sewer. Provision that when city has sewer, county and cities will reconsider what will be the share of density. Nothing here changes the status quo. Community planning did plan update for town of

Yacolt. Also expanded UGB as part of that effort. Nothing we are doing changes that. Have reached out to public health to ask if there has been any change in the 12000 sf lots that are allowed. They said no. Any time City wants to expand, can do so where septic systems can be properly installed. No way to declare a health hazard if it doesn't exist. Sewer plan has already been approved, just the funding. Issues on economic development will come later. Some opportunity for employment land - hasn't changed.

- Carol Levanen (CCCU) - key is Chelatchie Prairie rail road. Doesn't require sewer. Many ways to create commercial development without sewer. In many rural areas in the country, many commercial developments aren't on sewers. Yacolt has a lot of those things right now. Need a strong tax base.
- Susan Rasmussen (CCCU) - glad to see Yacolt at the table. Glad to see County listening. Unique community. Question if there's any place else in this process that's being influenced by capital facilities, lack of funding, e.g., industrial lands. Support Yacolt.
- Oliver Orjiako (Clark County): thank reps from Yacolt for being at the table. Some of this may run into policy decisions that Council will address. Not sure what governor will come up with for stay-at-home orders, and understand this is challenging. Thanks for bearing with us moving forward.

Preview of Next Meeting Topics

- Address remaining topics not addressed in this meeting (market factor, redevelopment, and mixed use and residential in Commercial)
- Infrastructure set-aside