



MEETING SUMMARY

Clark County Buildable Lands Project Advisory Committee

Meeting #3

3/20/2020, 2:00 – 4:00 p.m.

Members Present: Bryan Snodgrass, Eric Golemo, Jeff Swanson, Jim Malinowski, Marjorie Ledell, Rian Davis, Ron Barca, Ryan Makinster, Stephen Abramson; Jerry Olson; Councilor John Blom (Council Liaison)

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

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 2 Summary

Jose Alvarez and ECONorthwest invited clarifications and corrections. Becky Hewitt asked for objections to approving the meeting summary. There were no objections.

Land Classifications

The second meeting 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.

Residential: Lot Size Threshold for Vacant / Vacant Platted Lots

- Why only go back 20 years? Problems with County blocking development on legal lots?
 - Lots in rural areas, in order to be a legal lot. Wouldn't fall into the purpose of this
- How does the County track tracts, plats, and lots? A lot of small lots get combined with another parcel.
 - Assessor property type codes - 0 value and type (open space, public facility, wetland, etc)
 - Going back far enough to capture existing lots, but not so far back that lots didn't exist yet.

Residential: Value Threshold for Vacant

- How do mobile homes fit in?
 - Considered for its building value
- Threshold for vacant--any value. Expecting no future movement on property that's in this category? Intensity of use of property in relation to value?
 - Above this threshold would go to underutilized first, then built
 - Vacant vs. underutilized. Depends what it falls into.
- Economy of scale with the parcel size
 - BVA for underutilized tries to get at that

Residential: Lot Size for Underutilized

- Seems to be a reasonable recommendation. Would suggest that it is at a higher end.



- Only utilizing this in Vancouver UGA. Other cities residential development will start to see more pockets of this. Would recommend this definition for all cities. Important for all urban areas to be contributing to capacity.
- Residential units that existed on those areas that were lost. These need to be accounted for.
 - Appropriate to assume that if 5-10% of acres redevelop, that a similar percentage of units would be subtracted out. (Net increase on properties rather than addition)
- What is the downside of including them? Doesn't seem like a big risk

Market Factor

ECONorthwest and Bob Pool introduced the next topic for discussion—market factor—and how the updated Guidance suggests that Counties approach market factor assumptions.

- How much is one side going to other (vacant>underutilized or vis versa)
 - Aggregating is messy with parcel boundaries
 - Will discuss internally things that switched between vac and underutilized
- Eric Golemo sent some materials before the meeting. Shows lots that are not converting, but not always due to market factors.
- Concept of tracking underutilized to vacant to convert (probably what happens more often). 30% never to convert seems high.
- Important to remember that never to convert isn't "never" it's just not within 20 years.
- What is the recommendation--to remain the same or to go higher? There seems to be a disconnect some years when model showed availability but there was actually a "severe shortage."
 - Keep 10 and 30, demand side market factor to remain discretionary based on observed patterns.
 - Other factors: infrastructure, availability, etc. Is it possible to tease out the relative contribution of these factors? Is it required? No.
 - Difficult to look at a landscape level. From a planning perspective, infrastructure can take years between being brought into a UGA and getting services.

Infrastructure Gaps

Jose Alvarez introduced the approach to infrastructure gaps. The committee did not have any questions or concerns about the proposed approach.

Public Comment

None

Preview of Next Meeting Topics

- Mixed use
- Follow up on redevelopment
- Follow up on other topics as needed