

From: [Rebecca Messinger](#)
To: [Oliver Orjiako](#); [Jose Alvarez](#); [Cnty 2025 Comp Plan](#)
Subject: FW: Letter regarding Comp Plan Update, following up on FOCC 1/726 comments
Date: Friday, January 16, 2026 9:44:11 AM
Attachments: [Supplemental Timeline Chair Marshall 011526.docx](#)
[1-Meeting Notes City-County Coordination Committee Meeting-230202.pdf](#)
[Lust-Email-RLS-250414.pdf](#)
[image001.png](#)

Please see follow up comments from Friends of Clark County. Thanks!



Rebecca Messinger
Clerk to the Council
COUNTY MANAGER'S OFFICE

Phone: 564-397-4305

Email: Rebecca.Messinger@clark.wa.gov



From: Ann Foster <annfoster5093@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 15, 2026 2:56 PM
To: Sue Marshall <Sue.Marshall@clark.wa.gov>; Kathleen Otto <Kathleen.Otto@clark.wa.gov>
Cc: Rebecca Messinger <Rebecca.Messinger@clark.wa.gov>
Subject: Letter regarding Comp Plan Update, following up on FOCC 1/726 comments

EXTERNAL: This email originated from outside of Clark County. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Chair Marshall, County Manager Otto:

Please accept the attached letter from FOCC with further comments on the Timeline Chronology, (public comment #38219186). Attachments to the letter dated 1/15/2026 are below as well.

Thank you again for your time.

Best,
Ann Foster, President
Friends of Clark County

Please note that slides referenced in bullet points 9 and 10 can be found at this link:
2-PPT Ridgefield Comp Plan Housing and Economic Development Chapter Update-
250213 (1).pdf



Friends of Clark County

PLANTING THE SEEDS OF RESPONSIBLE GROWTH

Clark County Council Chair Sue Marshall
County Manager Kathleen Otto

cc: Rebecca Messinger

Dear Chair Marshall and Manager Otto::

Previously we provided the Council with a Timeline Chronology of some of the specifics of this Comprehensive Plan Update (Public Comment # [38219186](#)). The below are additional specifics that we believe are important for your consideration.

1. The City of Ridgefield, by and through Claire Lust, knew that if Ridgefield wanted to bring resource lands into their UGA, they would need to go through the de-designation process. In November 2021, the Jones informed Ms. Lust that they wished to have their property included in the Ridgefield UGA and, at that time, Dr. Orijako told Ms. Lust that for the property to be included in the Ridgefield UGA, a “de-designation would be part of the process.” See Public Comment #9130800 submitted to the record November 22, 2021. FOCC notes *that there is nothing in the record that shows Ms. Lust followed up with the County regarding any request for the County to conduct a County wide resource land study* or what such a de-designation process would entail.
2. The county told the cities in February 2023 that the County would not be doing a county wide resource land study and, if the cities wanted to propose to add agricultural resource lands into their UGAs, they would need to conduct the appropriate studies.
3. On February 2, 2023, County staff met with representatives of the small cities and the Cowlitz Tribe for their February City County Coordination Meeting.
4. According to the notes of the February 2, 2023 meeting (See attached), Mr. Alvarez explained that there had been changes in the law since 2016 and told the city representatives that “if you are looking to expanding your urban growth boundary from resource designated land to urban the onus is on the city and the property to meet the de-designation criteria”.
5. According to the February 2, 2023 notes, Ms. Lust stated that “they had put out a RFP for consultant help for their Comp Plan update. This will be a big undertaking, because they will be trying to update some of their system plans at the same time.”
6. On April 14, 2025, Ms. Lust acknowledged that, during the February 2, 2023 meeting, the County told the Cities that the County was not going to conduct a county wide study (See attached email dated April 14, 2025 from Claire Lust to Steve Stuart);

7. Thus, when the cities submitted their plans to the County in August 2024, they did so knowing that they had not completed the requisite work as required by law to de-designate the properties and the County again told them via email that the county could not consider the plans with expansions without a county wide resource land study.
8. In emails with Mr. Alvarez in September 2024, Ms. Lust told Mr. Alvarez “Our staff are working with a couple property owners who submitted expansion requests to the County to ensure their legal counsel prepares de-designation studies in a timely manner” (Public comment # [36598770](#)).
9. On February 13, 2025, Ridgefield’s consultant wrote that the Ridgefield UGA currently had adequate overall capacity to accommodate expected increases in housing development since 2045 (See attached PPT at Slide 5)
10. On February 13, 2025, Ridgefield’s consultant wrote that “after adjusting for home based work force, the Ridgefield UGA is adequate to accommodate the projected job growth”(See PPT at Slide 11)
11. Given those statements, it appears that the City of Ridgefield acknowledges that they have the capacity for the allocations but they want to expand the growth boundaries into currently designated Ag Resource Land rather than accommodate the growth within their existing boundary.
12. From November 2021 until January 8, 2026, the City of Ridgefield did not ever raise the issue of TDRs.

Thank you for the opportunity to supplement our prior comments with these comments and attachments.



Ann Foster
President, Board of Directors
Friends of Clark County



CITY-COUNTY COORDINATION MEETING

Meeting Notes

Date: Thursday, February 2, 2023, 10:00 – 11:30 am

Location: County WebEx Meeting

Attendees: Chad Eiken, Rebecca Kennedy, Bryan Snodgrass, and Domenic Martinelli – City of Vancouver; Claire Lust – City of Ridgefield; Alan Peters – City of Camas; Robert Maul – City of Camas; Travis Goddard – City of Woodland; Mark Northrop & Mark Harrington – RTC; Amanda Lomasney – Cowlitz Indian Tribe; Ethan Spoo – City of La Center; **County Staff:** Oliver Orjiako, José Alvarez, Gary Albrecht, Bart Catchings, Jenna Kay, Sonja Wiser, Jacqui Kamp, Amy Koski, April Furth, Michael Sallis

Meeting Notes by: Michael Sallis

Welcome & Introductions:

- Oliver welcomed everyone

Review of last meeting summary:

- There were a few corrections needed from the previous meeting minutes. A revised version will be provided. The meeting minutes can be approved at the next meeting.

Countywide Planning Policy Amendments:

- Susan provided an update on the countywide planning policy amendments. She wants to let people know of the changes to 1.1.12. The new language says the following: "Each jurisdiction, the Cowlitz Tribe and Southwest Regional Transportation Coalition may designate one staff representative and an alternate to the Technical Coordinating Committee, (TCC)".
- Susan shared a list of cities that are on the TCC, and requested that the cities identify their representatives and alternates
- 1.1.13 is a recap from our last meeting. It states: Any local jurisdiction, including the County, may initiate an amendment to, or request an interpretation of any Countywide Planning Policy.
- Other changes include, if the TCC cannot come to an agreement or consensus, the countywide planning policy will still go through, and the difference of opinions would be documented.



- Travis stated that the City has not decided on which timeline they will go with, but will keep the County posted

County Draft Issue Paper #1:

- Issue Paper #1 provides history/background of planning under GMA. Community Planning staff will provide this information at the Council work session on February 22nd, so please contact staff if you have any questions or comments.
- Oliver mentioned that this draft issue paper provides a history from the last periodic update back in 1994 to the where we are today. There is a lot of information in this issue paper. We know that there were appeals during the last update and setbacks that we would like to avoid this time around. It's to help the Council members come up to speed on how we got to where we are. The current Comp Plan is in compliance with GMA.

Population/Housing Projections, and Employment:

- Jacqui wanted to let everyone know that the Issue Paper #2 will be out to the Cities by March 2nd, 2023. We are looking at a tentative Council hearing date of April 18, 2023. Scott Bailey, the State economist will provide employment projections after population projections are chosen.
- Oliver is hoping for a 1:1 ratio from the Council on population and jobs, which will help with the employment numbers from Scott.
- Jacqui turned it over to Jose to share his presentation. Commerce has a section on their website called updating GMA Housing Elements, within it there is a document titled; "Guidance for Evaluating Land Capacity to meet all Housing Needs". Jose highly recommends reading through this information, and he will provide a link. This talks about connecting moderate, low, very low, and extremely low-income households with different housing types by zoning in all jurisdictions.
- It would be good after you take a look at this information, to discuss at our next meeting. There is formal guidance that will be coming out in April. A lot of work will need to be done in preparation of meeting these new requirements.
- Oliver let the cities know that this guidance is out there and available to them. Feel free to provide comments in advance. We are not sure of the timeline, but Commerce is trying to finalize before having meaningful conversations with local jurisdictions.
- Oliver stated that the cities/town will be having similar discussions with city managers and councils.
- Bryan Snodgrass had a comment to let everyone know that if the middle population is chosen, than that would help most jurisdictions with their numbers.

Site Specific Request Coordination:

- Jose discussed site specific requests noting that since people know that we are updating the Comp Plan, they may want to change their zoning, for example, Resource

to Rural, Rural to Urban and Resource to Urban. One of the things we do is try to communicate with the cities to see if they plan on expanding their UGAs and how it affects the populations. One of the things we wanted to do is find out who to send inquiries to for each jurisdiction. The other is that some changes in the law has occurred since 2016 dealing with the designation of resource land. If there is an appeal to the comprehensive plan related to expansion of urban growth areas, annexation/vesting cannot occur until the appeal is resolved. In previous comp plans, we have had cities annex during the appeal process and since the annexation had occurred, the courts could not do anything about it. New legislature came out to change that and will be new for this periodic update. If you are looking to expanding your urban growth boundary from resource designated land to urban, the onus is on the city and the property owner to meet the de-designation criteria.

- Please let Jose know who the contact should be for property owner requests.
- Bryan mentioned that the Councilors/County need to understand that the cities are the ones to initiate the UGA proposals. Also, just send them an email, and they hope that the public participation plan has something like this too.

Roundtable:

- Bryan wanted to ask if the cities could have more of a voice as junior partners, and not just stakeholders.
- Oliver said that the Counselors are having similar conversations in their rules and procedures. There is some concern from other stakeholders that the 3 minutes limitation is too short. Oliver suggested the cities coordinate and write a formal letter to the County Manager, who will take it to our Council, as that is a legitimate ask. Only Council can grant that opportunity.
- Bryan said that the cities will send a letter to Kathleen Otto, the County Manager and cc, Oliver. The letter would ask to be junior partners as part of this process.
- Domenic said that the City of Vancouver is going through the same process as the County at this point for Comp Plan updates. So, there will be more information put up on our website as well.
- Travis said they are working on an agreement with Cowlitz County to do a Master Plan for the Woodland bottoms. They are also working with RTC on regional projects in Cowlitz County north of town. They are looking to replace the CC Street bridge. They are also looking at a third crossing from Pekin Ferry Road into Clark County, behind the Cowlitz Tribe Casino.
- Alan Peters from City of Camas said a consultant has just started helping with their Comp Plan update and bringing the City Council up to speed. They are also looking at a downtown sub-area plan. As far as UGA requests, they have received a couple that we will move forward. This is along the Camas and Washougal boundary line. So, they will be working together to see what works for both cities.

- Claire Lust from Ridgefield said they just put out an RFP for consultant help for their Comp Plan update. This will be a big undertaking, because they will be trying to update some of their system plans at the same time.
- Mark H. from RTC said they are in the process of updating their Regional Transportation Plan and moving towards adoption by the end of the year. They are also working on the I-5 bridge replacement project. Mark wanted to know if the County was still pursuing a third bridge option across the Columbia River.
- Oliver told him no, not at this time. Moreover, this was not part of our budget for this year.
- Jacqui introduced Amy Koski, a planner in the public health department to the group. Amy talked about some of the projects she is working on like the Fourth Plain Coalition. She will also be working with Community Planning and Public Works in the upcoming months from a public health perspective.
- Oliver asked when the last time was the cities updated their critical areas ordinance. The County last updated theirs in 2006. We have a hearing slated for March 1st before Council. County is also updating the FEMA Floodplain Maps for engineering and insurance rate purposes, along with updates to the Shoreline Master Program to be consistent with the Critical Areas Ordinance.
- Oliver asked Jacqui to give a quick update on the Housing Action Plan. The first batch of code amendments are focused on Middle housing and small single-family housing. There is a technical code group that is meeting now and Bryan is on that group. We are hoping to get to the Planning Commission in May and the Council by June. The next series is on multifamily and regulated affordable housing strategies that will be getting going this year. The second batch would go to Council this fall.
- Ethan Spoo is a consultant representing La Center shared that the city is kicking off the update on February 22nd. They will focus on the basics since there is a new Council from the last Comp Plan update. They will be talking to them about what a Comp Plan is and what is GMA, etc. They will talk about population forecasts and housing allocation. They also have code updates that are part of the periodic update. The code updates are dealing with manufactured housing and family daycares which are required and mandated as part of the GMA update.
- Next meeting is March 2nd, and county staff hope to have Issue Paper #2 ready for that meeting. FYI to the cities, go to the Commerce website and put in where you fall in order of funding. Clark County's will be sometime in June. The other area of interest is that the legislature is in session, and they have introduced new bills. One of the bills gaining traction is related to ADUs, but not quite sure if it's going to pass. There is also climate change. City of Vancouver has a climate action plan. If this passes in 2023 or 2024, they make require jurisdictions to insert a climate action plan as part of the periodic review. Oliver is following this through the Washington Association of Counties.
- Next Meeting, March 2nd.

- Bryan Snodgrass: Because not all amendments will apply to every city, there should be a way to approve an amendment without amending the cities Comp Plan, but instead have language that allow for adoption, or endorsement of the respective amendment.

Questions or Concerns:

- Oliver recommends that it should be approved through the cities Comp Plan process. Furthermore, because this affects all the cities in the County, it would make it more valid to move in that direction and have something consistent in every jurisdiction.
- Travis Goddard: Woodland has not updated their Comp Plan yet, but when they do, the proposed language will be added.
- Bryan Snodgrass: wants an option to adopt a countywide planning policy without taking it through the City Council twice, but to approve the one time.
- Oliver agrees but the countywide planning policy would be approved through the County Council public hearing process and amended through the city's annual Comp Plan update or periodic update.
- In other words, the County would take the amended language in the countywide planning policy and would seek approval through County Council. Once approved, then each City would adopt/amend through their own approval process after the County has approved.
- There were no other comments. Susan encouraged the cities to reach out to her if they had additional comments or concerns.

Draft Public Participation Plan for the 2025 Comp Plan Update:

- Jacqui sent everyone a link to the project page.
 - Public comment period ends February 8th
 - On February 22nd there is a Council Work Session
 - March 21 is Council public hearing
- We received some comments from the public, but please let us know if you have any additional questions prior to the hearing.
- Ethan Spoo will send comments on the PPP to Jacqui.
- Oliver expressed that this process is not new to the cities and that they will be going through their own periodic updates. This PPP is how Clark County will conduct outreach/communication through the periodic review. Also, if you see anything in the document that you would like to use in your own PPP process, feel free to do so. If you want to collaborate on public meetings and open houses, please provide input and information.
- Travis Goddard: Should Woodland be on the County's timeline of 2025, or should they go with Cowlitz County 2026 date?
- Oliver said that it's their choice to which date they would prefer to use since they are the only city that borders two counties.

From: [Claire Lust](#)
To: [Steve Stuart](#)
Subject: RE: Meeting notes
Date: Monday, April 14, 2025 12:22:55 PM
Attachments: [Addressing Questions re Resource Lands Study.docx](#)
[image001.png](#)
[02-2-2023 TCC Meeting Notes-DRAFT.pdf](#)

Steve, see attached.

The 2/2/2023 TCC meeting notes document has the first reference I could find to County staff telling City staff the County would not be doing a countywide resources lands analysis; see the section titled "Site Specific Request Coordination."

I asked Marty for density numbers for the two scenarios today. Will let you know what I hear back from him.

Thank you,



Claire Lust

Community Development Director | Community Development

(360) 857-5024

www.ridgefieldwa.us

510-B Pioneer St | PO BOX 608 | Ridgefield, 98642

NOTICE OF PUBLIC DISCLOSURE: This e-mail account is public domain. Any correspondence from or to this e-mail account may be a public record. Accordingly, this email, in whole or in part may be subject to disclosure pursuant to RCW 42.56, regardless of any claim of confidentiality or privilege asserted by an external party.

From: Steve Stuart <Steve.Stuart@ridgefieldwa.us>
Sent: Monday, April 14, 2025 8:35 AM
To: Claire Lust <Claire.Lust@ridgefieldwa.us>
Subject: RE: Meeting notes

Thanks Claire



Steve Stuart

City Manager | City Hall

(360) 857-5020

www.ridgefieldwa.us

230 Pioneer Street | PO BOX 608 | Ridgefield, 98642

NOTICE OF PUBLIC DISCLOSURE: This e-mail account is public domain. Any correspondence

from or to this e-mail account may be a public record. Accordingly, this email, in whole or in part may be subject to disclosure pursuant to RCW 42.56, regardless of any claim of confidentiality or privilege asserted by an external party.

From: Claire Lust <Claire.Lust@ridgefieldwa.us>
Sent: Monday, April 14, 2025 8:33 AM
To: Steve Stuart <Steve.Stuart@ridgefieldwa.us>
Subject: Re: Meeting notes

I will get information to you today.

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)



Claire Lust
Community Development Director | Community Development

(360) 857-5024
www.ridgefieldwa.us
510-B Pioneer St | PO BOX 608 | Ridgefield, 98642

NOTICE OF PUBLIC DISCLOSURE: This e-mail account is public domain. Any correspondence from or to this e-mail account may be a public record. Accordingly, this email, in whole or in part may be subject to disclosure pursuant to RCW 42.56, regardless of any claim of confidentiality or privilege asserted by an external party.

From: Steve Stuart <Steve.Stuart@ridgefieldwa.us>
Sent: Monday, April 14, 2025 8:25:54 AM
To: Claire Lust <Claire.Lust@ridgefieldwa.us>
Subject: RE: Meeting notes

Good morning Claire,

Just want to make sure we're getting answers together today for the County Council. As part of that, please let me know what our projected housing density would be under the targeted growth approach and County Council approach.

Thanks,
Steve

Steve Stuart
City Manager | City Hall

(360) 857-5020



www.ridgefieldwa.us

230 Pioneer Street | PO BOX 608 | Ridgefield, 98642

NOTICE OF PUBLIC DISCLOSURE: This e-mail account is public domain. Any correspondence from or to this e-mail account may be a public record. Accordingly, this email, in whole or in part may be subject to disclosure pursuant to RCW 42.56, regardless of any claim of confidentiality or privilege asserted by an external party.

From: Claire Lust <Claire.Lust@ridgefieldwa.us>

Sent: Tuesday, April 8, 2025 4:51 PM

To: Steve Stuart <Steve.Stuart@ridgefieldwa.us>

Subject: Meeting notes

Steve,

Here are my notes from this morning's County Council meeting.

Thank you,



Claire Lust

Community Development Director | Community Development

(360) 857-5024

www.ridgefieldwa.us

510-B Pioneer St | PO BOX 608 | Ridgefield, 98642

NOTICE OF PUBLIC DISCLOSURE: This e-mail account is public domain. Any correspondence from or to this e-mail account may be a public record. Accordingly, this email, in whole or in part may be subject to disclosure pursuant to RCW 42.56, regardless of any claim of confidentiality or privilege asserted by an external party.

From: [Claire Lust](#)
To: [Steve Stuart](#)
Subject: RE: Meeting notes
Date: Monday, April 14, 2025 12:22:55 PM
Attachments: [Addressing Questions re Resource Lands Study.docx](#)
[image001.png](#)
[02-2-2023 TCC Meeting Notes-DRAFT.pdf](#)

Steve, see attached.

The 2/2/2023 TCC meeting notes document has the first reference I could find to County staff telling City staff the County would not be doing a countywide resources lands analysis; see the section titled "Site Specific Request Coordination."

I asked Marty for density numbers for the two scenarios today. Will let you know what I hear back from him.

Thank you,



Claire Lust

Community Development Director | Community Development

(360) 857-5024

www.ridgefieldwa.us

510-B Pioneer St | PO BOX 608 | Ridgefield, 98642

NOTICE OF PUBLIC DISCLOSURE: This e-mail account is public domain. Any correspondence from or to this e-mail account may be a public record. Accordingly, this email, in whole or in part may be subject to disclosure pursuant to RCW 42.56, regardless of any claim of confidentiality or privilege asserted by an external party.

From: Steve Stuart <Steve.Stuart@ridgefieldwa.us>
Sent: Monday, April 14, 2025 8:35 AM
To: Claire Lust <Claire.Lust@ridgefieldwa.us>
Subject: RE: Meeting notes

Thanks Claire



Steve Stuart

City Manager | City Hall

(360) 857-5020

www.ridgefieldwa.us

230 Pioneer Street | PO BOX 608 | Ridgefield, 98642

NOTICE OF PUBLIC DISCLOSURE: This e-mail account is public domain. Any correspondence

from or to this e-mail account may be a public record. Accordingly, this email, in whole or in part may be subject to disclosure pursuant to RCW 42.56, regardless of any claim of confidentiality or privilege asserted by an external party.

From: Claire Lust <Claire.Lust@ridgefieldwa.us>

Sent: Monday, April 14, 2025 8:33 AM

To: Steve Stuart <Steve.Stuart@ridgefieldwa.us>

Subject: Re: Meeting notes

I will get information to you today.

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)



Claire Lust

Community Development Director | Community Development

(360) 857-5024

www.ridgefieldwa.us

510-B Pioneer St | PO BOX 608 | Ridgefield, 98642

NOTICE OF PUBLIC DISCLOSURE: This e-mail account is public domain. Any correspondence from or to this e-mail account may be a public record. Accordingly, this email, in whole or in part may be subject to disclosure pursuant to RCW 42.56, regardless of any claim of confidentiality or privilege asserted by an external party.

From: Steve Stuart <Steve.Stuart@ridgefieldwa.us>

Sent: Monday, April 14, 2025 8:25:54 AM

To: Claire Lust <Claire.Lust@ridgefieldwa.us>

Subject: RE: Meeting notes

Good morning Claire,

Just want to make sure we're getting answers together today for the County Council. As part of that, please let me know what our projected housing density would be under the targeted growth approach and County Council approach.

Thanks,
Steve

Steve Stuart

City Manager | City Hall

(360) 857-5020



www.ridgefieldwa.us

230 Pioneer Street | PO BOX 608 | Ridgefield, 98642

NOTICE OF PUBLIC DISCLOSURE: This e-mail account is public domain. Any correspondence from or to this e-mail account may be a public record. Accordingly, this email, in whole or in part may be subject to disclosure pursuant to RCW 42.56, regardless of any claim of confidentiality or privilege asserted by an external party.

From: Claire Lust <Claire.Lust@ridgefieldwa.us>

Sent: Tuesday, April 8, 2025 4:51 PM

To: Steve Stuart <Steve.Stuart@ridgefieldwa.us>

Subject: Meeting notes

Steve,

Here are my notes from this morning's County Council meeting.

Thank you,



Claire Lust

Community Development Director | Community Development

(360) 857-5024

www.ridgefieldwa.us

510-B Pioneer St | PO BOX 608 | Ridgefield, 98642

NOTICE OF PUBLIC DISCLOSURE: This e-mail account is public domain. Any correspondence from or to this e-mail account may be a public record. Accordingly, this email, in whole or in part may be subject to disclosure pursuant to RCW 42.56, regardless of any claim of confidentiality or privilege asserted by an external party.