From:	Oliver Orjiako
To:	Jeffrey Delapena
Subject:	FW: Following up
Date:	Thursday, October 1, 2026 8:14:04 AM
Attachments:	Outlook-xez4iswm.png image001.png image002.png image003.png image004.png

---

FYI. Thanks.

OLIVER ORJIAKO
Director
COMMUNITY PLANNING

564.397.2280

From: Ann Foster <annfoster5093@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 30, 2026 7:19 PM
To: Sue Marshall <Sue.Marshall@clark.wa.gov>; Oliver Orjiako <Oliver.Orjiako@clark.wa.gov>; Kathleen Otto <Kathleen.Otto@clark.wa.gov>
Subject: Fwd: Following up

I am forwarding this to you for your information- nothing you probably don't know:)
Best
Ann

---------- Forwarded message ---------
From: **Peter L. Fels** <plfels@gmail.com>
Date: Wed, Sep 30, 2026, 5:45 PM
Subject: Fwd: Following up
To: <info@friendsofclarkcounty.org>, <karissa@friendsofclarkcounty.org>, Heidi Cody <heidi@waconservationaction.org>, Teresa Hardy <teshardy31@gmail.com>, Don Steinke <crVancouverUSA@gmail.com>

Hello People,

I had a conversation with Glen Yung regarding the Comp Plan update, then followed up with an email and he responded.
I am forwarding copies FYI and for you to forward on to anyone who might be interested.
I know it is late in the process and the emails are lengthy but they might be useful information for anyone hoping to change his mind and steer his vote.

Peter

---------- Forwarded message ---------
From: **Glen Yung** <Glen.Yung@clark.wa.gov>
Date: Tue, Sep 29, 2026 at 8:10 PM
Subject: Re: Following up
To: Peter L. Fels <plfels@gmail.com>

You are absolutely free to share the email. It is a public record, and I would actually encourage you to share it. I would be interested in hearing other people's feedback on some of these thoughts as I continue working through these decisions.
On your last point, I understand that the current modeling estimates that we have enough capacity within the existing UGAs to meet the projected housing need. My concern is how much confidence we can reasonably put in that estimate given how much is changing.
Normally, we can look at what has actually happened in the past to help predict what will happen in the future. The problem this time is that almost all of the data we are using to make that prediction is fundamentally changing.
Our zoning is changing, densities are increasing higher than we have ever allowed, state housing laws have changed, the types of housing that can be built are changing, and we are implementing major changes from HOSAP. We really don't have any history at all under these new rules to tell us exactly how the market will respond.
The land itself is also different. The last UGA expansion was in 2016, so for the last ten years development has naturally been working through the properties that are easier and less expensive to develop. In fact, one of the criticisms I hear regularly is that we had too much land available in the past. If that is true, developers had even more ability to choose the easier properties and avoid land with wetlands, infrastructure issues, difficult topography or other significant barriers.

As the easier properties get used up, more of what remains is likely to be harder and more expensive to develop. That can affect housing production in two ways. Some properties may simply become too expensive or difficult for a project to be financially feasible. And on the properties that do get developed, wetlands and other constraints may mean fewer units can actually be built per acre. Both could result in less housing being produced from the remaining

land than our past development experience would suggest.

Our model is based largely on development patterns from a time when land was plentiful and developers could choose the properties that were easiest to develop. We are now using those past patterns to predict what will happen with a very different remaining inventory.

None of this means I think the model is wrong. It just means there are a lot of unknowns this time around. We have changed both the rules and the land conditions that much of our past experience is based on. That makes it difficult for me to have a high level of confidence that because the model estimates enough theoretical capacity, the market will actually produce that amount of housing over the next 20 years. I think to have a reasonable buffer is not a bad idea.
Thanks again for the conversation. I appreciate the thoughtful back and forth.

Glen

Glen Yung
Clark County Council
DISTRICT 1

From: Peter L. Fels <plfels@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, 29 September 2026 19:21:34
To: Glen Yung <Glen.Yung@clark.wa.gov>
Subject: Re: Following up

Glen,

Thank you very much for your extensive response. I think other people would be interested in what you are thinking. Since you sent it from your Clark County email address, I believe it is a public record. However, I want to make sure you don't object to my sharing your thoughts with others interested in the comp plan.

I won't share it if you don't want me to.

Also, one quick thought I have about the housing shortage is that county staff, state officials and others have all said there is enough land capacity within all the cities to cover expected demand. So I don't think lack of land for housing is a reason to expand the UGAs.

Thank you again.

Peter

On Tue, Sep 29, 2026 at 4:03 PM Glen Yung <Glen.Yung@clark.wa.gov> wrote:

> Peter,
>
> Thanks for following up. I appreciated the conversation and the thought you have put into all of this.
>
> On greenhouse gas reduction goals, my concern isn't with setting goals. It is with setting them at a level where the cost of achieving them may ultimately be unattainable or unsustainable for the County and the broader community. Cities have much more flexibility than counties when it comes to generating revenue to fund these types of programs. The County's ability to raise revenue is much more limited, and in many ways counties were never structured to provide municipal services to urban areas on the scale that we now do. I am absolutely supportive of taking steps we can take that don't impose significant costs on the broader community or make housing more expensive. If you have ideas for things we could be doing along those lines, I would be very interested in hearing them.
>
> On housing, I agree that expanding the UGA by itself doesn't guarantee affordable housing. But I also don't think we can ignore basic supply and demand. When we restrict the amount of land available for development, that contributes to higher land costs, and land cost is a significant part of the cost of housing. There is only so much subsidized affordable housing that can be built because ultimately it is limited by the amount of tax dollars and grant funding available. The lion's share of the housing we need to accommodate our growth is going to have to be built by the private sector. That means we need to make sure there is enough land available and that the housing we need can actually be built and financed.
>
> I do agree with your concern about the increase in land value that can occur simply because government changes the zoning or designation of a property. That is actually one of the reasons I am interested in developing a TDR program. We missed the opportunity to have that mechanism in place for this Comprehensive Plan update, but if we expand the UGA in the future, I would like to see a system where some of the value created by that decision can provide a broader community benefit rather than all of it simply going to the property owner. Longer term, I would also like us to develop a system that reduces the incentive for speculative buying based on anticipated zoning or UGA changes.

I also agree with you about being very cautious before permanently de-designating agricultural land. At the same time, we have a housing crisis that we have to weigh against that concern. We also need to remember that a majority of the land being considered for expansion is intended for employment rather than housing. Having enough land for good jobs is an important part of this discussion too. This is why I find this decision so difficult. We need to find the right balance and be careful that we don't swing too far in either direction.

I think your point about parking and financing is a good one and is consistent with what I have heard. One important difference with affordable housing projects is that when traditional loans are either not involved or represent a relatively small portion of the overall project value, there is substantially less financial risk tied to whether the project can attract enough tenants at market rents. Affordable units also have significant demand because of their affordability, even when parking is limited. That is very different from a privately financed market-rate project where lenders have much more at risk and are concerned about whether inadequate parking could make units harder to rent. We can't meet our overall housing need through publicly funded or nonprofit affordable housing alone, so we have to pay attention to what lenders will actually finance in the private market.

On permit-ready plans, the County does have programs that accomplish some of what you are describing. We have a master plan process that allows builders using repetitive or mirrored plans to avoid going through a complete review of the same house every time. I have also talked with staff in the past about whether we could do something similar with pre-approved ADU plans.

The difficulty with infill is that every site can be very different. I have built somewhere around seven or eight ADUs in the downtown area, and each one of those projects required a completely separate design and engineering process because the circumstances were unique. Existing house locations, setbacks, property lines, lot width and depth, and access all change what can actually be built. That doesn't mean there aren't opportunities to make permitting easier, and I am always interested in finding them.

And I completely agree with your last point about our children living in the world that results from the decisions we make today. That weighs heavily on me too. I want to do what we can to protect the environment they inherit. I also want my kids, and other people's kids, to be able to afford to live here, receive a good education, and have good jobs available to them if they choose to stay here. To me, all of those things are part of planning responsibly for the next generation.

Thanks again for taking the time to meet with me and for continuing the conversation.

Glen Yung
Councilor Glen Yung
Council District 1
Main Phone:564.397.2232
glen.yung@clark.wa.gov

From: Peter L. Fels <plfels@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 24, 2026 9:51 PM
To: Glen Yung <Glen.Yung@clark.wa.gov>; glen@glen4council.com <glen@glen4council.com>
Subject: Following up

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.

Glen,

Thanks again for taking the time to meet with me Wednesday. I wanted to follow up on a couple of things we discussed.

First, you asked what setting GHG emission goals means for the County. As I mentioned, in Vancouver the city first set the goals. Then they proceeded to develop methods and ordinances to meet those goals, both for city operations and the private sector. Similarly the County does not have to come up with all the details now as to how it will reach the goals as part of the Comprehensive Plan . Those can be developed over time. However, it seems it will be easier and better for our area if Clark County and the City of Vancouver share the same goals.

We also talked about balancing the tradeoffs of creating more affordable housing and working toward the decline of climate change by reducing emissions. I don't think there is any evidence that expanding UGAs will create more affordable housing. It might allow more single family homes to be built on larger lots, but that just follows the path we have been on toward increasing global temperatures. I found some anecdotal evidence that single

family development is more profitable for the developers and that the margins on multifamily development increase if developers can buy a property before its zoning is changed. If developers can't make the profit margins they want, some will leave the market but the demand will still be there. I think creative people will fill the void.

I think that erring on the side of caution, as you say, should lead us to not permanently take agricultural land out of production by de-designation. Once it is de-designated it is not going to be used for farming. Whereas if some land in the future turns out to not be suitable for agriculture it can be up-zoned at that time.

A couple of other random points: I found that banks generally do not like to fund market value developments that have what they deem to be inadequate parking, confirming what you have heard. However affordable housing projects do not need to have the same number of parking spaces to obtain funding.

Also, I want to mention that several cities in Washington and elsewhere are using pre-approved/permit ready building plans to save permitting time and costs. Washington Commerce Dept. has information on this. Permit ready plans get approved much faster and can be designed to meet energy conservation requirements, thus reducing costs for builders. This would be useful for the construction of infill units. I encourage you to push staff to look at adopting this idea.

I know you have healthy skepticism about the facts being presented to you. But I hope you will agree they are the best we have and we should move forward accordingly until there is reliable evidence to the contrary.

Please consider that our children are going to live in a different world. They will want to know you and I have done what we can to slow down and reverse those changes.

Thanks again for your kind consideration.

Peter Fels

To unsubscribe from this group and stop receiving emails from it, send an email to info+unsubscribe@friendsofclarkcounty.org.