From:	Cnty 2025 Comp Plan
To:	Eric Golemo
Cc:	Cnty 2025 Comp Plan; Mike Odren; Rebecca Messinger
Subject:	FW: DEAB Public Comment- October 1st Public hearing the Clark County Comprehensive Plan
Date:	Friday, October 2, 2026 3:25:39 PM
Attachments:	DEAB Testimony 10-1-26 Council Hearing.pdf image001.png image002.png image003.png image004.png

---

Hello Eric,

Thank you very much for submitting DEAB's comments related to the 2025 Comprehensive Plan update.

Confirming this has been received and will be added to the Comprehensive Plan Index of Record. Forwarding to additional staff as well to be shared with the council.

Jeff Delapena
Program Assistant
COMMUNITY PLANNING

564.397.4558

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: Eric Golemo <egolemo@sgaengineering.com>
Sent: Friday, October 2, 2026 2:54 PM
To: Cnty 2025 Comp Plan <comp.plan@clark.wa.gov>; Mike Odren <modren@gomackay.com>
Subject: DEAB Public Comment- October 1st Public hearing the Clark County Comprehensive Plan

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.

County Council,

I testified at the hearing on 10/1/26 . But I ran out of time to finish with the reduction to 2 minutes. So, I am including a written copy of the testimony for the record.

Sincerely,

Eric

Eric E. Golemo, PE
Owner / Director of Engineering and Planning
SGA Engineering, PLLC
Civil Engineering / Land Use Planning
Development Services / Landscape Architecture
2005 Broadway, Vancouver WA 98663
Phone: (360)993-0911
Fax: (360)993-0912
Mbl: (360)903-1056
Email: EGolemo@sgaengineering.com

DRAFT - DEAB Testimony (3 Minutes)

Clark County Council Comprehensive Plan Hearing

October 1, 2026

Chair and Councilors,

My name is Eric Golemo, and I am speaking today on behalf of the Development and Engineering Advisory Board.

DEAB has provided comments throughout this process. We do not want to reiterate what was previously submitted, it is in the record. Our overall message has been consistent:

We need a balanced Comprehensive Plan that accommodates growth while protecting the character and quality of life that make Clark County a desirable place to live. And most importantly, we need a plan that actually works.

DEAB supports increased housing capacity and density where appropriate. But density cannot be the only tool. The plan relies heavily on redevelopment and increased density within the existing Urban Growth Boundary, with very little additional buildable land.

Our first ask is to take a more balanced approach to accommodating growth: use realistic density assumptions, provide targeted UGB expansion where appropriate, and maintain a supply of all housing types, including owner-occupied housing. This includes small detached homes and Townhomes in medium density and mixed use zones, with minimum density requirements that allow these housing types to remain feasible to build.

Our second ask is to take a similarly balanced approach to agricultural land. Protect agricultural land that has real long-term commercial viability. But recognize that not every parcel currently designated AG remains viable for commercial agriculture. Some are adjacent to or surrounded by urban development and interfere with logical transportation, utilities, and efficient growth. Agriculture can and should continue throughout appropriate rural areas of the County. We should protect viable agriculture while allowing appropriate transition where conditions have fundamentally changed.

Our third - and probably most immediate - ask is to incorporate DEAB's recommendations into the multifamily code.

DEAB previously submitted detailed comments, justification, and specific code language suggestions. DEAB supports the proposed higher maximum densities, but we remain concerned about the significantly higher minimum densities. We reviewed actual projects that have been financed, permitted, and built in this market. Many would not meet the proposed minimums - particularly properties being converted to R-36 and R-50 with minimums of 24 and 40 units per acre.

A higher maximum creates opportunity. A minimum creates a mandate. If that mandate doesn't work economically, physically, or with the surrounding neighborhood, we don't necessarily get more housing. We may not get any feasible projects at all.

We also ask that the County preserve viable housing types and ownership opportunities, provide flexibility for small and constrained sites, and consider compatibility with surrounding neighborhoods. Higher density makes sense in appropriate locations, but one development model will not work everywhere in Clark County.

Finally, if these code issues cannot all be resolved tonight, our fourth ask is simple: don't lock them in. Direct staff to continue working with DEAB and development, housing, real-estate, and design professionals to stress-test and refine the multifamily code. DEAB believes that work can continue after Comprehensive Plan adoption if necessary.

DEAB is not asking the County to abandon its housing goals. We're asking for the flexibility necessary to actually achieve them.

Ultimately, the success of this plan should not be measured simply by theoretical capacity in a planning model. **It should be measured by whether we maintain our quality of life while actually producing the housing and communities we're planning for.**

Thank you.