From: Jeffrey Delapena
To: "Heidi Pozzo"; Rebecca Messinger
Cc: Oliver Orjiako; Jose Alvarez
Subject: RE: Comp Plan: Council discussion of CFP did not provide full PC context
Date: Monday, October 5, 2026 8:16:00 AM
Attachments: image001.png
image002.png
image003.png
image004.png

Good day, Heidi,

Thank you for providing this comment related to the Comprehensive Plan update.

This will be added to the index of record and shared with the council.

Best,

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: Heidi Pozzo <hcpheidi@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, October 5, 2026 7:10 AM
To: Jeffrey Delapena <Jeffrey.Delapena@clark.wa.gov>; Rebecca Messinger <Rebecca.Messinger@clark.wa.gov>
Cc: Oliver Orjiako <Oliver.Orjiako@clark.wa.gov>; Jose Alvarez <Jose.Alvarez@clark.wa.gov>
Subject: Comp Plan: Council discussion of CFP did not provide full PC context

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 Jeff,

On Friday during the Comp Plan discussion, as Council prepared to vote on the Capital Facilities Plan, the discussion about why the Planning Commission voted to deny the CFP included part, but not all of the rationale. The Council discussion noted the funding gap in the $500MM range, but did not address the full range of issues. Following are the full comments that did not rise to Council:

PLANNING COMMISSION DELIBERATIONS
JOHNSON: Motion passes. We now move to number 30- -- let's see, you were on was it, Ron, did you
want 38 or 37? 38, Capital Facilities Plan. So, we are looking to approve, I'll either take discussion or a
motion on Capital Facilities Plan Element, Chapter 6, Number 38.
BARCA: So I want to just to bring this one up from the standpoint I don't have a specific amendment to
bring forward, I wanted to clarify my vote and that is based on the testimony that has been put into
the record over the last couple of months it has the appearance that many of our projects from our
previous comp plan have been stacked on to the concurrency on this comp plan, the half a billion
dollar transportation package I don't believe is realistic and it has the appearance that Public Works
has been approving projects that would not be passing in the context of the test of concurrency.
So, from the funding aspect I don't believe the capital facilities plan is well-developed or realistic for
the funding that's available within the County and I'll be voting no on the capital facilities aspect.
JOHNSON: Any other discussion on Line Item 38, Capital Facilities Plan? If not, I would hear a motion
or -- go ahead.
MONTGOMERY: Commissioner LeDuc Montgomery. And I would say just I share some of the same
concerns in re-reviewing some of the public comment today to prepare. I mean, there

was a lot of
testimony from folks about concerns of new development where the existing infrastructure, you know,
wasn't going to be able to be service it from their perspective and then as we had heard in prior
meetings there's a very long list and it seems like a lot is getting added to it and so I would like to be
able to come forward with a solution to the problem but I am just concerned about adding more in if
we're not able to keep up with that type of development, so...
JOHNSON: Okay. Any other discussions on that? If not, I would hear a motion for Chapter 6, Capital
Facilities Plan Element.
BARCA: This is Commissioner Barca. I'd like to make a motion to deny the capital facilities plan as
written.
JOHNSON: Do we have a second?
MONTGOMERY: Commissioner LeDuc Montgomery. I'll second.
JOHNSON: Okay. So, we have a motion to deny the Capital Facilities Plan Element, Chapter 6. Any, is
there any discussion? No discussion. Jeff, could we get a roll call please.
ROLL CALL VOTE – ITEM NO. 38, MOTION TO DENY
HALBERT: NO
BERGTHOLD: NO
FADNESS: NO
BARCA: AYE
HARROUN: NO
MONTGOMERY: AYE
JOHNSON: NO
DELAPENA: 2 to 5.

Minutes of Public Hearing

Planning Commission Hearing

2025 Comprehensive Grown Management Plan Update

Thursday, August 20, 2026, 6:30 P.M.
6th Floor Hearing Room, Public Service Center, 1300 Franklin Street, Vancouver, WA

CALL TO ORDER

Planning Commission Rules of Procedure

JOHNSON: Okay. Good evening, Planning Commissioners, members of the public and staff. I'd like to call this hybrid public hearing to order for Thursday, August 20th, 2026. My name is Karl Johnson and I'm the Chairman of the Clark County Planning Commission.

The role of the Planning Commission is to review and analyze comprehensive plan amendments, zoning changes and other land-related issues. We follow a public process including holding hearings during which the public has an opportunity to provide additional perspectives and information.

In legislative matters, the role of the Planning Commission is advisory. The County Council will hold separate hearings, consider our recommendations and then they will make a final determination.

Our rules of procedure. The Planning Commission will conduct a public hearing tonight and take testimony. All public comments received before tonight's hearing have been sent to the PC members and entered into the public record.

County staff will present first, and the Planning Commission can ask questions. Next, we will invite the applicant to speak, if there is one, and then members of the public who wish to provide testimony.

When we get to the public comment portions of our agenda, we will provide more information on how to participate both virtually and in person. However, if you are in person tonight and wish to provide comment on a hearing agenda item, please sign up via the sign-up sheets in the back of the room. I think they're still there.

During the public testimony you will have three minutes to speak, and remarks should be directed to the Planning Commission only. Please do not repeat testimony that has already been provided.

At the conclusion of public testimony, staff and the applicant may respond to the comments and the public portion of the hearing will then be closed. The Planning Commission will then deliberate and make recommendations to the Clark County Council.

For both virtual and in-person members of the Planning Commission and staff, please ensure that your microphones are muted unless you are speaking. Planning Commission members, when you make a motion and/or second, please state your name for the court reporter.

Any conflicts of interest. Do any members of the Planning Commission have any conflicts of interest related to tonight's hearing items? Hearing none in person or online, we will proceed with the roll call. Jeff, can we do that please.

ROLL CALL VOTE

HALBERT: HERE
BERGTHOLD: HERE
FADNESS: HERE
BARCA: HERE
HARROUN: HERE
MONTGOMERY: HERE
JOHNSON: HERE

Staff Present: Oliver Orjiako, Community Planning Director; Rebekah Ward-Palmerton, Senior Deputy Prosecuting Attorney; David Loos, Deputy Prosecuting Attorney II; Jose Alvarez, Program Manager II; Amy Wooten, Planner III; Bart Catching, Planner III; Susan Ellinger, Planner III; Harrison Husting, Planner III; Jenna Kay, Planner III; Michael Sallis, Planner III; Jeffrey Delapena, Program Assistant; Larisa Sidorov, Office Assistant II; and Cindy Holly, Court Reporter (Virtual).

GENERAL BUSINESS

A. Approval of Agenda for August 20, 2026

JOHNSON: We'll just quick some general business items before we start. Approval of the agenda for August 20th. Can I get a motion and a second, please.

HALBERT: Commissioner Bryan Halbert. I **move** that we approve the agenda for tonight.

BERGTHOLD: This is Commissioner Bergthold. I'll **second** that.

JOHNSON: Jeff, we have a motion and a second to approve our agenda for August 20th. Can we get a roll call, please.

ROLL CALL VOTE

HALBERT: AYE
BERGTHOLD: AYE
FADNESS: AYE
BARCA: AYE
HARROUN: AYE
MONTGOMERY: AYE
JOHNSON: AYE

DELAPENA: 7/0.

B. Approval of Minutes for July 16, 2026

JOHNSON: Motion passes. Next, can we get approval for the minutes July 16th, 2026. I'll take a motion and a second, please.

FADNESS: Commissioner Fadness. I **move** to approve the minutes for July 16th, 2026.

HALBERT: Commissioner Halbert. I **second** that motion.

JOHNSON: We have a motion and a second. Can we get a roll call, Jeff.

ROLL CALL VOTE

HALBERT: AYE
BERGTHOLD: AYE
FADNESS: AYE
BARCA: AYE
HARROUN: AYE
MONTGOMERY: AYE
JOHNSON: AYE

JOHNSON: Motion -- oh, sorry, go ahead, Jeff.

DELAPENA: 7/0.

B. Communications from the Public

JOHNSON: Motion passes. So next up is communications from the public which are not on tonight's agenda. Is there anyone that wishes to speak tonight on any item that is not on tonight's agenda, online or otherwise?

Ma'am, you can come up right here and it's just not on anything about what we're talking about here but if you have something separate, go right ahead. Okay.

REED: My name is Susie Reed and I live in Hockinson. I've been here living here for eight years now and it's kind of a peripheral issue, so I'm not sure where it falls in.

When I moved here coming back to Washington having grown up in Washington, I found a beautiful property, and I have had some interesting experiences, and I'm concerned as there is growth.

The things that I'm interested in knowing is the transparency of development in terms of how bids are made, who gets them and the construction pieces because in my experience here and also in my house in Sedona I have had what Robert Green refers to as real estate mobbing and in that pursuit because I am a researcher I have researched that for five years and I have found some things that concern me a great deal in terms of interconnections and workings in the community and multistate.

And so I just want to if I'm going to live here now and am living here now I want to be sure that these transactions with all of the things that are going on with financial issues in the country and that sort of thing that there's a very transparent open bidding process and I'm here to learn what you do primarily because what I have found, I'm not pointing any fingers here, but I have found a network of folks that I have concerns about.

And so, I would like to see what your processes are, what you hope to accomplish, what the design is as you add additional housing and the access for that, so we don't have, you know, reflecting pool problems

or that sort of thing, you know.

I don't want to bring any more up than what I've mentioned because this isn't the appropriate venue, but it's significant and so the transparency is really important and that's really what I wanted to say and I'm just here to learn. Thank you.

JOHNSON: Thank you for your comments. Jeff, do we have --

HOLLEY: Hold on. Can --

JOHNSON: Yes, go ahead, Cindy.

HOLLEY: -- they spell their last name.

JOHNSON: Can you spell your last name. R-e-e-d, Cindy.

HOLLEY: Thank you.

DELAPENA: We have one more hand up.

JOHNSON: Yeah, come on up, we'll do these first and then we'll do that, Jeff. Just make sure you're right in the microphone so our reporter and can you spell your name.

SCHLATTER: Yeah. My name is James Schlatter. I live at 16716 N.W. 61st Avenue in Ridgefield and I wanted to give you some input about my personal property, our personal property as it relates to the Comprehensive Plan.

JOHNSON: Can we hold that until we actually, this time is spelled out right now for --

SCHLATTER: Well, I came up because you said if it was not on the agenda that you should come up now and --

JOHNSON: Yeah. No. No. No. No. It will be the comprehensive, we're going to be talking about the Comprehensive Plan. Yeah, this was just like let's say that's kind of generic there. So, if you can give me just a second we're going to coming and we're going to --

SCHLATTER: Okay. No problem.

JOHNSON: And I'll put you in the front of the line if you'd like, yeah. Yeah.

DELAPENA: For attendees using their computer or Webex application, if you would like to speak, please use the raised-hand icon. For attendees using the telephone audio only option, press star 3 on your phone's number panel to raise your hand.

For those in person that would like to provide comment, please raise your hand. Once acknowledged, you may come to the microphone towards the front of the room. Public comments are limited to three minutes per person in order to accommodate all speakers. Again, this portion of tonight's hearing is only for items not listed on tonight's agenda.

We will begin with those in the hearing room who would like to make a general comment. Was there

anybody else who would like to make a comment on items not listed on tonight's agenda?

MONTGOMERY: This is Commissioner LeDuc Montgomery. I don't know where this fits, but I'm out of town today unfortunately for a family funeral and I may have to leave the hearing a bit early and I just wanted to say I deeply value all the public comment that is, you know, anticipated having seen some of the folks that are in the room from the Zoom and so if I do end up leaving in the middle of the public hearing, it's not because I don't care and I plan to review the recording and the written testimony and public comments that's been submitted and to participate in any deliberations and votes that occur, but thank you.

JOHNSON: Thank you.

DELAPENA: All right. No one else in the hearing room. We will now call on those people on Webex or the phone that have raised their hands.

JOHNSON: Is there anybody online, Jeff?

DELAPENA: For those people using the telephone options, press star 6 on your phone's number panel to unmute yourself when it is your turn to speak.

LANE: Good evening. This is Jackie Lane. I just want to ask for your recommendations to the Council is that you don't de-designate any ag land, that you make sure your recommendations follow the law specifically dealing with --

JOHNSON: Ma'am, we're going to get to the comprehensive part. These are for items still --

LANE: Oh, I'm sorry.

JOHNSON: -- not on -- we're going to get to that in just a second if you could hold on.

LANE: I apologize.

JOHNSON: That's okay.

DELAPENA: There are no other raised hands online.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEM

2025 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan Update. Clark County is updating its comprehensive plan to meet the Growth Management Act deadlines established in RCW 36.70A.130(5)(b). The update process began on January 19, 2023. The County Council adopted population and job numbers for the 20-year planning horizon that ends in 2045. The Council also adopted a public involvement plan that the County has implemented. The environmental review process included the analysis of three alternatives, and a final environmental impact statement on a preferred alternative was released on July 24, 2026. The purpose of this hearing is for the Planning Commission to take public testimony on the elements of the comprehensive update, deliberate and make a recommendation to the County Council on the topics listed below.

The comprehensive plan update includes the following:

- Changes to the comprehensive and zoning plan map;

- Updates to policies and text in the comprehensive plan document;
- Changes to Clark County Code Title 40, the county's unified development code, to implement map and policy changes;
- Changes to the Arterial Atlas;
- Updated Capital Facilities and Capital Facilities Financial Plans; and
- Updated school, fire, and traffic impact fees

Staff Contact: Oliver Orjiako – Community Planning Director
Oliver.Orjiako@clark.wa.gov, 564-397-4112

JOHNSON: Okay. So here we go. We're going to go to the, to our general business and our public hearing item. Reminders to the public, if you are providing public testimony in person, please sign the sheet in the back; and if you are joining remotely, we'll provide those instructions if you don't know how to do it.

So right now, we're going to dive right in now to the Comprehensive Growth Management Plan. With that said, we'll get a staff presentation first from Oliver or Jose. Jose. There we go. Okay.

ORJIAKO: Good evening, Planning Commission members, especially the Chair, Vice Chair and members of the PC, Planning Commission. For the record my name is Oliver Orjiako, Community Planning Director, and with me this evening is Mr. Jose Alvarez, who is the Land Use Program Manager.

I have several of our staff here, I cannot call them individually, but I would like to sincerely thank them for the work that they have done. We had -- we've had a kickoff of this process in early 2023 and here we are, so great work.

I also want to thank the Planning Commission for a series of work sessions that you've had with the planning staff and some of you attended open houses that we had, and I also want to thank the county residents that showed up at many of our open houses.

Why am I saying thank you? You have a lot of documents associated with this process and we were coming to you in various work session going over what staff have produced and what came to the public participation process as well and here we are.

So, I want to commend you and commend planning staff and the general public for their participation. We went through so many, we had so many open houses, we attended so many other groups that have invited us, various neighborhood association, NACCC and other stakeholders that have participated in the process.

So tonight I'm just going to give you a general overview of what is before you and help you to the best that we can answer your questions and help you in making your recommendation to the Council.

So tonight, if we can go to the next slide, I will just go over quickly the agenda or the format that we will follow this evening. One is overview and adoption process followed by Community Framework Plan and Countywide Planning Policies.

We'll get, then get into the Preferred Alternative and that is what is before you, all the work that we have done to date is reflective of the Preferred Alternative which was the business of the Final Environmental Impact Study.

We'll then highlight, provide you some highlight of proposed changes starting with the major ones, comp plan text and policies. Then share with you which we have done, and the public changes made to Title 40

which is the County Unified Development Code.

We'll talk briefly about the Capital Facilities Plan to support the Preferred Alternative and also the County Capital Facilities Financial Plan identifying at least in the first six years of the 20-year plan how we're going to fund the necessary services to support the plan.

We'll then talk about the Arterial Atlas and then school, fire and Traffic Impact Fees of which you have already made a recommendation on school and fire, so you'll be -- that will be before you again, but the focus is going to be on the Traffic Impact Fee. And, finally, the Environmental Impact Statement that form the basis of us kicking off this hearing. Next slide, please.

PC members, you have seen this slide before, this is our general project schedule which we have in four phases. As I mentioned in the beginning we had a kickoff of this update in this room January of 2023. You can see, I'm not going to go through each item, but as you can see every phase, all the items checked off have been completed.

We are now in the adoption process, which is the final phase. We have submitted to the department of, State Department of Commerce all our documents even though it's all in draft form but the same thing that is before you is what we have submitted to the Department of Commerce to start our 60-day comment period.

The Council, and you can make a recommendation, the Council cannot make a decision until that 60-day comment period. We are now where we circled is where we are. We have had a series of work sessions with you, so this is the beginning of the hearing process where at the end you'll be making your recommendation to Council.

Following that we'll have a work session with Council to review your recommendation and we're anticipating that the Council will have their own hearing as you indicated Chair Karl Johnson and take additional public testimony before they complete this process by, our goal is by October 16th.

I see, I didn't mention them, but I see two of our legal staff are here, David Loos and Rebekah Ward-Palmerton are here, so if there are any legal questions they're here to support us, they have been supporting us and providing us guidance since Ms. Chris Cook retired. Next slide.

PC members, I think I will start with the Community Framework Plan. We are not recommending any changes to the Community Framework Plan. Just as a background the Community Framework Plan was adopted in 1993, it was a 50-year vision of how the community wants to grow, and this is countywide and we use this framework plan to then develop our 20-year growth plan consistent with the framework plan or that vision.

This I believe is the fourth or fifth time that we are updating the plan that was adopted in 1994 and each periodic update we readopt the Community Framework Plan. I have been maybe teasing my staff that the next periodic update will require a check in with the community to see whether the vision, the 50-year vision still remains.

This, again, was adopted in 1993 and when this was adopted in 1993 I think the county population was a little bit over or less than 260,000, now we are over 540,000, so I think it's proper to check in to see whether the vision still stand, but I can say unequivocally that we are pretty much developing very close to the framework plan if you look at it, even though it's a conceptual map, but it provides and reflects how the community at the time wants to grow. Next slide, please.

Under State law, Revised Code of Washington 36.70A.210, counties and cities are required to collaborate in developing a Countywide Planning Policy to govern the development of comprehensive plans and also the Washington Administrative Code, WAC 365-196-305, ensures consistency between comprehensive plan of counties and cities sharing a common border or related regional issues.

We have come to you going over various Countywide Planning Policies and we will touch upon one or two that I also want to give a shout out to all the local jurisdictions in the county, we have been working with them, meeting with them monthly since we started this process, so I commend them for collaborative effort, they have testified and I see some of them here in the room, so I appreciate they're working collaboratively with the County.

These two sections that I mentioned require us to work collaboratively and to make sure that the county and cities plan are internally consistent.

And if I may continue, the purpose of the Countywide Planning Policy is to facilitate transformation of local governance in the urban growth areas typically through annexation. I think we shared with Planning Commission and when we had the work session with Council, annexation it is according to the Growth Management Law the cities are expected gradually but one day to annex majority of, if not all, the areas that are within their urban growth boundary so that urban growth management services are primarily provided by cities and rural and regional services are provided by the county, that is what the Growth Management Act calls for.

So as part of the purpose of the Countywide Planning Policies collaboration and agreement between county and city jurisdiction to include same policies in each jurisdiction comprehensive plan for consistency. As I mentioned earlier, the Countywide Planning Policy was first developed in 1994, it was amended in '04 when we also did the periodic update in '07 it was amended again and also in 2016.

As part of this process, we went through all the Countywide Planning Policies and amended them where appropriate and added one or two additional Countywide Planning Policy. One, that calls for us to coordinate and consult with the Tribe if we have any within our jurisdiction. We have the Cowlitz Tribe; they are part of our planning team that we meet with monthly and other service providers. Next slide, please.

What is before you is a second look at the Preferred Alternative Land Use Plan that you made a recommendation that went to Council. Council reviewed your recommendation and made some minor changes which I will go through with you briefly, but what is before you is the Preferred Land Use Plan which is the basis of this hearing and this process.

We are no longer talking about Alternative 1, 2 and 3, all those were studied when we did the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, now this is the final. If we can go to the next slide, please.

Let's start with the City of Battle Ground. This is the Battle Ground urban growth area as it's reflected in the Preferred Plan that the Council advanced for the study in of the Final Environmental Impact Statement.

If you recall, Planning Commission members, your recommendation was to include both the Meadow Glade area X'd out and the Dollars Corner. The City of Battle Ground moving west towards Dollars Corner and the area to the northwest of the current urban growth boundary, the two red circled area.

So those areas identify in solid black both to the north and to the west are the two areas that the Council moved forward and included in the preferred. They excluded the Meadow Glade area as the City of Battle Ground requested. You're going to hear from the City of Battle Ground later in their testimony if there are any other areas they would like you to consider, but I'll leave that up to them.

If you look at the total acreage is roughly 488 acres total expansion, the area, the Meadow Glade area excluded is about 327 acres, so the difference is about 161 acres in terms of expansion area if you look at it by acreage. Next slide.

Again, this is Battle Ground (sic) urban growth area and the Preferred Alternative. The two areas the Grove Field Airport to that on the east side as well as the property to further to the east known as the Nevin property.

In your recommendation on the Preferred Alternative that went to Council you only recommended the Evergreen Airport coming into Camas urban growth boundary. While the Nevin property was studied in Alt 3, Alternative 3, you did not recommend that piece to be part of this process, but the Council since studied it, so...

Total acreage there if this is accepted is 244 acres but just want to highlight that in your recommendation you only recommended the Grove Field Airport. Next slide, please.

This is the City of La Center urban growth boundary showing you in red circled area where the Preferred Alternative, these are the two areas that the City asked, there may be other areas in Alt 3 that was not included, but this is consistent with your recommendation even though you asked for, you made your recommendation for including the contingent on TDR which the Council did not move forward on.

The total area for expansion, those area that are in green, is a total of 121 acres. You can see the area to the north there is a whiteout area in the middle, the City of La Center may be testifying asking you to include that area because you don't want to leave that doughnut hole, but that will be when they testify that's going to be their ask. Let's go to the next slide, please.

Planning Commissioners, this is the City of Ridgefield urban growth boundary a total of 239 acres. This is what is shown on the Preferred. There are other areas in Alt 3 which the Council did not, you and the Council did not advance to be included in the Preferred.

The smaller area to the south of this 239, the property to the south there are in red is just very small, I think it's 14 acres, it is known as the Maul property when they testify in case they do, currently it's ag and this other property to the north is also ag.

Let's go to the next slide for the Town of Yacolt.
Again, Planning Commission members, this -- it's only 12 acres Yacolt expansion. There are other areas that in the term of Yacolt asked for, but you did not recommend them and the Council did not, only this piece the Council advanced as you did.

What about Vancouver and Washougal? Those two cities are not recommending any expansion to the urban growth boundary that's why we didn't include them. We can go to the next slide.

So, in the Vancouver unincorporated area this is the map amendments, this is more of a summary we have been sharing with you that we're amending the zoning in the urban medium and urban high, this will be in the apartment multi-family districts.

Currently we have five residential and office residential district. We are trying to combine those to three residential and office residential district.

In other words, in the R district would like to see R-12 going to R-24; R-18 and R this 18 and numbers are units, 18 units to an acre to 22 going to R-36; and then R-30, R-34 going to R-50. Similarly in the OR, the OR is office residential district you can do either office or multi-family.

Why did we recommend this? The housing work that we started prior to the legislature passing several housing bill, the HOSAP study which some of you participated in that committee and we made changes to the single-family district that are now allow for a variety of housing type from accessory dwelling unit to triplex, four-plex, townhouses and so forth, that you can now develop in the single family zone.

That was prohibited prior to the legislature requiring us under House Bill 1220 to consider opening up the single-family district that has been exclusively zoned for single-family detached or attached single-family homes to allow for a variety of housing type which we accomplished through that first amendment or implementation of the HOSAP study.

That action itself increases the density in the single-family zone to about 21.7 or 21.8 units to an acre which is, you know, technically 22 units to an acre, so it makes no sense to leave in the multi-family zone to leave R-12, R-18 when you can get up to 22 units in the R district, so that is why we are trying to graduate this up, so that's one of the changes that we are recommending in the Vancouver unincorporated area.

Other changes or just minor amendment to the zoning in certain R1-10, R1-20 and to R1-7.5 and then we made other zoning and comp plan designation on nine site-specific requests, again within the existing urban growth boundary.

Again, as you all know there were so many property owners that submitted site-specific requests which was studied in Alt 3 and none of those were recommended to move forward by the Planning Commission and as well as the Council.

There were other requests, but the Council decided not to touch forest or deal with the mining overlay given the fact that we have no new information to revisit surface mining overlay or revisit in the forest designation. So, with that we can go to the next slide so I can just share with you.

As I mentioned part of this periodic update our focus has been on housing and also climate because, and I can touch on that briefly, I said housing because this is not new to you since we've been coming to you and reworking our housing element we have been doing so to be consistent with all the new bills that the legislature passed.

The last legislative session focused heavily on housing, and you have 11, HB 1110, you have HB 1220, I cannot mention all of them, these are the two that I recall or remember quickly, but this required us to no longer encourage but to plan for and accommodate housing for all economic segments of the population including permanent supportive housing.

The new policies also address racially disparate impacts, displacement and exclusion in housing. So, this new bill requires us to no longer just say we're encouraging, it require us to plan for and to do so which we share with you all that we're now required to provide housing or plan for housing by various income bands, and we can get into that if you like, but we've shared those with you when we did the allocation.

The second major bill that the legislature passed which prompted them to give what I will call the 2025, 2026 and 2027 adopters additional six months was their late passage of the climate element which is the HB 1181.
We've worked; I commend the committee that worked on the new chapter.

The county's now required to adopt a climate chapter and with specific elements such as resiliency and greenhouse gas reduction, environmental justice and best available science requirement. So, we have a new chapter now dealing with climate element.

It's no surprise I can say that there was a study done a couple of years ago Growing Healthier there was some folks who were really not happy about that study, but in that study we had a chapter on climate, you know, climate chapter.

What was said in that report, if I may, not a dictatorial, it's really happening, we are beginning to see severe temperature, if you will, severe flooding, severe fire and this new element has, this Climate Bill has so many components in it, how to reduce greenhouse reduction, we have a target and I'm hoping that when the Council and you hears testimony from the public and those that worked on the Climate Bill you may hear whether you, you set the target to 2050 or move that up to 2045, I'll leave that up to the policymakers, but we are recommending setting a reduction target to 2050, but that is just staff.

Part of the Climate Bill also require us to look at our current transportation element and as a result of that bill we are now required to also provide and adopt reduction in vehicle mile travel and strive equitably to implement multimodal transportation network in a way consistent with environmental justice, that's one of the requirement in the new bill, that's why I'm highlighting those.

And also, we are now have a new requirement to create ADA Transition Plan for our transportation facilities and adopt Active Transportation Level-of-Service Standards. All of those we have shared with you, so those are the major changes you will find in the housing, climate and transportation element.

There are other chapters now, there are about 15 or 16 chapters or elements, those are the chapters as we went through with you in our work sessions, those changes were made as a result of update required of us because of new legislative update. We also looked at those chapters and update them just for clarity.

And then every time you look at it there must be some scrivener error so we used this opportunity to correct as many as we can, and then we provided opportunity to various advisory groups to review the chapters and affected internal departments also review these changes that we are making and provide us input.

So those are the changes you will find when you review or the public review each of the chapters. And as we shared with you, there is a table that like I said earlier there are so many documents that we have put on your lap to review to help you make your informed recommendation and findings to Council.

I cannot thank staff enough for the work that they have put through and all our partners. In my meetings monthly we have Clark Regional sitting at the table, we have the Tribe, we have C-TRAN, we have RTC, I cannot thank them all enough but let me stop there.

This is a team effort so I will turn the rest of the highlights of the amendment starting with County Code to Jose Alvarez. I'll stop there unless you have question for me before I turn it over to Jose otherwise, Jose, go ahead.

JOHNSON: Make sure you state your name. Any questions for Oliver right now? Go ahead, Ron.

MONTGOMERY: This is Commissioner --

BARCA: This is Commissioner Barca. Did I hear something?

MONTGOMERY: Commissioner LeDuc Montgomery. I'll wait till after Mr. Barca.

JOHNSON: Okay. Thank you.

BARCA: Oliver, I'm interested in you addressing what has come in from Futurewise concerning the climate elements. I heard you go through a couple of things.

Do you believe that you have adequately answered what is Futurewise's concerns around the climate, I'm trying to remember the exact phraseology of it, but it's climate impact I believe?

ORJIAKO: I will say that we have followed Commerce guidance in writing our chapter. I do not believe that the Commerce guidance expressed what development regulations we should adopt. So, my response to you will be, yes, if we have not followed the Commerce guidance I will be concerned.

I will say that I don't believe that Futurewise, not a criticism but just an observation, I don't think they have all the supporting document that we have provided, and we have also provided our climate chapter to Commerce, if there are any issues I believe we will address them.

As you know development regulation for example you can do it concurrently with this process, you can also do your development regulation you have to come up with whatever that is one year after your adoption. So, there are other areas which we have shared with you and our Council for example.

You know that whether it's requiring every new home to be electrified or whatever using electricity rather than gas, that is up, hung up currently in the courts, so I wouldn't be writing a rule favoring electricity over gas until the Supreme Court makes a decision on that. I'm just using that as an example.

There are other, some changes that will come through the International Building Code, which is not yet in my shop, but when that comes I believe that our building official will work to update our building code to reflect whatever the new rules may be.

So that will be my response to your -- to your -- that's my observation in terms of the comment from Futurewise. I'm not downplaying that, but I think they need to look at our record and knowing that we have followed Commerce guidance.

BARCA: Okay. So, thank you for that. I believe what I'm hearing then is in regard to that you believe you've already built a record that follow Commerce's instructions and that when that information or the documentation from that science is released or put into the record, then it will go ahead and prove the point that the County has met the requirements?

ORJIAKO: That will be my conclusion. And, like I said, if there are areas that Commerce says here's the new development regulation you have to put in place, we will have opportunity to respond, but have we followed best available science, best information and best guidance provided by Commerce which the law says that Commerce needs to provide guidance to local jurisdictions to develop their chapter we have followed that.

BARCA: Thank you.

JOHNSON: Alicia.

MONTGOMERY: Thank you. Commissioner LeDuc Montgomery. I just wanted to say thank you to the staff. I know this has been a monumental effort, it's still ongoing, but just as a first-time serving Commissioner I found the materials and responsiveness to questions extremely helpful and just wanted to say thank you for that work by you and your team and all the County staff.

ORJIAKO: Thank you, Alicia. Thank you, Planning Commissioner Alicia, appreciate that.

JOHNSON: Any other questions for Oliver? Okay. Jose, go ahead.

ALVAREZ: Okay. Next slide, Jeff. For the record Jose Alvarez, Land Use Program Manager. So, the County Code Amendments, these are on this slide primarily housing related to address the new housing legislation that Oliver had discussed, the consolidation of the multi-family zones that he showed earlier and the uses allowed in those zones, also the amendments to the manufactured home park to protect those and then refinements to some of the recently adopted Middle Housing Code that was adopted a couple of years ago.

I think Exhibit 3 in your documents has a Table of Contents that lists all of the code sections that will be amended. Next slide.

So, this slide is primarily dealing with the Transportation Impact Fee section of the code. The real, the biggest change here is, outside of some clarifications, this was the inclusion of the annual automatic adjustment to the impact fee rate based on Washington based Construction Inflation Index and then, like I said, some refinements to that section and a reference to the Appendix as opposed to the Traffic Impact Fee technical document. Next slide.

So, the Capital Facilities Plans, the Growth Management Act requires that the land use plan have sufficient infrastructure, i.e., capital facilities, which are listed there on the slide and to serve the land use plan and ensure that there's sufficient resources to pay for it.

We've worked with our jurisdiction partners and also service providers that also participate in our monthly meetings and we've reached out to them for input and in Appendix E captures all of the capital facilities analysis that we received from the jurisdictions and the service providers to demonstrate that they can serve the plan over the next 20 years. Next slide.

The transportation costs to serve the 20-year plan, the County has to demonstrate that the funding is available to pay for the needed infrastructure and, if not, we need to identify strategies that can close that gap.

This discussion analysis is covered in Appendix A in here, we're showing that we have a deficit, a rather large deficit of over 540 million, $550 million and we've identified some of the strategies that could be used to narrow that gap and we've had that conversation for Council for their consideration and then how, what the options they have going forward to try to reduce that gap. Next slide.

So, the Capital Facilities Financial Plan is internal to the County, so the County as listed the transportation, parks and open space, stormwater drainage, county buildings and other facilities and you

can see what the sort of expenditures are anticipated and where the revenue sources are for that and that we have sufficient resources identified for that and this is representing the six year, the most recently adopted 2026 to 2031 financial plan for the County. Next slide.

So, the Arterial Atlas is a County managed planning document and GIS map that designates the official network alignment and functional classifications, the principle minor collectors, major roadways in the county.

We worked with our GIS staff to do an overhaul of how the document is created and trying to set up a system so that we can better record changes that are made.

Sometimes when a subdivision happens or through that development process a road is identified on the arterial atlas and through that process it may be shifted or moved and there isn't really a good feedback loop to record that and so we want to make sure that we are able to capture those more efficiently going forward and that's part of the work we did and why there were so many errors that we had to correct over this last ten-year period. Next slide.

So, the School Impact Fees you reviewed and made recommendation to Council on July 16th. We are looking to have a separate hearing with Council September 15th. This is just an informational item to include in the record. Next slide. This is also something that you reviewed, the Fire Impact Fees on the same day, and we're also taking that to Council for the September 15th hearing. Next slide.

The Transportation Impact Fees we shared with you two weeks ago and we have updated numbers based on our review of the consultant's analysis. We found that they had inadvertently omitted four intersections from the analysis and when we asked them to include those, the changes you see are reflective of those, the inclusion of those four intersections, and so that's why they're highlighted and that's why they're different from what you saw two weeks ago. Next slide.

So, the Environmental Review that we undertook for this Comprehensive Plan Update is just looking at the proposals and it's alternative to accommodate the growth that's planned over the next 20 years. It's not a decision document, it presents options and the impacts and the review is covering the impacts from the anticipated population and employment and growth over the next 20 years.

We issued the Draft Environmental Impact Statement in October, October 1st of 2025, we had a 60-day comment period on that. We received over 330 comments and then we responded to those and then the Final EIS was issued July 24th of this year. That's all we have for presentation. Do you have any questions?

Questions from the Planning Commission

JOHNSON: Is there any questions for Jose?

HARROUN: Commissioner Harroun. Jose, on I noticed on the, we had made a recommendation on some impact fees, and they weren't reflected in the chart, which is before us, is there a reason that that wasn't corrected?

ALVAREZ: No.

HARROUN: Specifically like the Woodland School District.

ORJIAKO: This is Oliver Orjiako. You are correct, Planning Commissioner Jack Harroun. Yeah, this is your recommendation, the Council have not made a decision on that yet, it's yet to go to Council, but I know you made a recommendation not to approve it, it was I believe 4/3 or something like that, so we did share your recommendation with the Council, but because they have not made a decision we left it as it is here but you're correct that you did not approve Woodland.

HARROUN: But isn't our final recommendation based on our previous recommendations? Like, I mean because if we're having a package that we're going to vote on to give our recommendation and then some of our recommendations aren't accurately reflected within outside of stuff that's been highlighted because the Council had made certain changes, how does that work?

Because if we're thinking, oh, we had already recommended this and then staff doesn't change it in the official documents and then we vote on it again we technically changed our recommendation.

ALVAREZ: Right. I think what we're going to have a separate hearing and within that hearing we're going to share with the Council what you recommended for each of the school districts, this is just showing what the school districts submitted to us and so that's what their proposal is.

You don't have to take another action. What we're going to take forward to the Council is your recommendation to not approve, this doesn't say approve or denial of any of these, this is just what was proposed.

HARROUN: Okay. I guess I'm just a little confused because I think we're here to make a recommendation on the total package; correct?

ALVAREZ: Right. And you've already made a recommendation on these, so you don't have to discuss this.

HARROUN: Right. But --

ORJIAKO: Commissioner Jack Harroun, so --

HARROUN: I guess that's where I'm just confused because it's like, it feels like we've created a document --

ORJIAKO: No.

HARROUN: -- and then the document's been changed and then we're going to vote on the document and we're like whoopsie, you know.

ORJIAKO: No, it's not changed. If you recall in my brief overview I said you are not acting on the fire and schools, you're going to be voting on the Traffic Impact Fees. If you get to fire and school, a motion can be made that your previous recommendation stands.

I think Jose is correct that what we are showing here is what the school district have provided us. I made the observation that you have reviewed these, took public testimony, made your recommendation, the Council has not acted on that recommendation, we're acknowledging that.

If you make a motion today it will be consistent with what you already made motion on before and that will also what will go before the Council, they have not taken any action. So, we're obligated to show and

orally to inform the public that or Woodland you did not vote to approve that.

HARROUN: I appreciate that, but I'm just looking at the title of this, it says School Impact Fees - Planning Commission Recommendation 7/16 and then it has technical what I would read is then our recommendation on this slide myself. That's all I'm highlighting. I'm not saying anything, I'm just, yeah, I'm just highlighting that.

ORJIAKO: Noted.

JOHNSON: Ron.

BARCA: This is Ron Barca. For the Chair I'm trying to understand when do we vote on the Capital Facilities Plan itself as part of the Comprehensive Plan? I'm hearing components of it but I'm not hearing us adopting the entire Capital Facilities Plan which I believe is a requirement per GMA. So, can us and everybody here have a clear understanding about when we're voting on the Capital Facilities Plan?

JOHNSON: Jose, help us out here.

ALVAREZ: I think it's part of the Comprehensive Plan overall. So, we've stripped out the schools and the fire, so when you adopt the rest of the Comprehensive Plan, like I said, Appendix A has the Capital Facilities Plan, that has the Transportation Impact Fees imbedded in that and so that's when you would adopt that or move to adopt that.

JOHNSON: What about the cities, we haven't -- do we got to go through all the cities again?

ALVAREZ: No, I don't think you need to vote. The cities are Appendix E, but you don't have to weigh in on the cities.

JOHNSON: All right. Okay.

BARCA: So, this is Ron Barca again. So, an understanding then in the way that you laid this out, we're adopting it just with like all the chapters all just rolled into one?

ALVAREZ: Unless you have specific things that you want to call out and vote on or make changes or amendments to.

BARCA: Okay. I very much want to break capital facilities out specifically. I actually believe that when it comes time we should be voting on all of the chapters individually before we even get into the land use aspect of it.

I believe the way that this is set up its backwards from what we would want to have clear understanding of each of the elements in the housing, transportation, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera, before we get into the land use.

So that would be my recommendation but specifically with transportation as you laid out we have about a half a billion dollars of problems to discuss before we go forward I think.

ALVAREZ: And when you say land use, you mean the mapping changes that are listed? Yep.

JOHNSON: Okay. What I'd like to do is pull it back. Is there any more questions for staff, I'll start there?

Anybody online? Okay. Let's go forward with public testimony then based on what staff said. Jeff, could you again just a reminder you have the cities will come first.

How many cities do we have here? I'll put you in alphabetical order so whoever's first, Battle Ground will be first, Camas, La Center, Ridgefield, Yacolt and Vancouver, so we'll just do that. If you could come up to the reserved chairs.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

HARROUN: Chair.

JOHNSON: Yeah.

HARROUN: It might be appropriate for like about a five-minute break since we've been at it for about an hour and a half.

JOHNSON: Let's try to get through the, they have five minutes, let's try to get through the cities first, okay, that would be helpful. So can I have the cities come up to the reserve part, just see how many I have first.

We're going to give you a five-minute time limit, please adhere to that, it's just we have other, it looks like a big list up here that a lot of people are going to want to speak.

And so, with that said, do we have Battle Ground here? Make sure you state your name and spell it.

CRUMMETT: Good evening, Planning Commissioners. My name is Sam Crummett for the record spelled C-r-u-m-m-e-t-t. I have a letter; I'll go ahead and pass out a hard copy if you'd like to look at it. Thank you for the opportunity to comment. It's been a pleasure also working with County staff, it's been quite the process but appreciate the collaboration.

First of all, Battle Ground is in support of the Preferred Alternative shown in the Final Environmental Impact Statement. Specifically for Battle Ground the big, the big effort here is to extend our urban growth boundary to the Dollars Corner expansion area.

JOHNSON: Can I just one second, can we try to move that, I think that's what's feeding back. I'm sorry. No, it's not, no, you keep yours on. It's a feedback, yeah.

CRUMMETT: I'd be happy to sit up there too if that's easier. Okay. There you go. Better?

JOHNSON: Yes, much better.

CRUMMETT: Actually, that's better for me as well. Thank you. We do have a couple amendments that we'd request to make to the Preferred Alternative and that's listed as Number 26 and Number 27 in the decision-making package that's on the, the large matrix you have there. I'll go over these briefly.

First of all, and there's some illustrations in the letter that I gave you, the first is a 35-acre parcel owned by the City of Battle Ground and we have our water reservoirs on that property, we would like that parcel brought into the City for permitting reasons and just efficiencies of having our utilities in the City. That would come in as a low density, low density designation.

There's a Conservation Covenant on that parcel, the City, it's not City policy to have any housing or anything on that property, it would be strictly for our water reservoirs, so that's recommendation 26.

This didn't just come out lately, this was supported by our city's planning commission as well as the city council in the fall of 2025, it was included in all the correspondence to you as the Planning Commission as well as County Council, but I think what happened is it just got glossed over. It was in our letters, but I understand there's a lot of material to go over.

And then the other amendment is three parcels, this would be Number 27 in the decision-making packet that you have. These three parcels are -- would come in as residential, again supported by our council and planning commission, 17 acres approximately.

The big reason for this is we have subdivisions on the west and south side of this project and then we have a half-street improvement that's made that would essentially just kind of stay a half street for ten years because the City couldn't further develop in this area.

We do have a developer that has shown interest in that, I know that's not really a part of your decision-making, but we find that this would be a logical place to add some additional housing into our city, it would be a minor amendment, it would not materially affect our land capacity analysis or any of that, so those are our two amendments.

And I think I'll just briefly speak to the Meadow Glade piece because I know there's some discussion about having that put back into our urban growth boundary. The reason we would rather not have that in is because in 2020 we did a major planning effort, it's called the Land Use Master Plan, it's on our web page, and at that point we decided it's best not to grow in that direction but to focus our growth down the 502 corridor towards the Dollars Corner expansion, that would allow for some housing growth in the commercial districts that we would have in the Dollars Corner expansion area.

So, we really don't want to jeopardize in a sense having excess growth particularly knowing that we need to comply with the Growth Management Act at the end of the day. So, we have a conservative growth plan that is going to accommodate our needs for both jobs and housing in the next 20 years. Thank you for listening and I'm here to answer any questions you may have.

JOHNSON: Thank you. Any questions for Battle Ground?

BARCA: I do. What is your fundamental difference between taking Meadow Glade out but then adding the parcels of Number 27 which is low density itself? It's got surrounding development on it, I would say fundamentally it appears to be the same other than the direction of the growth.

CRUMMETT: Yeah. The fundamental difference I would say would be the proximity to existing city infrastructure. Our existing city infrastructure isn't readily available in the Meadow Glade area. We have capital plans for that area currently, but in terms of being able to quickly get homes built, those parcels, and again it's only 17 acres, could readily be converted to housing.

BARCA: But they're both low density developments already in place; right?

CRUMMETT: Yes.

BARCA: And they're both contiguous to your existing city limits?

CRUMMETT: Correct.

BARCA: Okay. So, what I'm hearing is Battle Ground is foregoing any future development to the south?

CRUMMETT: Essentially at this time. It could be in ten years we come back during the next periodic review and say we think we're now ready to pull Meadow Glade back in.

BARCA: You want to pull it back in?

CRUMMETT: But really the planning exercise, I'll go back to our land use master plan update, 2021 we looked at all sides of our city, north, south, east, west, for technical reasons I won't get into at this point, growing westward was the most feasible place to go and that was particularly for job growth.

BARCA: Okay. And I guess I understand the aspect of wanting to expand in the purposes of job growth. It still comes back to me I think for us looking at balancing budgets, working out details, you're giving what you think is less desirable area for your purposes giving it back to the county for the county to absorb it back into their budget and have to deal with the aspects of whatever growth is able to come towards it regardless of Battle Ground's growth, it's going to be the growth that the county then permits and allows and pays for.

CRUMMETT: Well, it's currently in the urban growth boundary, it's still Clark County's jurisdictions, it's still the County's; however, in terms of growing efficiently, urbanizing and really a cost efficiency, not county versus city, but the most efficient way to grow we believe is not going south toward that Meadow Glade area, but where our existing infrastructure is, particularly the SR-502 now four-lane highway which is a major investment, we find that that's where we want to put our investment is where there's already existing significant investment.

BARCA: On the north side of the highway only?

CRUMMETT: Primarily the north, some sections of the south side. We did avoid agriculturally designated areas along that corridor.

BARCA: All right. Thank you.

JOHNSON: Commissioner Fadness.

FADNESS: Yes. Commissioner Fadness. This is a question for the City but, Oliver, you might need to jump in as well, my understanding was that these amendments weren't included in the Final EIS, these areas that you're asking for in the amendments, so I just want to know how that would affect our process since I don't believe these were studied; correct?

CRUMMETT: They were studied, they were included in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement under Alternative 3 that included all of the site-specific requests around Battle Ground, so they were studied.

FADNESS: Okay. And I guess what's the process then of including that into the Final EIS?

ALVAREZ: I don't think there would be, there wouldn't be any additional analysis, it would just be your recommendation whether Council agrees or not.

FADNESS: Okay. Thanks. Yeah, I just wanted to understand there wasn't going to be a lot of additional

work if we were to bring these in so thank you.

HARROUN: This is Commissioner Harroun. Just to address Commissioner Barca's comment on, I know we share the same concern on pulling Meadow Glade back like we're dumping an expense back to the County.

I remember amongst somewhere that there was I think it was from staff or something that said that, that we were mistaken and that there was actually no cost, that it wasn't going to cost the County anything additional, that was my, like I remember like it was an after the fact.

I don't know what letter it was or at this point or what in the thousands of pages of documents, but I think there was, there was something addressing our concern that we had regarding that so, but I'm not sure, so...

JOHNSON: Do we have any more questions for the applicant? Hearing none, thank you. Next up. Well, sorry, Ron.

BARCA: Chair, before we move forward I just want to address what Commissioner Harroun had said. I think fundamentally this is still back to the idea that they're taking it out of their urban growth area which it should be part of their plan for annexation, they should be planning for it for capital facilities and taking it out so the County is going to at some point in time be faced with the aspect of the growth along that boundary line and have to deal with that and we're shifting it to their westward expansion for the purposes of jobs, but how much of that area ends up becoming like the tent pole for growth and I don't believe looking at the boundary that it's going to be feasible to think that there isn't going to be a need to bring it back in or to have the adoption unless the City is really committed to not growing southerly anymore.

So, my concern is it fits the purposes of this particular growth plan at this particular moment, but it isn't really long-term planning.

JOHNSON: Okay. Thank you very much. Camas, do we have a representative from Camas? Camas is not here. La Center.

MERRILL: Okay. Sorry about that. Good evening, Planning Commissioners. My name is Angie Merrill, M-e-r-r-i-l-l, I'm the City Planner for City of La Center and I'd like to first note that we're sorry that Mayor Strobehn could not be here this evening as he's out of town.

The City of La Center would like to express its support for exploring the implement- -- exploring and implementing a Transfer of Development Rights or TDR program for the agricultural lands.

As La Center has worked through the Comprehensive Plan Update our city leaders and staff repeatedly engaged with residents and stakeholders to understand their vision for the community.

We have consistently heard three important priorities; maintaining a small town charm and feel of downtown La Center; focusing growth near the I-5 Junction where transportation and infrastructure can support it; and creating family-wage jobs so La Center does not become simply a bedroom community.

Our city council unanimously adopted a preferred alternative that reflects those priorities including targeted growth around I-5 as well as downtown and Timmen's Landing subarea plans. We believe this approach provides opportunities for needed housing and employment while preserving the character that

makes La Center special. La Center understands and supports the importance of preserving productive agricultural lands.

At this time, we believe we need to be innovative, and we need innovative tools that allow us to accomplish both goals, protecting valuable agricultural land while giving smaller cities the ability to accommodate responsible growth. The small town character of La Center is one of the very reasons people choose to live, work and invest in our community. We want to preserve the character while planning responsibly for the future.

We appreciate the County's consideration of a TDR program and encourage the Planning Commission to support the innovative approach to balancing agricultural preservation with the growth needs of Clark County's smaller cities.

I'd also like to address Oliver had noted that in our preferred alternative there was a doughnut hole, as far as expanding, you have it pulled up here. So, the parcel that is in white it's Parcel 986027200 is owned by Clark Public Utilities, and we initially didn't ask to bring it into the City, but we don't want to leave a doughnut hole, so that is something that we have requested to bring into the City as well.

And so, I just want to thank you for your time and the opportunity to give testimony this evening. If you have any questions I'm here to answer them.

JOHNSON: Questions for La Center?

MONTGOMERY: This is Commissioner LeDuc Montgomery. I just wanted to clarify, so La Center is in favor of a TDR program in conjunction with proposed UGA changes?

MERRILL: Yes, that's correct.

MONTGOMERY: Thank you.

HALBERT: Yeah, Commissioner Halbert. I just want to understand that doughnut hole just a little more, is it on one of the, on the matrix here that we're going to be voting on?

MERRILL: It is. So up at the, up to the north, the northwest you can see there's the green, the parcels in green and then there's just the, a doughnut hole.

HALBERT: I got that. I'm just wondering where it's at on our matrix for voting?

JOHNSON: Number 28.

HALBERT: Oh, Number 28. Okay. Okay. Maybe that answers it. Let me take a look at 28.

JOHNSON: Number 28.

MERRILL: Thank you.

JOHNSON: Any other questions for La Center? Okay.

BARCA: A quick question for staff.

JOHNSON: Go ahead, Ron.

BARCA: You're really quick. You're really quick, yeah. This is Ron Barca. In regard to Number 28 it's a five-acre parcel owned by Clark PUD, it also says de-designation of agricultural lands, is this Clark PUD parcel ag land?

ALVAREZ: Yeah, designated ag. Correct.

BARCA: It is?

ALVAREZ: Yes.

BARCA: And what's its utilization right now, is it being used as ag?

ALVAREZ: I think it's a station.

MERRILL: Yeah, there's some kind of substation there on that.

BARCA: Substation. Okay.

ORJIAKO: That's a substation, it can be allowed in the ag.

BARCA: Okay. Certainly. I was just wondering how it showed up in the agricultural study whether it showed it as prime land or how that is working. Okay. Thank you.

ORJIAKO: Yes. Yes. It did.

BARCA: Prime land with a substation on it. Okay. Okay.

ORJIAKO: Soil and other characteristics.

JOHNSON: Any more questions for La Center? Okay. Moving on. Steve, Ridgefield.

STUART: Good evening, Chair, members of the Planning Commission. For the record my name is Steve Stuart, S-t-u-a-r-t. I am the City Manager for the City of Ridgefield.

We're here to, number one, thank you for all of your work and thank staff for the coordination with our team, it has been extensive working through all of the changes in GMA including providing adequate affordable housing, a climate element and all of the changes that we're now working toward completion.

Secondly, we're here to support the Preferred Alternative that went into the FEIS and the Planning Commission's recommendation on those items associated with Ridgefield. Those recommendations we believe meet our community's vision that has been established through extensive process and envisioned to 2045 our comp planning process.

It also assures that we meet GMA requirements for providing affordable housing and adequate jobs for our community into the future. It does so by targeting our density in the places where it makes sense using mixed use hubs that have the services and amenities to support them primarily within our existing boundaries, but we also to meet our requirements moving forward are looking at limited expansions in areas already characterized by urban growth.

Those two areas that you see on the map that is on the screen at this point, the first one is what we call the Maul property, that is approximately 14 acres that was spoken of earlier, that area is surrounded by the City of Ridgefield's urban growth area, almost completely surrounded by the city limits of the City of Ridgefield.

It was surrounded in 2007 and has been a doughnut hole since that time. It is characterized by urban growth and development in a variety of ways that we have submitted into the record and are willing to give additional detail to as requested.

The second piece is what we call the North Industrial Urban Reserve area. This area was placed into industrial urban reserve 30 plus years ago in 1994 as an area to be used for future industrial and job growth, that is 30 plus years from where we sit now.

It is characterized by urban growth as it is surrounded on three sides by the City of Ridgefield. It is boundaried on the east boundary is I-5, on the west is an arterial that connects the City of Ridgefield with the Cowlitz Tribal Reservation that is directly north of this property area. These targeted expansion areas give us the opportunity again to provide adequate affordable housing and jobs in mixed use hubs, which is the proposed uses for those areas.

Finally, we see an opportunity. We see an opportunity that has not existed for many years to be able to do better and thus the City of Ridgefield has joined the City of La Center, the City of Camas, others who have promoted a Transfer of Development Rights program to actually create opportunity for affordable housing and jobs while also preserving commercially viable farmland in Clark County.

This opportunity will be expressed more deeply by the professional that these three cities of Camas of La Center and Ridgefield have been working with later in testimony, so I won't go into any additional detail.

We remain committed to that concept, we remain committed to the connection between this expansion and a TDR program, and our city council is willing to put their words in writing and create that Letter of Intent and Interlocal Agreement with the County that solidifies that partnership moving forward. I'm happy to answer any questions you have and thank you for your time.

JOHNSON: Thank you, Steve. Any questions for Ridgefield? Go ahead, Ron.

MONTGOMERY: This is Commissioner LeDuc -- oh, go ahead, Ron.

BARCA: Oh, that lag time.

MONTGOMERY: Yeah.

BARCA: This is Ron Barca. On the map there are several small parcels that also show themselves as job creation or urban low-density residential, is it the City's intent to go ahead and annex those and bring them in as well as these large parcels?

STUART: Forgive me, Commissioner. Are you speaking to the areas that are currently they're crosshatched and are in urban holding?

BARCA: Yes.

STUART: Yes. There are subarea plans for both the Carty Road subarea which is the southern crosshatched area and the Gee Creek Plateau subarea, which is the crosshatched area, we used to call it the doughnut hole, but Gee Creek Plateau sounded a lot better.

That was a subarea plan adopted for both of those areas with implementing code and the implementing code and subarea plans were done in close connection with the people who live there, the people who have established that unique character in those areas and making sure that as it develops it develops with that unique character in place.

We do not see the need to upzone every area of the City of Ridgefield. You can create density through targeted areas of mixed use without having to hurt or harm existing neighborhoods integrity. So, these two areas do have a unique character, they have really tough topography, a lot of ridges, thus Ridgefield obviously has a lot of areas that are not developable if you look at the VBLM in those areas.

BARCA: So --

STUART: So, the answer's yes. How's that?

BARCA: The answer's yes. Okay.

STUART: Yes. We are actively annexing those areas as we speak. I actually have an annexation proposal for one of those areas on our agenda next Thursday.

BARCA: All right. Thank you.

JOHNSON: Commissioner LeDuc Montgomery.

MONTGOMERY: Thank you. And I appreciate the City of Ridgefield's efforts in developing concepts around the TDR program and putting some proposals in writing, so I appreciate that. And just the same question as we said to La Center, does Ridgefield support a TDR program in conjunction with the proposed UGA changes?

STUART: Yes.

MONTGOMERY: Thanks.

JOHNSON: Thank you. Any other questions for Ridgefield? Once, again, great job Steve, I appreciate it.

STUART: Thank you.

JOHNSON: Up next is do we have Yacolt here by any chance? Is Yacolt online?

BAKER: Hi, I'm here.

JOHNSON: Okay. You have five minutes City of Yacolt.

BAKER: Thank you. Good evening, Chair and Commissioners, my name is Alison Baker, it's B-a-k-e-r, I'm a Planner with Jackson Civil and I'm testifying on behalf of the Town of Yacolt. Thank you for the opportunity to comment tonight.

Yacolt does not support the Preferred Alternative treatment over our residential land capacity and we're asking the Commissions help to get the record corrected before the Comprehensive Plan moves forward.

In November of 2024, Yacolt's planner of record Paul Dennis told this Commission that a 20-acre parcel in town had developed into 47 homes over that summer consuming lands that Yacolt was counting towards its 150-unit housing allocation through 2045. Mr. Dennis asked the County to reflect this in their capacity numbers and to consider a possible UGA expansion to replace those units and that is part of the record from that 2024 meeting.

The October 2025 Draft EIS proposed a 90-acre UGA expansion for Yacolt which included both residential and employment growth and under that alternative which became the Preferred Alternative Yacolt showed a 118-unit housing surplus, so a total of 228, I'm sorry, 268 units of capacity against the 150-unit target.

However, the Final EIS published this July cut that UGA expansion to just 12 acres for employment only, the residential component is gone and Yacolt's housing units changed from the 118-unit surplus to now a 7-unit deficit, so it's a 125-unit swing using what seems to be the same capacity estimate and we couldn't find an explanation for the change.

I checked the parcel that Mr. Dennis flagged in 2024 using the County Assessor and Auditor of records which confirmed it was subdivided into 47 lots in January of 2024 and sold individually that February and building values were already on record. The County's jurisdiction map for the Preferred Alternative shows the land as vacant while a more current 2025 VBLM map shows that property as built out.

So, if the Preferred Alternatives capacity figures are based on an outdated map, that 7-unit deficit is likely unreliable and the true shortfall could be even larger. So, you know, we'd welcome clarification on how this figure was recalculated, disclosure matters for transparency and understanding especially when considering a change that determines whether Yacolt has room to grow.

Yacolt has low housing inventory already and the lots sell quickly, people want to live there, and that demand won't necessarily be redirected to neighboring jurisdictions where the County's model show surplus as suggested in the FEIS.

Yacolt's rural development pattern means that in-fill and density tools that other jurisdictions use to absorb growth won't necessarily pencil here until a certain level of development exists and unmet demand will translate into higher housing prices or sprawl which is what the GMA boundary system exists to prevent. Yacolt and the surrounding areas will absorb the impact and every unit not built in Yacolt is property tax base, utility revenue and commercial activity removed from the community.

So we're asking the Commission to do three things, first, we would like the County to explain the drop in Yacolt's capacity between the Draft and the Final EIS including whether it reflects that parcel that Mr. Dennis mentioned in the 2024 meeting; second, until an explanation is provided we'd like you to not treat that 7-unit deficit as the full extent of Yacolt's shortfall as the true number might be larger and we'd like you to not close the door on the residential UGA expansion within Yacolt based on an unverified figure. Thank you.

JOHNSON: Thank you. Is there any questions for Yacolt?

HARROUN: This is Commissioner Harroun. So, question for you, what land are you asking to be brought

back in?

BAKER: It's actually near what is circled and what looks to me like Teal here at the southern -- I'm sorry. Could you repeat the question, I might have misheard you.

HARROUN: My understanding is you're concerned that Yacolt had come before us and asked for certain parcels to be brought in, we didn't necessarily like follow your recommendation or your request and that could be based very much on faulty data and faulty assumptions, which parcel, is there a specific parcel number that you -- because we can't even recommend, if you have a specific recommendation like we would like this parcel included, these 20 acres or these 50 acres or these 100 acres, which ones and where are they and then, yeah, does that make sense?

BAKER: Yes. I believe the parcels are in the south and southwest portion of the UGA. If it's possible I can confirm that and circle back with you.

HARROUN: I think that would be helpful if you had a very -- the City of Battle Ground came with some very specific requests and recommendations that are actionable, I would recommend that you would include that for the record to us, that would be extremely helpful.

BAKER: Certainly.

JOHNSON: Jose, do you have any clarity on that?

ALVAREZ: Yeah. We can provide you a map that shows where those parcels are, what was in Alternative 2 that wasn't moved forward in the Preferred Alternative and that's why there's a difference between the numbers in the DEIS and the FEIS because of the removal of those three areas, there's to the southeast and then two to the northeast.

In terms of the development that occurred I had a conversation with Mr. Dennis and explained to him that the projected growth was from 2023 to 2045, so any development that occurs is captured within that projection, so that's why we didn't exclude it from the model because it's already incorporated in that anticipated growth.

JOHNSON: Thank you.

BAKER: Thank you for the clarification.

JOHNSON: Any other questions for Yacolt? Commissioner Barca.

BARCA: This is Ron Barca. I'm going back to our conversation about Yacolt before and I'm hoping that someone from staff can remind me, was there limitations that were placed on Yacolt's growth based on the aspect of septic penetration and the lack of sewer?

ALVAREZ: Yeah. So, I think that they, they don't have sewer, so the septic requires a 12,500 I think square foot lot minimum.

BARCA: Okay. So, it puts it into the aspect that's their minimum lot size at 12,000. Okay.

ALVAREZ: That's correct.

JOHNSON: Any other questions? Okay. Vancouver.

SNODGRASS: Good evening. Bryan Snodgrass, S-n-o-d-g-r-a-s-s, on behalf of the City of Vancouver. Here first of all to thank this group, the city council, excuse me, the County Council, county staff and then our small city counterparts for reaching this point, which is a very important milestone.

I think as our letter you should have in the record this week from Council Member Erik Paulsen indicates one of the, a congratulations as well for the proposed plan fulfilling one of its most important tasks in providing more than ample growth opportunities for the future.

As you may recollect the plan was originally anchored on aggressive growth forecasts, those are then accommodated through a model which had quite a bit of review at least on the residential side, not so much on the job side, but the result there is that some outdated assumptions are resulting in more capacity than is actually we believe than being reported.

So ample growth opportunities and important to emphasize that those are not only for rental opportunities, that's been some of the discussion, but also ownership as well and the best indication of that I think is in terms of metrics as you can look to the FEIS for instance notes that more than three times as much land countywide is zoned for low-density development, housing development, than it is for high-density housing development and mixed use combined.

There are a couple of areas that in our view need to be addressed to bring this process to a successful and defensible conclusion. One of those is within the Vancouver UGA, the existing UGA unincorporated area, some, and emphasize some, it doesn't have to be a large amount, zoning needs to be provided in our view in the many areas where residents are being forced and current zoning essentially forces them and pro-zoning does as well to drive over a mile to the nearest work or shopping opportunity.

And we had -- this is inconsistent with climate requirements, it's inconsistent with current County policy that says interrelated uses should locate near each other.

And we had earlier provided about two years ago a list of potential sites that could accommodate supportive zoning, none of it included, most of those lands are now proposed rezoning are either outright allows, disallows, excuse me, many of those supportive commercial or employment opportunities or in a few cases it's mixed use that would allow it but doesn't necessarily incent it.

Going forward we understand there's quite a bit on the Planning Commissions plate; we would simply ask that you if you are unable to address the zoning issue in these hearings to at least recommend that the city council consider in future work plans post adoption that this be addressed. It's an important issue to the City of Vancouver and I think to the livability of the residents in the area, and I think to the defensibility in terms of GMA requirements to the GMA plan.

The other issues raised and it's in the letter as well is regards a couple of issues that, legal issues that need to be resolved one way or the other, and how they get resolved I think is of potential regional consequence and so we just would very much want to have a discussion, hear our discussion I should say among yourselves, among staff, among County Council of how these are going to get resolved.

One of those is the, there is a sizable countywide surplus as you know, land surplus. The most recent information we could find in the record before you about that was in the FEIS which said there was 10,000 more housing unit capacity than there is forecast countywide. That's -- if that's not resolved, and I trust it will be in some way; that's a fairly basic GMA violation. There's a more nuanced issue surrounding that

doesn't affect us directly, but it does indirectly surrounding the agricultural land study.

We -- our record is supporting the self-determination of the other cities, that hasn't changed, how that, how the issue gets resolved is of some importance and needs some discussion. Certainly, what we had heard in our understanding of the study was that it found that agriculture was viable. If there are other interpretations, that's a matter that I think also we would want to hear discussed, both of these issues raise important questions for us, and I think in the region.

The one of those is will the growth forecast or VBLM assumptions be changed at the 11th hour, we're somewhat leery of that because that happened earlier in this process in the Vancouver UGA triggered a couple of at least temporary proposed expansions which made no sense on the ground and the County I think wisely pulled back from those.

If small city expansions requiring agriculture are adopted but then removed by the Hearings Board as they have been in the past will have to be made up in the Vancouver UGA.

And I think lastly in the Vancouver UGA on the question of capital facilities adequacy what are the implications if the County is found in GMA violation as it has been quite often in the past on these issues and becomes grant ineligible, what are the implications for service adequacy in those areas. So those are our comments and happy to answer any questions.

JOHNSON: Questions for Vancouver? Mr. Barca.

BARCA: Ron Barca. So, looking at the capital facilities plan are there elements of fees or regional zones that you've had to come up with different taxation policies to try and raise the revenue higher than what is currently in place for the City of Vancouver now?

SNODGRASS: That's a detailed question; I'd have to get back to you on. The short answer is I don't know as I sit here about what, if I understand you're asking what changes have we had to make in the capital facilities plan that we just adopted. We adopted all our plans this past June, that not just that -- do things differently, is that your question? Sorry.

If I understand your question it's in the Vancouver City of capital facilities plans what have we done differently in this recently adopted plan, is that the question?

BARCA: That's correct.

SNODGRASS: I mean, it's range of things, but I can give, I can probably follow-up with a more detailed answer if that's what you need.

BARCA: Okay. Yeah. Looking at the capital facilities plan as it's outlined in I think it's Appendix E, most of the cities just show like a completely balanced budget, they have whatever their expenditures are, however many millions of dollars it is and then it shows on the other side there is revenue to pay for it, Vancouver is the only one that put in the aspect of the actual funding mechanisms.

And so that's why I was wondering whether you've gone down that detail to understand what that is which I think puts you above what the other cities did, but I was wondering whether that also included the aspect of saying there are some places where revenues had to change to meet those demands.

SNODGRASS: Yeah, let me follow-up.

BARCA: Thanks.

JOHNSON: Any other questions? With that said, we have a, that's the end of the cities, so we have about a little less than 20 people, what I'd like to do right now is take a --

ALVAREZ: Well, I think we have, is Camas online?

JOHNSON: Is Camas online? I thought I had called them out. Okay. So, it looks like Camas is actually here.

CATCHING: You should be able to unmute now, Alan.

PETERS: Yes. Hello. Hi. This is Alan Peters; I'm the Community Development Director with the City of Camas. I apologize, I wasn't able to sign on to the meeting earlier, but here now and wanted to thank first of all Chair Johnson and the Planning Commission.

Share today we had another key milestone in the County's pre-update process and we're looking to the Planning Commission to make a recommendation at this time to the County Council on adoption of the countywide 2045 plan. Camas of course appreciates the partnership we've had with the County and the opportunity we've had to work together on this update with your staff as well as the other, the other cities in Clark County.

We support the draft plan and the inclusion of the two expansion areas requested for Camas included in the EIS Preferred Alternative. First of all, Grove Field, we believe is presenting the opportunity to bring public port property that would be committed as to job creation including Grove Field in the UGA would provide zoning and infrastructure needed to advance the Port of Camas/Washougal's economic development growth while helping us meet our job targets.

The Nevin property is another important expansion area located in proximity to urban development and infrastructure in Camas and Washougal. While this property is largely zoned agricultural and undeveloped, it's 160 acres included five-acre lots that could be developed with single-family homes and we believe inclusion of the Nevin property into the Camas UGA to offer urban development is a better use of this property and better alignment with the GMA. So, we would encourage the County Planning Commission to forward a recommendation including Camas's request.

And then finally I want to also reiterate our support for incorporating Transfer of Development Rights policies into the plan. These programs have been successfully implemented across the state, and I believe that the time has now come in Clark County for this opportunity, there's some momentum for it and I think a TDR program presents an important opportunity to connect our desire to preserve ag lands and provide links to jobs and housing in our city.

So, again, I wanted to thank the Planning Commission and encourage you as we conclude this process to get us across the finish line here and support Camas's growth plans. Thank you.

JOHNSON: Thank you. Questions for Camas?

BARCA: This is Commissioner Barca.

MONTGOMERY: Yes. Again.

BARCA: Please, go ahead, Alicia.

MONTGOMERY: This is really simple and I think you already answered it, but does the City of Camas support a TDR program in conjunction with the proposed UGA changes?

PETERS: Yes, the City of Camas is in support of a TDR program.

MONTGOMERY: Thank you.

BARCA: This is Commissioner Barca. I would like a little bit of clarification please on the 244 acres that's shown on the map, is that to be considered urban low density?

PETERS: So, there are two components to that expansion request. The Grove Field property we would designate mixed employment which is a type of light industrial zone. The 160 or so acre Nevin property it is included in the Preferred Alternative as multi-family high, that was our initial request. The City later amended that request and actually requested employment designation, but our understanding is that request came in too late and so it was included in the EIS as multi-family.

BARCA: Okay. That's what I wanted to try and get some clarification on. So, for the Nevin property specifically, you're going to anticipate bringing it in as employment land, not any type of housing?

PETERS: Well, that that would have been our intent, our understanding again based on the timing of our request now making it in time for the EIS. So, the EIS evaluated this as high-density residential and so that is what the proposed plan shows it as being included in. I think we would accept that designation.

Our preference of course would be commercial, and I think that's something that, you know, if it is brought in as residential, you know, we would certainly keep in mind, you know, the possibility of, you know, perhaps doing a mixed use development or something like that that would be still consistent with whatever the adopted plan is.

BARCA: Okay. Underneath the Grove Field property you are creating as the vernacular is now somewhat of a doughnut hole by not being contiguous in adopting those parcels into the urban growth boundary as well, is there a particular reason why you didn't look at those parcels, but you went up to Grove, is it specifically for job growth?

PETERS: Yes. And that's absolutely correct. This request was made specifically by the Port of Camas/Washougal, and it's linked specifically to their property that they own. So, it does, you know, I think of it more as a peninsula, but doughnut hole is fine too, it certainly does create an irregular boundary, but we have no interest at this point in expanding in this area.

This is a largely parcelized part of Fern Prairie with a lot of, you know, smaller rural lots and really don't think fits in with our plans, but the opportunity to bring in Grove Field again it's strictly for jobs and just came at the request of the Port of Camas/Washougal, it's something that we felt much more comfortable with, it also avoids ag lands, a lot of the property in that area or some of the property in that area would include ag land, and so we sought to avoid that in this instance.

BARCA: Thank you.

JOHNSON: Any other questions for Camas? Hearing none, thank you very much. Appreciate your time.

With that said, we are now done with the cities, and we are, we have about 17 or 18 people potentially signed up, what I'd like to do right now is give our recorder about a ten-minute break and then we'll start up with the testimony from you guys. Okay. So, let's take a ten-minute little break here and we'll get going.

(Pause in hearing.)

JOHNSON: Okay. We're going to get back at it. So, what I'd like to do there's four chairs up here and two microphones here and as I call your name, I'm going to call four at a time so just for expedited, you can come up and sit up here and then you can come up front.

Just be clear to spell your name, first and last and, you know, talk slowly. You'll get three minutes and just try to respect that because it gets going here. So, the first four people I have on the list here -- do we have anybody online to speak of first?

CATCHING: We do have several people online, but we thought we were going to do the room first.

JOHNSON: Okay. We'll do the room. Okay. Angie Merrill, are you here still? Oh, City. Don --

ORJIAKO: Steinke.

JOHNSON: -- Steinke. Don, could you just come up, you'll be first on. Claudette. Don, you could actually come right up to the mic. Susanne, are you going to speak again, is she still here? I think she already spoke. Janet, wait, no, no. Linda. Are you here, Linda? Yes, go right there. And then Janet, are you here? Go next Linda.

And then is that David, David Toyer, did I -- David, are you here? Okay. Sorry. I can't read these. And then the next one will be Peter. No, not Peter, excuse me, Teresa Hardy, are you still here? Teresa, can you come up to the last, can you slide over one, David. Thank you. Oh, wait. Yeah. Hold on, Teresa, I'm sorry, I mixed it up, we had someone still coming up. Okay. We'll take off now and --

DELAPENA: Chair.

JOHNSON: Yeah.

DELAPENA: Before we get started, I do need to read our instructions.

JOHNSON: Okay. Go ahead and read your instructions.

DELAPENA: Please note to be a party of record you must submit written testimony before, during, or prior to the close of tonight's hearing, or provide oral testimony at the public hearing, or request in writing to be a party of record.

If written comments were received prior to August 20th, 2026, they were submitted to the Planning Commission members and posted on the Planning Commission website. Tonight's hearing is being transcribed by a court reporter, so please spell your first and last name and speak slowly. Public comment time is limited to three minutes.

JOHNSON: Okay. Go ahead, sir. Thank you.

STEINKE: Testing, is this working?

ORJIAKO: Yes.

STEINKE: Hello. My name is Don Steinke, I live in rural -- oh, Steinke, S-t-e-i-n-k-e, I live in rural East Clark County, I was on the climate advisory group and I'm here to support the recommendations that they made and urge that you pass them. We unanimously agreed to recommend approximately 150 goal and policy proposals.

I suggest the consideration at some time of an additional issue that did not surface until six months ago after we had finished meeting. The new issue is grid-scale batteries. Grid-scale batteries vary from the size of dumpsters to shipping containers. The Columbian Newspaper reported last week that the Pacific Northwest and Conservation Council said we needed 5.2 gigawatts of battery storage regionally by 2032.

Batteries are needed to shave peak demand and to store daytime solar energy for use in the evening. Grid-scale batteries vary in power from one to nine megawatts. We need approximately 1500 grid-scale batteries regionally by 2032. Currently we have one in the entire state, Portland has 30 right across the river from here. We need 1500 more in the region but maybe only 50 in Clark County by 2032.

The question is where do we put them and how will we regulate them, we need them. About two years ago a developer tried to install one battery in Rural Thurston County and people protest, protested. Their protest was motivated by a serious battery fire at the Moss Landing Battery Complex in California, that battery complex was not properly regulated. The project in Thurston County was eventually approved on the condition that the fire department approve of it.

The Pacific Power Council says we also need; we need grid-scale batteries. Do we concentrate them in industrial areas like Portland General Electric has done or do we distribute it, distribute grid-scale batteries on commercial roofs and in church parking lots like Minnesota is doing or both.

The law requires us to reduce emissions; batteries can help us do that. Batteries also provide some resilience in the events of a cyber-attack or wildfire. I'm suggesting that we welcome grid-scale batteries but also develop regulations to minimize the risk. Thank you.

JOHNSON: Thank you for your conversation, sir. Next up is Claudette.

DERRICOTTE: Can you hear me? Okay. Good. My name is Claudette Derricotte, and I live at Cascade Park Estates which is a manufactured home park. And we --

JOHNSON: Can you spell your name, please.

DERRICOTTE: Oh, spell my name. Okay. First name you want spelled also? Okay. C-l-a-u-d-e-t-t-e, last name D-e-r-r-i-c-o-t-t-e. We've lived there since 2018, since 2018 and I live there with my husband who is a Vietnam veteran. We have a lot of us; my colleagues are here too advocating to preserve the manufactured home parks in unincorporated Clark County.

So, I have been given, shared by Glenn a memo on June 22nd and it talks about that 34 manufactured home parks that are home to over 2,000 households in both urban areas and rural areas and what we are trying to advocate is keep our manufactured homes, manufactured home parks.

And we appreciate the work that you've all done to include us in that plan and what it says in the memo of

the Manufactured Housing Park Code concepts is that this is a form of housing that we can, you know, most of us can afford. I'm sorry, I'm a little discombobulated right now.

But in here what you're saying is that what I'm hearing and what I'm learning because I'm still learning the process of all of this, is that we -- when you make your plan there's the idea of having high density and what we need to do is to preserve the parks so that -- oh, I'm running out of time.

So, we want to just remind you that when you go to consider something viable or nonviable, maybe there should be some extra support in there as to what is nonviable so that we don't lose our manufactured home parks to rezoning. Thank you.

JOHNSON: Thank you for your testimony, ma'am. You did a great job.

BARCA: Just one moment, Claudette, before you go.

DERRICOTTE: Yes.

BARCA: Are you aware of the work that staff has done?

DERRICOTTE: Oh, yes.

BARCA: Okay. And have you seen that particular document in the proposal?

DERRICOTTE: Yes. I was going to try to overview on it but the idea of protecting them and the equality of the people because there's so many of us. I mean, I spoke to Mr. Silver who's the CEO of the Vancouver Housing Authority, on Monday, they had a meeting at the library, and he is approached many times for people to buy, for them to buy the manufactured home parks but we need funding. If we can get funding and have it available, then us, our communities can buy them also.

So, in the whole concept of 20 years down the road there are options, we could become co-ops and own the property, a lot of us want to improve our properties and our homes but we can't because we're like on the edge of the cliff waiting to be rezoned and kicked out and the RCW is two years, I mean we have to get out in two years and we do not get the value back from our homes.

So, yes, I understand what you have all done and we have been following it and we appreciate it, but we need to preserve our housing. In the state, not just unincorporated, there are approximately 1200 registered manufactured home parks in Washington State, maybe those that aren't registered there's 1600, that's 65,000 households.

BARCA: Okay. So just for my understanding, you've been working with staff, and you've seen the proposal and you're in favor of it, and if there's anything else I think in regards to your group if there needs to be continued contact, you know who to contact?

DERRICOTTE: Yes, we do.

BARCA: All right. That's what I was hoping for. Thank you.

DERRICOTTE: Okay. Thank you so much.

JOHNSON: Thank you for your testimony.

DERRICOTTE: Appreciate it.

JOHNSON: Linda.

HUETTL: Do I need to turn anything on? Okay. My name is Linda Huettl, H-u-e-t-t-l, and Linda with an i, I live in Cascade Parks as well. I am the president of the Resident Association. I'd like to thank you for clarifying the roll of the Planning Commission and the County Council.

I've been in front of the County Council on more than one occasion looking for the moratorium which was preventing redevelopment of manufactured home parks which they passed. My understanding is that expires in April or early of next year and that they are working on a more permanent solution for us.

After listening to everything that you said tonight with increasing density in the zoning and increasing the number of people, I'm just questioning how that impacts the manufactured home park.

And I also have a concern because as Claudette said if we are sold or redeveloped we get a percentage of appraised value for our houses and lose all of our own equity while having to pay lot rent until we move and having to pay for demolition of our homes which is a significant issue for seniors and for people of low income. So, I am asking that you continue to support the Council and the moratorium about redevelopment.

And I have a comment on a personal level. As I'm aging in society I thought my biggest concern was going to be that my children were going to choose my nursing home and now my biggest concern is that I have to be concerned about the possibility of losing my home, so... I thank you for your time and appreciate your efforts.

JOHNSON: That's great testimony. Thank you, ma'am, I appreciate it. Janet.

EASLEY: Good evening. My name is Janet Easley, J-a-n-e-t, E-a-s-l-e-y. I am a resident as the others are of Cascade Park Village which is a manufactured home park in Clark County.

I was interested in the proposed wording of Clark County Code 40.250.120 entitled Manufactured Home Park Overlay District. To summarize, this section is intended to preserve existing manufactured home parks and prevent the displacement of existing residents. Redevelopment of manufactured homes would be limited.

I am uncomfortable with Section E, use exception, exemption. A property owner of a manufactured home park may seek a zone change for the property for several reasons. The last reason is the applicant proposes to redevelop the site with affordable housing and will assist existing residents to minimize displacement including relocation assistance, et cetera. I assume the Planning Commission would subject any such proposal to analysis before approval. I have several thoughts about this.

The owner of a manufactured home park can probably easily determine that he or she can earn more money if more affordable housing is built on the manufactured home site. We have 170 homes and 300 multi-family homes or apartments could replace 170 manufactured homes, then of course the property owner will receive much more money in rent and lease payments.

Our manufactured home park is located in a commercial area, and the property is certainly subject to redevelopment pressures. Present residents of the manufactured homes on this site will be forced to

move. They will not receive full value for their homes, and their homes would be destroyed.

In our park residents are seniors, most have fixed incomes and some live solely on Social Security, moving will be disastrous for them, some may become homeless. Does the County really want to destroy 170 manufactured homes? The wording here appears to allow exactly what we've spoken to the County Council about, our fear of being forced to move from our homes.

I suspect that this section is included to ensure the present owners of manufactured home parks that there is a way for them to redevelop it their properties for another use and make more money. I plead that this wording would be changed or eliminated. Thank you.

JOHNSON: Thank you for your testimony, ma'am. Yeah. Next up, David. Real quickly, Teresa, if you can come up in the chair. Doug, are you here, Doug Berger, are you speaking tonight? No Doug. Okay. Dale. Sharon. Sharon, come up there, Sharon.

Jim, I think it's Jim. Are you here, Jim? Yeah, come up here, Jim. And one more, Jim Schlatter. You can come up, Jim. Come up, Jim Man, Main? Then how about Bobby, Bobby Derricotte. Bobby, are you here? Come on up if you're going to speak. Just up here. Okay. Thank you very much, sir, for being patient with me. Go ahead.

TOYER: Thank you Chair and members of the Commission, David Toyer, D-a-v-i-d, last name T-o-y-e-r, with Toyer Strategic Advisors, we're a land use planning and economic development consulting firm located up in Everett and we've had the privilege of working with the cities of Ridgefield, La Center and Camas to provide technical advice and expertise on Transfer of Development Rights.

As you heard from the cities earlier this evening relative to their proposed UGA expansions they do support creation of a countywide TDR program. And one of the things that we've done in working with the cities was help them propose language that is in the Land Use Element on Page 31, it's Countywide Planning Policy 1.1.24, and that establishes a specific policy that directs the creation of a Transfer of Development Rights program and it also sets it up to allow the County Council to require that UGA expansions can be done contingent upon participation and a Transfer of Development Rights program and ties that to the execution of an Interlocal Agreement.

And so, we appreciate the work that the Planning Commission did earlier this year and last year to make their recommendation in favor of several of those urban growth boundary expansions for the cities, and then you did make your recommendation contingent upon the creation of a Transfer of Development Rights program and recognizing the need to make sure that there's a policy framework and a process that would be in effect, that's where the genesis for this language has come from.

It has been shared with the Council and we would encourage the Commission as you contemplate the recommendations you made previously in support of those expansions that made it into the Preferred Alternative that you also likewise make sure that you take a look at that language in the Land Use Element and reconcile how that fits with the previous recommendation you made and I think your desire unanimously as a Planning Commission to want to put in motion really a unique and innovative approach to preserving agricultural land as well as providing for helping cities accomplish their growth planning goals, so... Thank you. I'm happy to answer any questions you may have.

JOHNSON: Any questions? None? Thank you, sir. I appreciate your comments.

TOYER: Thank you.

JOHNSON: Let's go with not Peter. Teresa, you're up next.

HARDY: Good evening. Teresa Hardy, H-a-r-d-y. I have two concerns, the first one I'm going to read. Many of us in the community were eager to see new Planning Commissioners we saw as wanting to protect our natural resources but were surprised when we watched you support a Preferred Alternative that needlessly expands UGAs and destroys designated agricultural land, in the case of Battle Ground and quality rural land that should be designated as ag.

We are confused by this decision given that it's been reiterated time and again that the VBLM shows it is unnecessary to expand UGAs to accommodate the projected growth population and as Bryan Snodgrass, City of Vancouver just addressed.

Now the County's Final Environmental Impact Statement has put this fact in writing as well. It states given the planning assumptions for growth rate and jobs acre; the Preferred Alternative exceeds the land capacity needed to accommodate the housing and job growth projected for the next 20 years.

So even if you stay with your previous position to expand UGAs like you did with the Preferred Alternative, we believe you really owe it to the public to really discuss this.

We believe that the UGA should be expanded why -- explain why you believe the UGA should be expanded when that's not what the VBLM shows is necessary when the County's own FEIS document states so and when it violates the Growth Management Act to needlessly expand UGAs which will predictably land the County on the losing end of a court battle that could potentially cost taxpayers a lot of money.

The next that I want to address is that as a Sierra Club we would like to see that you not move forward with approving the changes that have been made four years ago which was multi-family residential outdoor area standards and that are now multi-family residential amenity standards, recreation and landscape has been taken out of that.

Originally four years ago it was the DEAB who brought it and I have it in those packets. The first thing was when they brought it to Council as an interim ordinance and that was just to combine landscaping and recreation.

Then it went to the -- it went to the biannual and it was Bryant Enge at the time who said that it should not go through the biannual because there were unintended consequences, there were density implications, that was not a minor amendment, it should be considered under policy.

The Planning Commission went ahead and approved it, it went forward. Then it went through the multi-family housing options, it went through the Tech Forum, the Tech Forum did not include any public input on that, the only way you could do anything is to attend those meetings and send an e-mail in later.

We feel that there is not enough public input that has been put into this, that there are a lot of unintended consequences, there's equity issues around this because now in the 2026 latest draft it's not just multi-family housing, it's transitional housing, permit supportive housing, this needs to be addressed, it needs to be looked at more closely for climate equity and everything else.

There's a lot of changes that have been made and the public doesn't know anything about this, so we're asking for you not to move this forward in the Comp Plan. Thank you.

JOHNSON: Thank you for your testimony, ma'am. Who's next here. Is it Sharon? Are you up there? Yeah.

PEVEY: Good evening. My name is Sharon Pevey, P-e-v-e-y, and I am also a manufactured homeowner in Cascade Park and, oh, I need to -- okay. Okay. Yes. Well, I'm also a homeowner in Cascade Park community and it's been quite an experience living in one of these communities.

We are now an investment for most of the owners, and it's widely known, they're buying and selling like crazy, and as soon as I moved in the price increases started for rent. I originally, well, I paid $140,000 for my house. If we lose our home we only get 17 at the most and 10,000 for a smaller home, but so anyway, because of all the changes and what was happening I joined a statewide group, and we fought to pass bills in Olympia and we were the ones that passed the rent stabilization.

And it was heartbreaking, we were in Olympia and most, so most of these communities are for senior citizens, we have young families as well, but a lot of senior citizens and we were hearing an 80 some year old woman talk about her $1,000 rent increase and she was headed to the street.

And so, all the policymakers, we were all in tears that day, but so anyway, we did get the rent stability, but we have a bad amendment on the bill now also, so we have a hard time now even selling our homes. When we sell our homes our owners get a onetime rent gouge to whoever wants to buy your property and so our houses have to come way down in price in order to sell even right now.

So, we've been through a lot. We really appreciated working with the County on trying to protect our homes and trying to help us and so we really appreciate it, they spent a lot of time with us trying to get to know what we are dealing with actually and we're senior citizens, we thought we were going to live affordably the rest of our lives and so we are hoping and praying for overlay, overlay zoning for stability, at least we would appreciate that. So, am I off? Do I have a little more time? Oh, no, I'm done. Okay.

JOHNSON: Thank you, ma'am, appreciate it.

PEVEY: Thank you so much for listening.

JOHNSON: Thank you very much, ma'am. Who's next? Jim, finally get to you, there we go.

SCHLATTER: My name is Jim Schlatter, S-c-h-l-a-t-t-e-r, and the reason I'm here tonight is to give you some input about the property my wife and I own that's west of N.E. 61st Avenue at 169th Street, it's 23 acres and it was in the Comp Plan when they changed it.

They made our property only ten-acre minimum with all the other property in every direction around us five-acre minimums which was hard to understand. The only speculation that I could make was maybe it was because it was the remainder of a cluster lot development that was done 33 years ago and, however, if you looked at the cluster lot plat and if you looked at the cluster lot regulations nowhere on there does it say it should be zoned a lower density because it was previously part of a cluster lot development. It simply says that it cannot be further developed until the zoning changes, period.

So, there's no reason to have made our property only ten acres when everybody else is around us is five and in fact south of us and adjoining us there's six one-acre home sites, north and adjoining us there's seven one and a quarter acre zoned sites and to the northeast of us is somewhere around a dozen one to two-acre lots, so...

But really all I'm asking for is to correct this mistake and show in the Comp Plan that five-acre parcels is fine, that's what was given to everybody else. Oh, okay, I still have more time.

So, anyway, I'm asking you to please consider looking at that and realizing that it was a mistake. I'm going to have to go through a zone change request which costs a great deal of money because of this mistake and so I'm hoping that you can at least change, correct the Comp Plan to where our property is the same as everybody around us, the five-acre parcels.

And you can look on your Comprehensive Plan Map and there's our little property that's brown and everybody else's is the five-acre color around us. So, I appreciate your time. I hope you can consider this.

I did; I wrote a letter that I'd like to turn in if that's okay. I just had one other comment. I'm a retired developer, homebuilder, both single-family and multi-family and when I hear about zone changes going up to 43 and 50 units per acre, you make land almost unsalable, and you force a developer to build something that people don't want. You end up with four-story 400-square foot studio apartments and so I just think that density is just, is too high. And, anyway, thank you.

JOHNSON: Yeah, wait, hold on. We have a question for you here.

HALBERT: Jim, Commissioner Bryan. Could you give me your cross-streets again so I can look up the property.

SCHLATTER: Oh, yes. It is -- I can give you the address, but it's N.W. 61st Avenue at N.W. 169th Street and it's west on the west side of 61st Avenue.

HALBERT: Great. Thank you.

SCHLATTER: The address is 16716 N.W. 61st Avenue, Ridgefield. I can give you the parcel number too.

JOHNSON: Thank you for being patient since you were the first one to walk up and wait this long.

SCHLATTER: Well, sorry, for the mistake. Anyway, thank you.

HALBERT: Thank you.

JOHNSON: Yep. Next is, sorry, is it Bobby? Come on up, Bobby. And then give me a second here, Sam, no, that's City of Battle Ground. Walter. Walter, are you still here? Take a seat there, sir. Diane, are you here? Come on up to the front row.

Janet. Are you here, Janet? Can you come to the front row. Dave Rowe. Come on up, Dave. And Bert. Now, Bert do you want to -- is Bert here? I don't think Bert wants to speak. Okay. I think that's all. Is there anybody else that wants to speak that I didn't get? Okay. Go ahead, sir. Thank you for being patient.

DERRICOTTE: B-o-b-b-y, D-e-r-r-i-c-o-t-t-e. Just to let you know, sir, I never signed up to speak here. I do not talk in public. I do not talk give speeches. All I'm going to share right now, sir, I'm going to tell you the truth about what and who I am and what my hope is for the future.

All of these ladies and gentlemen here I live in the compound with them with my wife Claudette. I love

where I live. First of all, I never had a home. This is the first real home I ever bought in 2018. I lived in rentals as a kid. Joined the service, did my time in Vietnam, almost got killed but not in Vietnam, in Cambodia, but God saved my life through another human being because if not I wouldn't be talking and sharing.

So, all I can tell you, sir, is I was homeless when I was 50 years young in Long Beach, California. I still had a job, but I gave everything away to my ex-wife. I didn't want anything because she never had anything, but I knew that if I gave everything to her, the house, everything, gave her half my pension from the company I worked in Long Beach and I was in debt up to my neck.

Went back to Hawaii, met Claudette, she helped me pay my bills off. So, we got married. I retired from Hawaii, came here. We bought a manufactured home park here. If you have ever been homeless I'm going tell you though the loneliest thing about homelessness, I feel it for those ladies and gentlemen out there, even senior citizens my age of 85, being all alone, that's terrible.

And, finally, my children, I have two sons and a grandson. Oldest grandson 50, I mean oldest son 58, my youngest son 56. My grandson was born in 1988. I haven't seen him ever since he was born. So, I pray for them. I hope that things will be better for the future generation. I don't care about me; I care about the future generation.

You think about it because they're going to be homeless, my grandson, my sons, never have a home and I want to thank you and God bless you for doing what you do, sir.

JOHNSON: Sir, thank you for your comments and especially thank you for your service too, I appreciate it.

DERRICOTTE: You're the first gentleman that told me that. Nobody else told me that except you.

JOHNSON: My daughter right now, real quickly, my daughter is in Vietnam right now. I just thought so, thank you for your service, sir.

DERRICOTTE: I don't like you people, but I love you because you're a human being like me.

JOHNSON: Diane, is it Diane? You're up next. Okay.

DEMPSTER: Hi. Good evening. Thank you all for sticking through this evening, it's a long evening. Diane Dempster, I live in Vancouver unincorporated Clark County, and I'm very concerned about the loss of agricultural land that will occur if the Preferred Alternative is adopted.

Clark County's lost so much agricultural land and farmers in the last 30 years that a once thriving agriculturally economy struggles to even be recognized as an industry. With the growing population we need all the ag land we have left to feed the current and anticipated demand for local food. The ag land study shows that most of the land in Clark County is prime agricultural land. Approving the Preferred Alternative would result in the de-designation of 509 acres of prime agricultural land.

It's a myth that we need more land to create affordable housing. Single-family homes are the more expensive to build, take up most of the land and are out of the price range for many Clark County residents. Building on land outside the UGB cost more in infrastructure such as roads and sewers.

The County's own study show that there's plenty of land inside the urban growth boundary to meet the

upcoming demand and it's cheaper to build there. The housing we need is for low to moderate income families, not single-family homes in rural parts of the county. Thank you for your time.

JOHNSON: Thank you for your comments tonight. Janet. Let's see, Janet.

HEDGEPATH: Good evening, Chair Johnson.

JOHNSON: Can you turn it on, just hit the button there. Yeah. Anyone of them there. There we go. Thank you.

HEDGEPATH: Thank you. Good evening, Chair Johnson, Commissioners. My name is Janet Hedgepath, J-a-n-e-t, H-e-d-g-e-p-a-t-h, I'm a citizen of Clark County.

As I've watched the Comp Plan process it has become evident that the intent from the very beginning was to craft a Comp Plan that continued business as usual. As I saw decisions made disregarding data and trying to skirt the mandates of the GMA and the new legislation as the City of Vancouver wonderfully outlined, I recall that old victim, follow the money and I ask who benefits from these choices and who pays.

This Comp Plan accommodates developers and some of the cities who use the myth of needing more land and relaxed standards and fees to create affordable housing. Whether this Commission and Council still believe this ruse or just use it as a convenient excuse doesn't really matter because the results are the same.

Citizens live with more low-density zoning or sprawl and less ag land and no more affordable housing. Taxpayers pay the increased cost for utilities, roads and services that weren't covered by TIFs and no more affordable housing. And we all feel the loss of grants and state monies in the County's efforts to continue developing as it has previously with no more affordable housing. Taxpayers pay for the lawsuits that result from allowing questionable development and no more affordable housing.

Though I ask as you move forward please give more consideration to the impacts on everyday citizens and the cost to the taxpayers and not just the development community and what is best for them. Thank you.

JOHNSON: Thank you for your comments, ma'am. Let's see, it looks like we have Dave. Dave Rowe come on. Dave Rowe come on up. Is there anybody else in the audience that -- oh, okay. We got it up here, Dave.

ROWE: Dave Rowe, R-o-w-e, I live in Battle Ground. I gave a handout for you to look at. It's Clark County has an unutilized asset on the Comprehensive Growth Plan. Little mention of the Chelatchie Prairie Railroad in the Comprehensive Plan.

That map behind me was drew out in 1894 and that Chelatchie Prairie Railroad is on that map, it's over 130 years old, we don't use it enough that would help our county. The handout I just gave you talks about rail bikes. Rail bikes are used in many other rail lines such as Mt. Hood National, Mt. Hood Railroad and they charge $199 per bike two people. Pudding Creek rail bike charges 265 hundred dollars, or $265 for a two people bike and Noyo River in California charges $495 per for, for a two-person bike.

So, what I'm asking you because we just stopped thinking about utilizing that railroad to a better degree of and if we would use rail bikes there, it would sure help our schools, some of the income could be revenue to help our school budgets, which is sorely needed. Chelatchie, Clark County upgraded that corridor so it could be used by rail bikes.

So, I'm just asking you to kind of put in your Comprehensive Plan that there's other things to be used rather than just a railroad. It is a freight train right now and it could be put in for a passenger rail too.

I'm wearing this conductor's uniform because I'm a conductor down in Lake Oswego. We could have more conductors like they were in 18- -- they were running from 1802 -- 1902 to 1932 they was running freight on this line, and they were charging $1.70 per passenger so back in that time and they hauled quite a few passengers. In Portland from 1915 to 1920, four million people a year rode the trains in the Willamette Valley up to Vancouver, so I'd like to see them come back. Thank you.

JOHNSON: Perfect timing. Thank you for your comments. Is there anybody else in the audience that would like to speak? Come on up, ma'am, and just go ahead and take the mic and state your name.

BARCA: Chair.

JOHNSON: Yes.

BARCA: Just for the record I want to do that rail bike thing so I think we should at least get one and explore the opportunities and maybe for a weekend.

JOHNSON: Maybe.

BARCA: Yeah.

HALBERT: Second the motion.

JOHNSON: Thank you. Go ahead, ma'am.

ROWE: Okay. My name is Lisa Rowe, R-o-w-e, I don't think we're related. I am also a resident at Cascade Park Estates. I'm actually the newly elected treasurer secretary so I'm trying to get caught up on all of this stuff that affects me.

So, when I moved here I, actually I wasn't prepared to speak but now I feel this is personal so because I'm scared, but when I moved here I was planning on moving to the Portland area and I just happened to see online these manufactured homes that had garages and yards, that's where I want to live.

So, I ended up buying my house, spent every penny I had, and frequently now every week on Facebook there's many posts that say we're moving to the Vancouver area from Florida or whatever and they say what's the best area to live, where's good schools, 90 percent of the responses are don't move here, crime's bad, homelessness is bad, rents are up, don't, don't move here.

So, I don't think that I mean I'm all for progress growth, that is necessary, but I don't think people are going to be scrambling to come to Clark County to live in a box in a high density area. Mobile home parks are a great example of affordable housing.

And so I think that again growth progress is great but it shouldn't come at the sacrifice of our already affordable housing because people don't want to like I have medical issues, physical limitations that I can't go up and down stairs, I can't go in an apartment and take groceries in and out, take my dog in up and down, you know, young families that want to buy a house can't afford it and the mobile homes are a great option for that. Seniors can live independently, it's just, it's just a great option.

Before I came here I lived in one for 23 years and I loved it, but I think it's just an option that shouldn't be taken away and we shouldn't be growing at the sacrifice of our homes. I think it's, yeah, because I mean I'll lose everything if they take away our homes, I would have to leave Washington and go back to probably California, Nevada or somewhere where I have some support and I mean nobody cares if one person leaves, but it's not going to be just me.

Nobody's going to come here if there's nothing, there's no options, it's got the same high-density apartments that are in every city, there's going to be nothing unique about this area that's going to draw people in, it's not going to be appealing, you know.

So, I do know about the moratoriums and stuff and we definitely appreciate that, all the work that's going into that, but we need a more permanent solution. So, thank you.

JOHNSON: Thank you for your comments, we appreciate that. Yes, ma'am. Yes, come up. Make sure you state your name.

REED: My name is Susie Reed, S-u-s-i-e, R-e-e-d. I've been listening. I came here to learn and like I mentioned for me I'm an educational specialist, it's like learning a foreign language and so I've, I have an awareness level of knowledge, it's pretty minimal, but I appreciate learning this, but I wanted to share with you, so when I moved here and I won't go into detail I started having real estate mobbing. I have prime property. I even had somebody walk by the house and say prime real estate and then it started, you know, backflow valve was taken out, dirt put in, the sprinklers, that kind of thing is happening on a regular basis, I cannot get help with it.

And as I listen to these other people's stories, one of the things that, you know, I worked for 50 years and I -- and I knew a Fadness, I'm anxious to ask you about it, but when I was, my son was 6, I had cancer and he came up and he had a dream and he said to me, mom, I had a dream last night, I have a message for you and I said, you know, I just thought it's a kid thing, he had been watching TV with mom again, and he looked at me and he said why would you look for anything with your head when you can find it with your heart.

When you make your decision, he's an interesting kid. When you make your decisions be sure that you use your heart and as I listen to these people tonight and I listen and I ask the knowledge base that you gentlemen demonstrated in the types of questions that you asked was very impressive.

I don't know what it all means, but I could tell that there was a strong knowledge base behind those questions, so that's the head part, this is the heart part. And in anything that we do in life, I worked with kids with autism, anything that we do with in life the question becomes what is our purpose, what are we trying to accomplish, are we trying to accomplish a grand scale or are we trying to reach the individual person and make life, a quality of life where people don't say don't move here.

I was excited to come back, and I've had one heck of a time since I've been here, and I refuse to give up. I've learned to walk three times, I'm not giving up, but I'd really like you to consider these people's needs and make sure that they don't lose, I mean I worked for 50 years and I could lose everything, I might go join you, but they can't, you can't start over.

And then there's our kids, what are they going to do. So that has to be part of the configuration. What is affordable housing for those that come after us because we're all just a little bit away from disaster. Thank you.

JOHNSON: Thank you again. Okay. With that said, I think that was it. Do we have anybody online that would like to go and do your --

DELAPENA: All right. We will now call those participants that have joined remotely by a computer or telephone. Please raise your virtual hand or press star 3 on your phone to let us know you would like to provide comment. For those using telephone options, press star 6 on your phone to unmute yourself when it is your turn to speak.

CATCHING: So, Chair, we have several people online, but only a few raised hands so far. The raised hands have come up in order, so I'll just call them in the order that they raised their hands.

So first I'm going to unmute Steve, Steve Thalberg, go ahead when you're ready. And, Steve, I've sent you an unmute request, if you would like to speak go ahead, otherwise we'll move on. Okay.

HOLLEY: Who's speaking? Is that Jeff?

CATCHING: No, this is Bart. I'm sorry, Cindy, Bart Catching.

HOLLEY: Okay. Thank you.

CATCHING: Okay. So, Steve has lowered his hand, so we'll go to caller two. Caller two, I'm sending you an unmute request. If you could identify yourself.

THALBERG: Hello.

CATCHING: Yes.

THALBERG: This is Steve Thalberg. Can you hear me?

CATCHING: Oh, well, now we can, Steve, yes.

THALBERG: Okay. I had a problem on clicking the unmute button, it didn't work.

CATCHING: Okay. Go ahead, Steve, we can hear you now.

THALBERG: This is Steve Thalberg, S-t-e-v-e, T-h-a-l-b-e-r-g. I'd like to address the climate element. The Planning Commission and County should adopt measures to protect and enhance tree-crown cover as tree-crown cover is associated with multiple health benefits. And I -- please see the document that I sent to you guys earlier today.

Housing development is a concern in the county, and the construction of homes especially high-density dwellings frequently results in the destruction of trees. The County should adopt a tree protection and replacement program.

The City of Vancouver's urban tree and forestry program can be used as a template. They measure to protect and enhance tree-crown cover, will also reduce greenhouse gas emissions, improve air and water quality and enhance the quality of life which are all part of HB 1181.

With regards to Chapter 4, Environmental Element, I'd like to see added to 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.10.2, the adoption of a public benefit rating system commonly known as a PBRS. It's currently adopted in 20 of

Washington's counties. A PBRS will enhance the success of meeting all the goals of the Environmental Element and those goals mandated in HB 1181.

Regarding Chapter 5, the Transportation Element, I'd like to see added to 5.0.16 the approval of development projects whether they're residential or commercial should occur without exceeding the volume to capacity ratios, the V/C ratio of 0.9 and this will also reduce greenhouse gas emissions which is also addressed in HB 1181.

Regarding the Preferred Alternative, the Planning Commission is urged to reconsider their adoption of altering the urban growth boundaries for the cities in Clark County as those changes are inadequate and the goals for concurrency, traffic and infrastructure and the County admits that there is a projected $554 million shortfall in funding necessary for transportation improvements. The current system further sets up conflicts with adhering to goals for concurrency and the loss of agricultural land.

I refer you to the document that I sent to you guys earlier today for other issues that I'd like entered into the record. Thank you.

JOHNSON: Great timing. Thank you, sir, for your comments.

CATCHING: Next in line, Chair, we have Jackie Lane. Jackie, I've sent you an unmute request.

LANE: Good evening, Commissioners. I'll keep this pretty short because a lot of people have spoken more clearly than I can, but I would just ask you do not de-designate any ag land in this Comp Plan and ensure that your commendations follow the law, specifically the GMA.

And I would listen to the City of Vancouver in regards to the County's actions in the Vancouver UGA and ensure that impact fees and the cost of infrastructure supporting new development is covered by developers.

The taxpayers like me who have been there for years and years and years I don't want my taxes going up in order to -- is somebody else speaking -- in order to cover development growth and I don't want traffic to get worse because the County can't afford the infrastructure needed for new development. So that's it. Thank you. Have a great night.

JOHNSON: Thank you for your comments, ma'am.

CATCHING: Next up we have first name Heidi. Heidi, I've sent you an unmute request.

POZZO: Hello. My name is Heidi Pozzo, H-e-i-d-i, P-o-z-z-o. This plan adds density where the County, excuse me, the County's records say it cannot be served, not the roads, not the creeks, not the schools, not the parks.

On concurrency, more density is being added to the 179 and Salmon Creek corridors on roads that are already project problems. In May in the 174th Street subdivision case the applicant's traffic engineer identified road segments that exceeded the County's adopted .9 volume to capacity standard.

The GMA requires a concurrency ordinance that denies development dropping a road below the standard, Clark County has one. These segments fail and the developments are approved anyway. Under our code section never written to approve a failing test, a program never says no is not a concurrency program.

The GMA also requires the housing and transportation elements to balance, that cannot be determined here. This plan requires bike lanes and paths on 106 miles of County road, that space comes from buying land or existing lanes. The County has not designated which roads lose lanes so none of it is modeled. The analysis was run on the network as it exists today. The housing this plan assigns here needs to be reassessed.

Stormwater, two creeks take all the water from this corridor, Whipple and Mill both too warm and both eroding. Whipple ran over the temperature limit for fish on 71 of 93 days. Some of that is existing development, but everything this plan adds makes both creeks worse.

The water can't infiltrate here so the developments hold their runoff in detention facility, then pushes it to the creek. The facility slows the water down, but the water still rise and the forest is coming down.

In the Mill Creek catchment, the County projects two-thirds gone at the build-out with hard surfaces more than doubling. Every development complies but nothing adds them together and together they are eroding the banks and heating the water. A basin plan is the only tool that looks at a whole stream, neither creek has one. The Comp Plan commits the County to basin planning in two policies then assigns density to two basins without one, the analysis has not been done. My fuller comments are in the record.

From a parks perspective a 90-acre deficit of parks on the east side of I-5 exist and the park district will pause new development. From a schools perspective, Ridgefield and Battle Ground plans were written on the heels of the pandemic, updates are required every four years and that didn't happen. I ask you to recommend that the County reapply the urban holding until the County answers questions the studies raise. Thank you.

JOHNSON: Thank you for your comments, ma'am.

CATCHING: We have one more raised hand right now. Jim Byrne. Jim, I'm unmuting and sending you an unmute request. Jim, if you want to speak, unmute yourself. Okay. Hearing none, now we have call-in user two. Sending you an unmute request. Could you identify yourself.

FELS: Hello. My name is Peter Fels. I hope you can hear me. Spelled P-e-t-e-r, and then F-e-l-s. 13 years ago, the University of Washington published climate change impacts and adaptation in Washington State. That study predicted most of what we're now facing, increased temperatures and heat waves, more severe rainfall dense, increased areas burned my fires, drought, lower snowpack, decreased stream flows and the other things that we're facing such as more days of poor air quality due to wildfire smoke. Those predictions have come true; in other words, climate change is here globally and in Washington.

The study said how much and how fast climate changes occur depends on both the amount of greenhouse gas emissions and how the climate changes in response to those emissions. The legislature required consideration of climate change as part of the Comprehensive Plan process. Clark County should be doing its part to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and help us all have healthier lives and a healthier planet.

Your citizens advisory panel recommended the County adopt the same greenhouse gas emission standards as Vancouver. We all live in the same air shed and we're all equally impacted by what happens in the city and the county. I urge you to recommend adoption of the same emission standards as Vancouver.

The legislature also required the County to have sufficient supply of agricultural land to sustain the local agricultural community or economy. I agree with pretty much everything Diane Dempster said about that.

I think Clark County has the potential to have an even more vibrant agricultural economy than we have now by supporting local ag and the value added crops such as wine grapes, organic vegetables and the many things that our local farmers are already producing; however, they can't be sustained without full use of all available agricultural land.

The County should withdraw its approval of extensions of the urban growth boundaries over any agricultural land. Allowing upzoning of ag lands not only harms the agricultural economy but also increases the need for more vehicle miles traveled and reduces the benefits of more density toward reducing greenhouse gases. Please honor the recommendations of your agricultural advisory commission.

Finally, I want to urge you to consider working with C-TRAN to subsidize fare so all bus travel within the county is free. You'll increase ridership at a small cost because their income is only about 15 percent of the total C-TRAN revenues. This will also improve greenhouse gas reduction by increasing use of mass transit and by increasing transit use you may reduce impacts on the transportation infrastructure budget which it mentioned you have a deficit. I've lived in this county for over 30 years --

JOHNSON: Sir, you've run over your time. If you could wrap it up, please.

FELS: I'm wrapping up, I'm on the last two sentences here.

JOHNSON: Okay. Go ahead.

FELS: I've lived in the county for over 30 years and watched increase urbanization and reduction of agricultural and prime lands. The quality of life is separate; I'm concerned about the future my children and grandchildren face. Please recommend adoption of policies that will begin to reduce the trends of climate change. Thank you.

JOHNSON: Thank you for your comments.

CATCHING: Okay. Jim Byrne has his hand raised again. Jim, why don't you try unmuting yourself again. I don't know why we're --

BYRNE: Hello. Can you hear me? Hello. Hello. Can you hear me?

JOHNSON: Yes, sir, we can hear you now. Go ahead with your comments.

BYRNE: Thank you. My name is Jim Byrne, B-y-r-n-e, and I live in Ridgefield. Bryan Snodgrass, the Vancouver City Planner, stated earlier today that there exists a surplus of building lots in the buildable lands inventory and he was concerned that there may be potential litigation if the current Preferred Alternative is accepted and I would agree with him. We suffer a loss of agricultural lands and you'll have to de-designate those agricultural lands.

I'm also concerned about the climate change. The Growth Management Act says we need to deal with climate change in HB 8111 (sic) and I think that the Preferred Alternative will cause an increase in greenhouse gases and an increase in vehicle miles traveled. I believe the County should adopt the City of

Vancouver's greenhouse gas criteria.

I also have a concern over concurrency but that was addressed thoroughly earlier. And thanks for listening, thanks for the work you do, thanks for going through this process.

JOHNSON: Thank you for your comments, sir.

CATCHING: Chair, we have a hand raised again but it's caller user calling two again which I thought was Peter, I'm going to request unmute and confirm that before we move off of it because I don't know who it is. Sending you an unmute request caller user two, could you identify yourself. And hand is lowered, so... That is the end of the raised hands online.

JOHNSON: So, we have all of the people online. Is there anybody else in the hearing that hasn't commented that would like to comment? Seeing none, we will now close the portion of the public comment and bring it back to us here.

Return to Planning Commission

JOHNSON: What I'd like to do, it's 15 minutes to 10:00, I would like to leave this hearing open and resume it for discussion with the Planning Commission on, what's the date again, September, help me out here, Jose? Is it September 3rd? September 3rd; correct?

ALVAREZ: Correct.

JOHNSON: Yes. And so, we will come back. And so those of you who have waited through all of this we have so much stuff and we had a lot of stuff sent to us today that we have to get through.

So, what we'd like to do bring it back and for those of you who are waiting and hopefully for us to resolve this, I don't think it's going to happen tonight. Is there any comments from the Commissioners? Yeah, Ron.

BARCA: This is Commissioner Barca. I have a couple of questions for staff. One is with all of the focus we've had on the manufacturing housing ordinance I want to make sure that I understand where our discussion is on that in relationship to all of the exhibits and chapters that we have, where do we see it and discuss it?

ALVAREZ: Let's see, it's in the code changes section and I can, we can provide you the specific code section that deals with the mobile home park overlay and the proposed changes.

JOHNSON: I've also asked for next time we meet a clarity on what we will be voting on exactly. So, I know there's a lot of relevant confusion on how we're going to do this, so I've spoken to Oliver and Oliver is going to bring it back to where we can see these things and maybe that's one of the things that we're looking at there too, Ron.

BARCA: Right. I just wanted to make sure if it was part of a bigger chapter that we were making sure that we had an opportunity to get into it as expressed here for the concern.

And so, I am anticipating that we're going to go through the individual chapters which gives us an opportunity to add, subtract or agree with as stated by staff and it's also going to have to include in some cases the exhibits because that's where most of the capital facility questions arise is in I think it's Exhibit E,

yeah, and there's a lot that we need to go through on that, so...

I'm fine with going through them but the question was where will we find that portion of it, that was the question that I had open, and so Jose said he'll find it and I trust him and we'll get to it.

ALVAREZ: So, you can find it in Exhibit 3, the proposed Title 40 code changes, and then it's under the Table of Contents listed as Page 109 which is the Manufactured Home Park Overlay, 40.250.120, and there's also a 40.260.140 which is Manufactured Home Parks - Standards and Requirements.

BARCA: All right. Thank you.

JOHNSON: Any other questions for staff? Go ahead.

HARROUN: Oh, I don't have a question for staff, but I do want to ensure everybody, thank you coming, staying late, testifying. I know we're like up here a lot of us are looking at our phones but we're pulling up documents and we do read your comments, we do very much appreciate your input and don't think you're not being heard, because we are reading, we are listening and we are paying attention, so thank you so much for coming out.

ALVAREZ: Chair.

JOHNSON: Yes.

ALVAREZ: You said the date but not the time.

JOHNSON: That would be 6:30; right?

ALVAREZ: Correct.

JOHNSON: As usual. They're not feeding us that day, Jose.

ALVAREZ: It needed to be on the record.

JOHNSON: Any other comments? We're not closing this -- any other general business for whatever? Any comments from the Planning Commission?

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None

NEW BUSINESS

None.

COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION

HARROUN: Is public testimony closed now?

JOHNSON: The public testimony is closed, we've closed that, but the meeting is still, I guess we can just

close the meeting, right, whatever, I'll just leave it, you guys can figure it out. Any questions?

ADJOURNMENT

JOHNSON: Thank you again for staying so late, we appreciate it and thank you for being so kind too, it makes it easier for us, so have a good evening.

The record of tonight's hearing, as well as the supporting documents and presentations can be viewed on the Clark County Web Page at:
https://clark.wa.gov/community-planning/planning-commission-hearings-and-meeting-notes

Television proceedings can be viewed on CVTV on the following Web Page at:
https://www.cvtv.org/program/clark-county-planning-commission

Minutes Transcribed by:
Cindy Holley, Court Reporter – Holley Court Reporting
Jeffrey Delapena, Program Assistant – Clark County Community Planning

Minutes of Public Hearing

Planning Commission Hearing

2025 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan Update

Thursday, September 3, 2026, 6:30 P.M.
6th Floor Hearing Room, Public Service Center, 1300 Franklin Street, Vancouver, WA

CALL TO ORDER

JOHNSON: Tonight will be a little bit different. We won't call the meeting to order, we're going to go into Executive Session, but we're going to do a roll call first. So, we'll come back and the meeting will be called to order.

Just a mental note, all public comment had been closed from the time before, so if some of you are waiting to comment that portion's closed, we'll come back and deliberate, but right now what I'm going to do is call a roll call real quick.

The meeting's not open yet officially, but we will, I'll call a roll call, we'll go into quick Executive Session, it shouldn't, I don't know how long that will be, it shouldn't be that long, then we'll be back here to deliberate on the what we've been working on. So, with that said, Jeff, can we get a roll call please.

ROLL CALL VOTE

HALBERT: HERE
BERGTHOLD: HERE
FADNESS: HERE
BARCA: HERE
HARROUN: HERE
MONTGOMERY: HERE
JOHNSON: HERE

Staff Present: Oliver Orjiako, Community Planning Director; Rebekah Ward-Palmerton, Senior Deputy Prosecuting Attorney; Jose Alvarez, Program Manager II; Susan Ellinger, Planner III; Harrison Husting, Planner III; Jenna Kay, Planner III; Michael Sallis, Planner III; Jeffrey Delapena, Program Assistant; Larisa Sidorov, Office Assistant II; and Cindy Holly, Court Reporter (Virtual).

JOHNSON: So, with that said, where are we going to go, back in the back part --

DELAPENA: Down the hall.

JOHNSON: That way. So, we'll go down that way and we'll be back, public please be patient.

WARD-PALMERTON: Chair, you do need to say for the record the amount of time. My suggestion at this point is 30 minutes.

JOHNSON: It says that on here, 30 minutes with no potential action, I'm just reading what was said on here. Yeah, so we'll just put 30 --

HOLLEY: Who was talking?

JOHNSON: Karl is.

HOLLEY: No, before you.

JOHNSON: That was Rebekah Ward-Palmerton, that was our attorney.

HOLLEY: Thank you.

JOHNSON: Okay. Sorry, Cindy. But will 30 minutes, Counsel, 30 minutes, okay. And then we'll just go down there for no more than 30 minutes. All right. Thank you.

(Pause in proceedings from 6:31 p.m. to 7:15 p.m.)

Planning Commission Rules of Procedure

JOHNSON: Okay. Good evening, Planning Commissioners, members of the public and staff members. I would like to call this hybrid public hearing to order for Thursday, September 3rd, 2026. My name is Karl Johnson; I'm the Chairman of the Clark County Planning Commission.

The role of the Planning Commission is to review and to analyze comprehensive plan amendments, zoning changes and other land use related issues. We allow, excuse me, we follow a public process including holding hearings during which the public has an opportunity to provide additional perspectives and information.

In legislative matters, the role of the Planning Commission is advisory. The County Council will hold separate hearings, consider our recommendations and they will make the final decision.

The Planning Commission will conduct the public hearing tonight. We have closed, I'm going to kind of change this, we have closed the public comments, so this part does not pertain to what's happening tonight other than if you're speaking about something that is not on the docket and I'll get to that in a minute. Okay. We will deliberate tonight and make recommendations to the County Council.

For both virtual and in-person members of the Planning Commission and staff, please ensure that your microphones are muted unless you are speaking. Planning Commissioners, when you make a motion or a second, please state your name for the court reporter.

Tonight, are there any conflicts of interest from the Planning Commissioners that are here tonight? Seeing none, we will proceed. Jeff, can we get a roll call just for the record again please.

ROLL CALL VOTE

HALBERT: HERE
BERGTHOLD: HERE
FADNESS: HERE
BARCA: HERE
HARROUN: HERE
MONTGOMERY: HERE
JOHNSON: HERE

GENERAL & NEW BUSINESS

A. Approval of Agenda for September 3, 2026

JOHNSON: I need a motion for the, and a second for the approval of the agenda for September 3rd, 2026.

FADNESS: Commissioner Fadness. I **move** to approve the agenda for September 3rd, 2025.

BERGTHOLD: Commissioner Bergthold. I'll **second** that.

JOHNSON: We have a motion and a second. Jeff, can we get a roll call please.

ROLL CALL VOTE

HALBERT: AYE
BERGTHOLD: AYE
FADNESS: AYE
BARCA: AYE
HARROUN: AYE
MONTGOMERY: AYE
JOHNSON: AYE

DELAPENA: 7/0.

B. Approval of Minutes for August 20, 2026

JOHNSON: Motion passes. Can I get another motion and second for approval of the minutes for August 20th, 2026.

BARCA: This is Commissioner Barca. I'd like to make a **motion** to accept the minutes as written.

HARROUN: Commissioner Harroun. I **second** that.

JOHNSON: We have a motion and a second. Jeff, can you get a roll call please.

ROLL CALL VOTE

HALBERT: AYE
BERGTHOLD: AYE
FADNESS: AYE
BARCA: AYE
HARROUN: AYE
MONTGOMERY: AYE
JOHNSON: AYE

DELAPENA: 7/0.

PLANNING COMMISSION DELIBERATIONS

JOHNSON: The motion passes. The next section of our hearing tonight are communications from the public of items that are not on the agenda tonight. So, if you came and you wanted to speak for three minutes regarding something other than what's on here, you can do that right now. Jeff, do you see anybody online?

DELAPENA: I'll go ahead and give the instructions first and then we'll do that.

JOHNSON: Great. Thank you.

DELAPENA: For attendees using their computer or Webex application, if you would like to speak, please use the raised-hand icon. For attendees using the telephone audio only option, press star 3 on your phone's number panel to raise your hand.

For those in person that would like to provide comment, please raise your hand. Once acknowledged, you may come to the microphone towards the front of the room. Public comments are limited to three minutes per person in order to accommodate all speakers.

Again, this portion of tonight's hearing is only for items not listed on tonight's agenda. We will begin with those in the hearing room who would like to make a general comment. Please raise your hand and the Chair will call on you to come up front to the microphone. Please provide your first and last name for the court reporter. I don't see any raised hands in the hearing room.

We will now call on those people on Webex or the phone that have raised their hand. For those people using the telephone option, press star 6 on your phone's number panel to unmute yourself

when it is your turn to speak. We do not have anybody online with a raised hand either.

JOHNSON: Okay. Hearing none, we will now move on to the main hearing. Again, I want to thank you all for waiting while we were in Executive Session and your patience, it will be a long evening, we have a lot on here to get through.

Our idea tonight is to try to get through this to get it to County in a timely manner, so it is a lot, so please be patient and just listen away. So right now, we are going to go into deliberation with the Commissioners regarding the 2025 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan Update.

Clark County's updating its Comprehensive Plan to meet the Growth Management Act deadlines are established in RCW 36.70A. The update process began January 19th, 2023. The County Council adopted the population job numbers, the 20-year planning horizon that ends in 2045. The Council also adopted public involvement plan that the County has implemented.

The environmental review process included an analysis of three alternatives and a Final Environmental Impact Statement on the Preferred Alternate was released on July 24th, 2026.

The purpose of this hearing is for the Planning Commission to take public testimony, we've already done, but it's to deliberate and make a recommendation to the Council on topics listed below. Changes to the comprehensive and zoning plan map. Updates to the policy and text in the comprehensive plan document. Changes to Clark County Code Title 40, the County's Unified Development Code, to implement the map. Changes to the arterial atlas and update the capital facilities and capital facilities plans and update the school, fire and traffic impact fees.

That is in a nutshell is what we're going to try to do, we have 104 items of which some we'll be able to go right through, but what I'm going to do tonight and hopefully staff can challenge me and stop me or correct me or help me out here, Jose, I'm just going to start from the top with Battle Ground and go down through these and then if you have something to say, go ahead. Yeah, go ahead.

ALVAREZ: So, there's two things I want to bring your attention to. One of the, the arterial atlas was omitted from the decision matrix, so we want to add that as Number 29A. And then --

JOHNSON: That was the arterial atlas.

ALVAREZ: Item 23 is a site-specific request, there's no change to what's on the table, but I just wanted to disclose that on the map it's showing as R-50 and that's a remnant from Alternative 2, so if you make the motion to approve it as is written, that will be updated and reflected in what goes to Council.

BERGTHOLD: Chair, this is Commissioner Bergthold.

JOHNSON: Go ahead.

BERGTHOLD: Is it possible to have the maps on display while we're discussing the options.

ALVAREZ: Yeah, we can pull those up for you as-needed.

JOHNSON: As-needed, yeah.

BERGTHOLD: Thank you.

JOHNSON: Any other questions on process from the Commissioners? Okay. So, we will start off with Battle Ground UGA to expand the UGA towards Dollars Corner for additional employment capacity, that is the one where we go down 502.

Is there any amendments, discussion regarding our recommendations? If not, on any of these I'm open to taking a motion and a second as-needed.

MONTGOMERY: This is Commissioner LeDuc Montgomery. Regarding kind of starting off here with the various UGA expansion decisions, our prior, you know, vote regarding which alternative to study as part of the FEIS and now coming back to us for a final vote.

We recommended Alternative 2 but contingent upon implementation of a TDR program and we had a lot of discussion about no net loss of agricultural lands and how do we, you know, balance these competing issues of development and housing and employment capacity with preserving agricultural lands.

And so, I'd like to either now or at the applicable time, but before we vote on any of the UGA expansions propose an amendment to Policy 1.1.24 regarding a TDR program for the County to put forth perhaps a more concrete framework of what that TDR program might look like such that when we're voting on these UGA amendments each of our Commissioners would kind of know what we would be voting on in terms of that TDR contingency.

JOHNSON: Yeah, that was 5 through 9 our de-designations of ag, so that's kind of where I was going to lump them in, so I was hoping I was going, so for example, 1, 2 and 3 here on Battle Ground were not ag related and so, and there's others obviously, but I was just going to go down those, and then when we got to 5 through 9 we could put that amendment, maybe you could drop an amendment, then we can say the amendment once and then drop it on all 9 for efficiency. What do you think?

MONTGOMERY: Sure. I'll come back to that.

JOHNSON: Back to Battle Ground where we take a motion and a second on Battle Ground or is there any discussion?

BARCA: This is Commissioner Barca. Can we have the map pulled up, please. I believe it's the far left that drives out towards Dollars Corners, so...

JOHNSON: Is that the red or the blue I'm looking at?

BARCA: Both.

JOHNSON: Both. Okay. So, we see the expansion there the red and the blue is a part of it.

BARCA: This is Commissioner Barca. I believe blue is considered rural land in the zoning designation and the red/pink color is going to be commercial; is that correct?

ALVAREZ: The blue is proposed to be industrial employment and the red is commercial.

BARCA: So, in its current state are the colors the same amount of commercial land as is out there because Dollars Corners was a rural center?

ALVAREZ: Yes, that's the current. So, portions of the blue are RC-1, the red is primarily the CR-2 which is commercial. So, the blue is mostly RC-1 and R-5.

BARCA: All right. This is Commissioner Barca again. So, it has the appearance that mostly the commercial land is overlaid on what is commercial now with a little bit of changes to it, but the industrial land goes all the way through the R-1 designation, RC-1? Yeah?

ALVAREZ: Yes.

BARCA: All right. Thanks.

HALBERT: Commissioner Halbert here. I want to make a **motion** to accept the Battle Ground UGA as presented.

JOHNSON: Is there a second?

FADNESS: This is Commissioner Fadness. Would you be able to -- was that just for Item Number 1?

JOHNSON: Yes, for 1.

FADNESS: Commissioner Fadness. I'll **second** that.

JOHNSON: We have a motion and a second to approve Battle Ground UGA to expand the UGA towards Dollars Corner. Can we get a roll call, please.

ROLL CALL VOTE – ITEM NO. 1, MOTION TO APPROVE

HALBERT: AYE
BERGTHOLD: AYE
FADNESS: AYE
BARCA: NO
HARROUN: YES
MONTGOMERY: YES
JOHNSON: YES

DELAPENA: 6/1.

HOLLEY: I couldn't hear Alicia's vote.

MONTGOMERY: YES

PLANNING COMMISSION DELIBERATIONS

JOHNSON: Motion passes. Map Recommendations Number 2, Battle Ground UGA to expand the UGA to the north for additional residential capacity. Can we see that on the map, please. Oh, that's that little sliver right there. Okay.

ALVAREZ: It says the R-3 and R-7.

JOHNSON: Is there any discussion on this? If not, a motion and a second would be appropriate.

FADNESS: Commissioner Fadness. I would **move** to approve the expansion of the UGA as presented.

JOHNSON: Is there a second?

BERGTHOLD: This is Commissioner Bergthold. I'll **second** that.

JOHNSON: We have a motion and a second. Jeff, could we get a roll call please.

ROLL CALL VOTE – ALTERNATIVE 2.A (MODIFIED), MOTION TO APPROVE

HALBERT: AYE
BERGTHOLD: AYE
FADNESS: AYE
BARCA: AYE
HARROUN: AYE
MONTGOMERY: AYE
JOHNSON: NO

DELAPENA: 6/1.

PLANNING COMMISSION DELIBERATIONS

JOHNSON: Motion passes. All right. So, we move on now to 2.B the Camas UGA and this is to expand the Camas UGA to include the Grove Field Airport. Discussion or questions for staff?

FADNESS: This is Commissioner Fadness. I just wanted to kind of express my support for this. I did my flight training at Grove, and I know that this is kind of a big thing for the Port of Camas and Washougal in order to be able to kind of expand the services there.

Right now, it's a very small little runway that it's not really usable for much other than some little Cessnas. So, I would just like to start out and make a **motion** to include this or to recommend yes on this item.

BARCA: Ron Barca. I'll **second**.

JOHNSON: We have a motion and a second. Is there any discussion? Clarification, we have a motion and a second to include the Camas Grove Airfield into the UGA. Do we have any discussion?

MONTGOMERY: Yes. This is Alicia LeDuc Montgomery. I'm just curious if there's thoughts around the fact that the Alternative 2 would create more surplus because we've been talking about constraints, if anybody has thoughts on that piece, although I recognize it's an airport.

JOHNSON: It's just an airport; right? It's just the airport; correct?

FADNESS: Yeah. Yeah.

MONTGOMERY: And maybe I'm just --

ALVAREZ: Yes, that's correct. Alternative 2 is just the airport.

MONTGOMERY: So maybe I'm not understanding the charts where it's like the land use alternative comparison and capacity for employment and housing and when I'm looking at Camas under the Alt 2 it seems like it's increasing the surplus compared to Alt 1. Can you just explain that a little bit.

ALVAREZ: Yeah. Right. So, they've made some changes inside their UGA to increase their density in order to accommodate the less than 80 percent median family income, and then also they're required by State law to allow for duplexes and I think it's duplex, triplexes under a new bill and so that's increased their capacity but they're not proposing any expansion to their UGA, so these are changes internal to them to the existing UGA.

MONTGOMERY: Okay. Thank you.

JOHNSON: Any other discussion? Hearing none, Jeff, can we get a roll call, please.

ROLL CALL VOTE – ITEM NO. 2, MOTION TO APPROVE

HALBERT: AYE
BERGTHOLD: AYE
FADNESS: AYE
BARCA: NO
HARROUN: AYE
MONTGOMERY: AYE
JOHNSON: AYE

DELAPENA: 6/1.

PLANNING COMMISSION DELIBERATIONS

JOHNSON: Motion passes to expand the UGA to north for additional residential capacity. Number 3, Item Number 3, Battle Ground UGA, remove the southwest portion of the UGA from, and this would be commonly known, correct me if I'm wrong, as the Meadow Glade, this is the Meadow Glade move.

ALVAREZ: That's correct.

JOHNSON: And Council has brought that back and said Battle Ground wants that removed and Council, correct me if I'm wrong, said they didn't want --

ALVAREZ: They agreed with that.

JOHNSON: They agreed with that.

ALVAREZ: To remove it, yes.

JOHNSON: Oh, okay. Just checking. Just checking. Okay. So again, I'll take any discussion or a motion either way.

BARCA: This is Ron Barca. I think the point for me with all of the Battle Ground votes is the idea of how Battle Ground is going about doing their long-term planning.

The idea that if even if the Council is okay with just giving back Meadow Glade, I don't believe it's in the best interest of the County. It doesn't move the agenda forward for the County to take on more of the urban development and I think it's a mistake on our part even if Council voted 3 to 2 to accept it.

I'm looking at the idea of how difficult it's going to be for the County to make ends meet and the idea of taking this parcel of land back on I think is just convenient but not thought worthy and it should be thought worthy.

So, my other two votes were predicated on the same one that Battle Ground isn't looking at long-term planning, they're looking at immediate gratification through the industrial land and the commercial land and my position on this is that all three of these parcels needed better inclusion in their long-term planning.

JOHNSON: Any other discussion?

MONTGOMERY: Commissioner LeDuc Montgomery. I agree regarding the Meadow Glade expansion, or I guess giving it back to the County on that point.

FADNESS: This is Commissioner Fadness. I guess just to clarify what you're saying, Commissioner

Barca, is you keep mentioning that the County would have to take on urban development, but if this parcel is taken out of the urban growth area I don't believe that that dense urban development that you're talking will be able to take place.

Jose or Oliver, could you speak to what the zoning would resort to if it's taken out of the UGA and what could be developed in that area.

ORJIAKO: This is Oliver. Thank you, Planning Commissioner Kyle Fadness. The area if removed from the Battle Ground UGA as they propose, that area will revert back to rural zoning, predominantly Rural 5, and in some cases two and a half acre lots and five-acre lots, but it's going to be rural.

However, if there are county sheriff called, it would be the responsibility of the sheriff county to respond but broadly speaking the area will be revert back to rural zoning.

FADNESS: Thank you, Oliver. Yeah, I mean, I just don't really have a concern I guess with bringing this back to the County because what's the difference of like you say if it's not densely developing and there's a sheriff's call, there's really not a difference whether it's two miles in the west there or it's just in this corner here, it's not like we're bringing in a lot of sewer, storm and, or city provided utilities that the County would have to pay for.

BARCA: Commissioner Barca here. I guess in that regard, first of all, I think it's Meadow Glade is a rural center and so the zoning is down to one acre, is it not?

ALVAREZ: Yeah. So, if you look at the map of property to the east would be one acre, RC-1, and then the middle would be RC-2.5 and then on the west would be R-5 and that's what had essentially been zoned prior to it being incorporated in the Battle Ground UGA.

BARCA: And so, Commissioner Fadness, I think also in the context the State allows with a recent law change that we have not adopted yet, but I believe that rural lots are going to be able to all have an ADU that's a detached ADU on them. They can have attached ADUs now.

Realistically we could look at a 20, 25 percent growth increase without doing any kind of rural land changes at all in there, and should the density get taken in closer than it would be able to go even higher in that regard.

We did hear from the fire district that serves that now, it's the fire district out by the fairgrounds that's serving it, not the fire district that serves the City of Battle Ground, the Sheriff's Office.

Even if this is perhaps not the strongest case for it, I think what we're looking at though is the idea that jurisdictions need to pick up their responsibility, and I don't believe that the City of Battle Ground is so small now that it can go ahead and just decide that it doesn't want to take in land that it desired before.

This shows me that there's a lot of land that Battle Ground has not even annexed yet, but they want to drive out towards the money of the industrial and commercial lands in Dollars Corners.

I'm going to go back to the idea that I don't think the City is doing long-term planning, I think they're doing immediate gratification, and it serves them best just to get that off their books so they can go ahead and take the other parcel up to the north and bring that in instead.

FADNESS: I do understand what you're saying, but I will disagree just as, you know, they are developing where the corridors have been, the roads have been improved and where it makes more sense to develop and that's kind of my final statement on it. Thank you.

JOHNSON: Any other questions?

MONTGOMERY: Commissioner Leduc Montgomery. And I think just echoing some of what Mr. Barca's points that if there's multiple requests to expand I think they need to keep what they already have and take care of it.

If they're wanting to expand they need to already take care of what's in their, you know, jurisdiction to care for and so that's again what I'm against the removal is in tandem with, well, they want an expansion and they need to also maintain, care for what they've got.

JOHNSON: I think it's known that Battle Ground, that's why 502 was widened, that's why Battle Ground needs commercial land, it needs industrial land, and I think like you said I agree with you, Kyle, that that's where they're going.

I'm not sure where it's at, but if Council is there I'm inclined to say, okay, you know, let's move it back to the County, that's my place, but I would look at a motion and a second from anybody.

FADNESS: This is Commissioner Fadness. I **move** to remove the portion of the UGA as presented.

JOHNSON: Do we have a second on that?

HALBERT: Commissioner Halbert. I will **second** that motion.

JOHNSON: So, we have a motion and a second. Jeff, can we get a roll call please.

ROLL CALL VOTE – ITEM NO. 3, MOTION TO APPROVE

HALBERT: AYE
BERGTHOLD: AYE
FADNESS: AYE
BARCA: NO
HARROUN: AYE
MONTGOMERY: NO
JOHNSON: AYE

DELAPENA: 5/2.

PLANNING COMMISSION DELIBERATIONS

JOHNSON: Motion passes. Now we move on to the Camas UGA to expand, this is just the airport one, the Grove Airport, which is out north of Camas right there, it's just the airport in that area. Is there any discussion on this?

BARCA: This is Commissioner Barca. For staff, the way the map is shown right here is the white section underneath the airport remaining in the county?

ALVAREZ: This area here?

BARCA: Yeah, that area there.

ALVAREZ: That is correct. The only thing that they're adding to the UGA is the area that's designated airport and unfortunately I think that's all of it. I know there's a portion that's of airport that's, they're not proposing to annex, but, yes.

BARCA: Thank you.

JOHNSON: Questions or comments regarding this? I'd take a motion or a second if not.

HALBERT: Yeah, Commissioner Halbert. Just to be clear it is the purple color that is being annexed?

ALVAREZ: Yes, being annexed to the UGA.

HALBERT: Thanks. Then Commissioner Halbert. I'll make a **motion** that Camas UGA expand to include the Grove Field Airport.

JOHNSON: We have a motion to expand the Camas UGA at Grove Field. Is there a second, please.

HARROUN: Commissioner Harroun. I **second** it.

JOHNSON: We have a motion and a second. Jeff, can we get a roll call.

ROLL CALL VOTE – ITEM NO. 4, MOTION TO APPROVE

HALBERT: AYE
BERGTHOLD: AYE
FADNESS: AYE
BARCA: AYE
HARROUN: AYE
MONTGOMERY: AYE
JOHNSON: AYE

DELAPENA: 7/0.

PLANNING COMMISSION DELIBERATIONS

JOHNSON: Motion passes. Now we're going to go through 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9, each of these are -- include a de-designation of ag land. So, I know that we had talked about a TDR, if somebody wants to speak to that now and that maybe we could just get that discussion, I don't want to say out of the way, but we could just attach it to each of those.

MONTGOMERY: This is Commissioner LeDuc Montgomery. And what I have is a proposed policy language change to Policy 1.1.24 which I think staff had prepared a proposed policy too for a TDR program and we've had discussion about that and I just wanted to propose amended language that if it was adopted in my mind would then tie any vote to expand the UGA through de-designation of agricultural lands, those de-designations would be tied to the implement of, implementation of the TDR program, so that's where this proposed policy change is coming from.

And so, I can read my proposed language of the policy and then I have a quick statement on why I think this is more defensible if we are to move to de-designate any agricultural land.

So proposed policy language, 1.1.24, Clark County and participating cities shall cooperatively adopt and implement a countywide Transfer of Development Rights or TDR program to permanently conserve agricultural lands while accommodating the urban growth adopted through the 2025 Comprehensive Plan periodic update.

UGA expansions that include de-designated agricultural lands shall be subject to an urban holding designation until applicable TDR requirements are satisfied. The County and affected city shall enter into an Interlocal Agreement establishing TDR requirements, implementation responsibilities, conservation objectives and timelines. The countywide TDR program shall be fully operational no later than December 31st, 2027.

The program shall ensure the permanent conservation of at minimum one acre of agricultural land for each acre of designated agricultural land converted through UGA expansion, while also ensuring no net loss of agricultural resource lands resulting from adopted UGA acreage or planned housing, population or employment capacity resulting from implementation of a TDR program.
The program shall include a mechanism for identifying and evaluating rural lands for suitability of designation or redesignation as agricultural resource lands.

If sufficient TDR credits are unavailable or if the TDR program is not operational by the implementation deadline, the County and affected city shall use purchase or Transfer of Development Rights, permanent conservation easements or another mechanism providing substantially equivalent permanent agricultural conservation. Failure, delay or insufficient participation in the TDR program shall not result in removal, reduction or reversion of an adopted UGA expansion or a reduction in its planned urban capacity.

Future UGA expansions involving designated agricultural resource lands shall participate in the TDR

program and provide permanent agricultural conservation at a minimum one-to-one acreage ratio or provide an alternative mechanism achieving substantially equivalent permanent agricultural conservation.

So that is my proposed policy language, and I can talk briefly about where I'm coming from with that.

So, the Alternative 2 UGA expansion involves, you know, de-designation of agricultural lands and we had talked previously about adopt, tying that to the adoption of a TDR policy and I think that that policy needs to be meaningful if we're talking about actually de-designating lands especially when the County's already been sued for noncompliance with the timelines around the Comp Plan, thinking about defensibility in my mind as an individual commissioner.

The GMA requires us to reconcile two obligations, RCW 36.70A.060 requires the County to assure the conservation of designated agricultural resource lands while RCW 36.70A.110 requires UGAs to contain sufficient areas and densities to accommodate projected urban growth.

The Department of Commerce's rules are also relevant. WAC 365-196-310 states that UGAs should not be expanded into designated agricultural or other resources lands unless no other option is available. And WAC 365-196-815 explains that conservation means keeping resource lands available for commercial production and preventing their conversion into incompatible uses.

And then there's been some Washington Supreme Court decisions that reinforce the importance of taking the agricultural conservation obligation seriously. In the case of King County vs. The Central Puget Sound Growth Management Hearings Board, the Supreme Court considered uses proposed on designated agricultural lands and held that the challenged amendments did not comply with the GMA.

The Court was recognizing the Act's agricultural land provisions that protect continued viability of agricultural resource lands and industries. And the lesson I take from that is that conservation under the GMA needs to have some sort of substantive meaning, not just calling land agricultural while adopting policies that undermine continued availability for agricultural production.

And similarly, there was a King County vs. Central Puget Sound Growth Management Hearings Board case in 1999 where the Supreme Court made clear that an individual UGA designation remains subject to substantive review for compliance with the Growth Management Act.

So, I think some of these concerns certainly we've heard in our own record throughout the process. There was the environmental review that identified potential conflicts with Alternative 2's conversion of ag land and the GMA's requirement governing expansions into designated ag land.

We had our whole, you know, discussion about TDR during our original recommendation about what to study, there was the Agricultural Advisory Commission that unanimously recommended maintaining existing ag land, resource ag land.

And we've heard significant and repeated public comment throughout the process about the need or the desire of the community to conserve agricultural land capacity. And then there's, you know,

references and feedback in the FEIS, the Vacant Buildable Lands Model and others written testimony that we've received to this effect.

And so, for me the TDR provides an important, the policy I proposed provides an important means of reconciling those concerns with the urban growth that's been contemplated in Alternative 2. RCW 43.362.005 and .010 expressly recognize TDRs as a mechanism to permanently protect sending lands while transferring development opportunity into receiving areas and I think that's along the lines of the balance we're trying to achieve here or that's been discussed.

And so, my position is that I find the UGA expansions being proposed are substantially more defensible under the Growth Management Act when there is conver- -- when we're talking about conversion of agricultural land if it's paired directly with an enforceable commitment to permanently conserve ag land elsewhere that results in no net loss of agricultural resource land.

So, if there's a de-designation in one area, there would need to be a designation redesignation protection in another area so that we're not having a net loss when there's potential concern about is there enough demand for the capacity in the first instance. So that's why I support a no net loss approach on both sides.

On the one hand one acre of qualifying ag land permanently conserved for every acre designated land that is converted while preserving the UGA acreage and housing, you know, population and employment capacity that's being proposed to be adopted through this Comp Plan Update.

I also want to ensure that our TDR proposal includes a date certain and a fallback in case there isn't something durable so we don't end up in a situation where we vote to agree with certain ag land de-designation but there's not really an enforceable or durable TDR process, then that TDR process doesn't come to fruition and so then it's essentially the UGA, you know, is expanded regardless without that intentionality of the ag conservation goals.

And I think we saw that with our last round where we said, yes, we were voting to approve these various de-designations of ag land tied to a TDR program and then the Council agreed with the de-designation but took out our recommendation about tying it to a TDR.

So that's my reasoning for wanting to propose a more specific and hopefully durable connection of voting to de-designate certain ag lands with on the one hand voting to update this policy saying it's expressly being subject to a TDR so there's no net loss of ag land. I know that's a lot, but that's, I put some thought into it.

JOHNSON: So, with that said, let's just we're going to get there, so we're going to start with Number 5, thank you for that part of that, Commissioner.

So, we're going to start with the Camas UGA which include the de-designation of agricultural resource land and a UGA, a UGA expansion to the east for housing.

So, with that said, we're going to discuss that one. So, if there's discussion about the TDR and

whatever, this is where that begins, but we're going to specifically start with each one of these. So, Commissioner Barca, go ahead.

BARCA: This is Commissioner Barca. I'm sorry, Chair, but I think to go forward with Alicia's recommendation we need to go to Number 33, the Chapter 1 and get that revision at 1.1.24 put in place before we go forward with any discussion of any de-designated land.

MONTGOMERY: This is Commissioner LeDuc Montgomery. I agree, I think the fastest approach or a streamline approach would be we go to that section, I propose this policy and then whether or not it's adopted we can then quickly vote on the others in light of whatever the outcome is.

JOHNSON: So, let's jump to Page 5 which is Number 33, Chapter 1, Land Use Element. We went through all these chapters before. So, I would take your amendment, Alicia, however you want to do that, and we can vote on that up or down and then we can go back. Okay.

HARROUN: Can we discuss?

JOHNSON: Oh, yeah, sure. On we're doing 33 now.

HARROUN: 33, yeah, but discussing the TDR.

JOHNSON: Yes. Correct.

HARROUN: This is Commissioner Harroun. So, I liked what we passed originally. I would recommend that we go back and just send back what we passed originally, there was quite a bit of debate and thought about that.

The no net loss provision is a death nail to the development because in essence what you're saying is you're going to have to go find some, you're going to have to parcel together, like if you had 100 acres or 500 acres, you're going to have to go purchase 500 R-5 lots and designate them permanently agricultural land and it's economically infeasible because all of a sudden your cost per acre goes to an extraordinary amount, you're $700,000 for a five-acre lot. And so, what happens is it's just a backdoor way of just killing any, any of the de-designation.

So that's so versus taking large portions of agricultural land in that you can purchase in blocks and we're talking about the farmers are putting a permanent covenant easement, however that TDR program works, it makes it more viable for the farmer, and it helps with the existing agriculture and it ensures that that in perpetuity is going to remain agricultural and productive agricultural land.

The no net loss provision is a poison pill to any development because you cannot functionally purchase stuff that's zoned for residential and then flip it to agricultural to do that, so...

So, a hundred percent on board for the TDR program, I like it because I think it helps the farmers, I think we can get larger blocks of land that's more functional and I like what we had passed originally. But I appreciate the spirit of the no net loss, but I live in a, there's a practicality to it that it needs to be

functional as well, so that's kind of my, that's my concern, yeah.

JOHNSON: Yeah. Okay. Commissioner Barca.

BARCA: Yeah. So, Commissioner Harroun, I think you're mistaken somewhat in the context of this. This is the purchase of development rights, not the purchase of the land, this is only the idea of having the TDR program buy up the development rights of some other parcel for the sake of moving forward into the de-designation aspect of it.

So, it isn't the full-blown purchase, it's whatever number is an agreeable number for the sake of getting that purchase of development rights taken off of a new parcel and then added back into the ability to develop in the ag land that is but come de-designated.

HARROUN: I appreciate your thought process there, but there's kind of a distinction without a difference in that if you take a parcel that you could build a house on and then make it so you cannot build a house on it, right, you're not, you're stripping all of the value. So, whether or not you're taking physical custody of the land, you've stripped the value from the land.

So, it's the same thing in residential building right now, a one-acre parcel, a three-acre parcel and a five-acre parcel are all pretty much the same price because it's about the authority to be able to build a single-family house there, so it doesn't matter the parcel size. So is that -- I'm trying to answer your concern there.

But that's the no, what happens with the no net loss provision if you're just -- if you -- you're stripping out the ability to make it a viable product. Does that make sense?

BARCA: No, it doesn't make sense to me because in the context what you're doing is you're changing the hierarchy of what it's used for. So, you're saying in the context that there's the ability to put a single-family dwelling on it and what we're saying is through the purchase of the development right, now the highest utilization for it remains in the context of agricultural production over the long-term.

HARROUN: But then you would no longer be able to put a single-family house there.

BARCA: That's right because you purchased that development right.

HARROUN: But it makes the land fairly worthless from a development standpoint.

BARCA: All right. So, I guess we're back to the idea of saying highest and best use. In your estimation the aspect of highest and best use is only if you build some development on it, a single-family dwelling or whatever the case is. I think what Alicia pointed to though is there's pretty strong language already in the State law about needing to preserve and to utilize that.

So, we've already just recently had in the county a particular farm get the purchase of development rights come off of it from its farmland trust, I think it was Joy Farm, something like that, in that regard they made a conscious choice, they weren't in the context of making their land less valuable to them,

what it does is it allows them the ability to get paid upfront for them to be able to do more with it.

So, this is only for people, this is for only people that want to agree to it though, Jack, and I think what you're doing is you're saying, you're making their decision for them by saying that the only way that they can make money on that land in your estimation is if they decide to convert it.

HARROUN: No. You're, and this is, and what I'm talking about is the code language specifically, but what you just referred to of the farmer permanently sold their development rights, okay, that's exactly, but it was already zoned ag, the land, the farm was already in ag land and what I'm saying is that that's exactly what the original stuff that we passed allowed to do that we go to that farmer say, hey, you got this farm, we're going to purchase any future development rights if the zoning changes, this will permanently be ag and then here's, you know, some financial consideration for that.

What -- so there was -- there wasn't in this case with a no net loss it wouldn't apply, okay, because -- because what my understanding of the code language now Alicia has proposed we then have to go find land that is not currently zoned agriculture, purchase those development rights and turn it into agriculture and so, and that's the concern I have which makes it financially infeasible and you won't, the program won't work. So, it's the no net loss is what I have real concerns with.

Some of the timeline stuff I think I want to look at the whole clock on the adoption and then how quickly, you know, it can be implemented, but that's, and that's why I like the original language that we originally approved.

JOHNSON: Any other discussions on this?

MONTGOMERY: Commissioner LeDuc Montgomery. I think there's another perspective which is what we passed or, you know, referred to the Council and then gets passed is also there's already a legal challenge in court and I think that absent a no net loss provision it's going to be a lot less defensible before the Hearings Board or any appeal for the county that it's taken this long and then we're still getting to a place of in Alternative 2 and all this de-designation that isn't really fully supported by the full record going back through this whole process.

HARROUN: But you understand that it doesn't work, that a TDR with a no net loss does not work.

MONTGOMERY: I don't agree with that.

HARROUN: Well, okay, explain to me how the finances work behind that? It doesn't -- it doesn't work. This is a really big deal because we have these cities that desperately need this land and then you make it financially infeasible for it to be developed because they would then have to go find something that's not resource lands and so we're not helping the existing farmer.

We're finding somebody that has developable land that's or non-resource lands, right, and then asking them to convert it to undevelopable land or, you know, it would be agricultural land, and then the finances behind that work because you're saying, hey, can I give you X amount of dollars for you never to develop here nearly, well, this is what the land is worth so and if you strip those rights away you

strip all the value away so you would have to remunerate that which then doesn't work from a development standpoint for the developer.

So, it doesn't work and I want to pass something that actually can work and that actually helps our current agricultural committee, so that's, it's a big deal, the no net loss thing is a huge deal.

MONTGOMERY: So I guess just to clarify in your mind if somebody had land that was zoned say residential but they were using a large portion of it for agricultural uses and they were willing to convert part of their property to the ag resource land or for the purposes of TDR conservation you think that wouldn't work because that person just wouldn't agree to it?

HARROUN: Right. So, let's say you have 40 acres, right, and it's all zoned residential, it's worth, I don't know, I want to say right now like $500,000 an acre, right, if it's agricultural land it's probably worth, call it $30,000 an acre, $20,000 an acre, right. So, there's a $470,000 nexus so that you would have to then purchase those rights for for it to be even-steven, right, and so --

MONTGOMERY: And so correct (inaudible).

HARROUN: -- so what you're, you know, unless they're altruistic and go, well, you know, I'm 80 years old and I wanted to keep on farming but that's different, I mean I'm just looking at it from an economic standpoint.

MONTGOMERY: Right. And I'm saying economically some people do actually value agricultural use on residential property such that they would agree to something like that because they do want to conserve agricultural uses.

HARROUN: I'm not disagreeing that there is definitely people like that, I'm just saying from a marketplace standpoint, I mean you're looking for the unicorns versus the, you know what I'm saying, I've read some articles even with the datacenter people telling them they were offered 20 million but they took 2 and put it in a permanent conservation, and I applaud them for it, but I'm saying from a market reality, from a functionally, a function market which is what we're trying to create with a TDR that doesn't work.

MONTGOMERY: And I would do it with my own land. I currently have residential property in Clark County, and I use half of it for agricultural purposes, we raise turkeys, we have an orchard, we have gardens and I would sign up for this program.

HARROUN: I'm not disagreeing with you that there are individuals that value that, but I'm just saying at scale it falls apart.

MONTGOMERY: I guess I just hear, we've heard so much public comment and participation in this whole process that it sounds like there is a significant portion of the community that does value the agricultural aspect of land use in Clark County that there probably would be a market for it and I'm also concerned about the basis for the UGA expansions absent a no net loss from a legal standpoint when we're talking about it being challenged and so that's just kind of my final position on it.

I think no net loss is the most legally defensible and it's consistent with a significant amount of public feedback and the Ag Commission study and the Vacant Buildable Lands Model, to me it's that middle path that is the most defensible approach to trying to address this issue.

JOHNSON: Any more discussion on this?

BARCA: I do have something in that regard. This is Commissioner Barca. I guess I would look at it right now is the Planning Commission has a lot of very difficult decisions in regards to the aspect of it's hardly ever the case where we have a full win/win and everybody's happy what the outcome is.

We are the arbitrators of somebody being disappointed somewhere along the line, but what I see with this is our opportunity, Jack, is the idea give the people that are interested, whether they're unicorns or maybe they're much more available in the marketplace than you think, give them an opportunity to participate in the program and the way that Alicia has put the wording in place is if the program is not viable in that regard then it collapses back to the idea of the jurisdictions either get a purchase of development rights on their own that they're able to pull forward or that the land reverts into the UGA and that's a closed deal and it never happens again.

So, I think the way that Alicia worded it we're putting it into the context of having some belief system that there is going to be able to be a TDR program with purchase rights that would be viable based on what the county did and come forward.

If we go back to the aspect of what you're saying is I have the same concern as Alicia already spoke on the idea that it's much more along the line of the development community will see that there's an opportunity to go forward, but I don't think we're having the strength of presenting this growth plan to the State for review and have it holdup in that regard.

So, to me if we don't have a very viable program that we believe that the public is asking for and we're going forward in that regard, then we're really in a position that says we don't have the foundation for us to be able to even bring in any of this designated land.

JOHNSON: So, in our, in the Land Use Element, we have a TDR that's in place in it, that's the one you're looking at right now, correct, 1.1.24 or whatever; is that correct?

So, what seemed to be the disagreement here is it sounds like some of you want, some of us want to put in something more added to this or we approve the Land Use Element with a TDR already in it.

So, for to get moving on this I can see everybody's position it seems to be, I would like, I would entertain a motion to either accept the Land Use Element Chapter as-is with the TDR program that you're looking at on the board or not.

And I want to be very clear, if we make a motion that says I want to add this and then we say no, it's voted down, we're going to have a land use chapter that's messed up, so my point is be careful on how we make this motion.

So, whoever makes the motion they make the motion, but the reality is, is there's a TDR right there and to me it has, I'm reading timelines for full implementation of Transfer of Development Rights, and any requirements or limitations placed on the expansion area at such time the TDR program is implemented.

We don't have this until we approve this chapter and we're going to be approving or not approving de-designations, so these are happening simultaneously. So, I'm looking for a motion that either up or down on the Land Use Element as-is with the TDR or not.

HARROUN: This is Commissioner Harroun. I **move** that we accept the TDR as written as in the record in 1.1.24.

JOHNSON: And can you add and approve Chapter 1, would you, friendly amendment, I mean we're approving the Land Use Element.

HARROUN: And approving the Land Use Element, yes.

JOHNSON: We have a motion. Do we have a second?

FADNESS: Commissioner Fadness. **Second**.

JOHNSON: We have a motion and a second to approve Chapter 1 of the Land Use Element, I'll ask for discussion, the Land Use Element with the TDR that is currently written in front of us 1.1.24, okay, that's the motion and seconded on the table. Discussion.

MONTGOMERY: Thank you. Commissioner LeDuc Montgomery. I think I've read this provision and I'm glad that there is a starting point included, but my concerns remain the same that it doesn't have specific date certain, and it feels a little too nebulous and I'm concerned about durability here.

And so, I propose, you know, some date certain and again the no net loss aspect to me is really important for a legal defensibility standpoint to be able to feel confident in voting to approve these multiple agricultural land de-designation, and so that's why I just wasn't fully comfortable going with the de-designation vote with the current starting point language.

And so, I took that and tried to expand on it to make it a little bit more durable to where I felt comfortable and so that's why I was wanting to propose the language I read earlier to basically replace what's in the 1.1.24 in front of us.

JOHNSON: We currently have a motion and a second to accept the Land Use Element with the existing TDR. So, unless there's a friendly amendment added to that, which probably not, I'm looking for a roll call, and let's wait. Is there any more discussion? Ron.

HALBERT: Well, I'm concerned --

BARCA: Who are you?

HALBERT: Yeah. Oh, I'm sorry. Commissioner Halbert here. I'm just concerned, I think, Alicia, you need to make an amendment at this point and then we vote on that amendment to accept your language changes here or not and then come back and approve the whole chapter.

I have some concerns over your language also and that I'd like to know more about it and the impacts of it and, you know, Jack's brought some, you know, some valid points up and I'd like to know the, have some time to figure out the economic impacts of actually implementing a lot of shall's in that shall lose in that no net loss language and so just I'm struggling with it from that standpoint without having the chance to absorb it and understand how it actually is implemented and the process here, so... Does that make sense to make an amendment?

JOHNSON: Yes. The only way I think we can get around that is withdraw the motion and vote on Alicia's amendment or whatever and then redo that if the motion is willing to be withdrawn.

HARROUN: I would like to vote on the motion.

JOHNSON: Okay. Motion's on the table. Can we get a roll call please, Jeff.

HALBERT: Excuse me, but what -- Commissioner Halbert. What motion, are we just talking about the one as presented?

JOHNSON: The Land Use Element, yeah, as presented.

HALBERT: Thank you..

ROLL CALL VOTE – ITEM NO. 33, MOTION TO APPROVE

HALBERT: AYE
BERGTHOLD: AYE
FADNESS: AYE
BARCA: NO
HARROUN: AYE
MONTGOMERY: NO
JOHNSON: AYE

DELAPENA: 5/2.

PLANNING COMMISSION DELIBERATIONS

JOHNSON: Motion passes on Chapter 1. Now we can write that in. Now what we can do is understanding that the TDR that we approved just now, you're looking at it, would apply, correct me, right, that's what we're doing putting that TDR over the top of these de-designations; correct, Jose?

So, when I'm approving or disapproving these de-designations it's with the understanding that the TDR that is written in the land use 1.1.24 is part of that?

ALVAREZ: That's my understanding of how that would work.

JOHNSON: Okay. Moving ahead then, we're going to start with Number 5, Camas UGA, include the de-designation of agricultural resource land and UGA. Can we put that map up, I'm assuming that is the one to the east of between Washougal and Camas. There it is. The big square there.

HARROUN: This is Commissioner Harroun. On here it says expansion to the east for housing. My understanding was that Camas had changed that like an original like it was like a mixed use; is that correct?

ALVAREZ: I believe they after we did the DEIS they proposed a change to nonresidential use and so nonresidential use was not studied in the DEIS.

JOHNSON: Any discussion on the ag and it also would be a good time also just to reiterate positions on TDRs too as we go through these for the record.

FADNESS: This is Commissioner Fadness. I just want to make sure, Jose, that doesn't affect, since it wasn't studied in the DEIS, that does not affect us, you know, in that aspect that it would be zoned commercial instead of residential?

ALVAREZ: I think -- so the -- at this -- you're not making a motion to change the zoning. If upon annexation the City decided to change the zoning, this process will have long terminated.

FADNESS: That's what I thought. I just wanted to make sure that it didn't affect us.

JOHNSON: Any other discussions on the Camas? Ron.

BARCA: This is Commissioner Barca. Just for the record then based on the vote that we just took on the land use chapter I don't think any of the de-designated parcels are going to be viable based on what the County needs to do, so I'll be voting no on all of them.

JOHNSON: Okay.

MONTGOMERY: Commissioner LeDuc Montgomery, and I'm in the same position for the same reasons. I kind of already discussed I just think from a defensibility standpoint without the no net loss I don't think things are going to be on a strong position.

JOHNSON: Any other discussions on this?

HARROUN: Just real quick. I just want to reiterate a point that I had brought up a long time ago. The land is already -- like half of the land that they're asking to bring in is already five-acre parcels, you know, gentlemen farms and it will get developed as McMansions, ranches and I think having either it's

housing density or commercial use it's going to be much better use of that property, so I would be voting to let them bring it in.

JOHNSON: I would take a motion or a second unless there's more discussion.

HARROUN: This is Commissioner Harroun. I **move** that we approve Number 5 to include the Camas UGA, the de-designation land.

FADNESS: Commissioner Fadness. I'll **second**.

JOHNSON: We have a motion and a second. Jeff, can we have a roll call please.

ROLL CALL VOTE – ITEM NO. 5, MOTION TO APPROVE

HALBERT: AYE
BERGTHOLD: AYE
FADNESS: AYE
BARCA: NO
HARROUN: AYE
MONTGOMERY: NO
JOHNSON: NO

DELAPENA: 4/3.

PLANNING COMMISSION DELIBERATIONS

JOHNSON: 4 to 3. Passes 4 to 3. Okay. We're moving on to the next one. La Center UGA, de-designate agricultural resource lands and expand the UGA to the north for additional employment capacity. Any discussion or a motion and second.

FADNESS: This is Commissioner Fadness. I just couldn't remember when we had done the initial vote on this one, did we vote to approve?

JOHNSON: Yes.

ALVAREZ: Yes.

ORJIAKO: Yes. This is Oliver. You voted to approve with the tying into the TDR motion as was in your previous motion and we can pull that up so that you can see that if you like.

FADNESS: That's okay. I just wanted to confirm.

ORJIAKO: Yes.

JOHNSON: Any other discussion? Looking for a motion or a second.

HALBERT: Commissioner Halbert. I make a **motion** that we accept La Center UGA Number 6 here to de-designate agricultural lands.

BERGTHOLD: Commissioner Bergthold. I'll **second** that.

JOHNSON: We have a motion and a second. Jeff, can we get a roll call please.

ROLL CALL VOTE – ITEM NO. 6, MOTION TO APPROVE

HALBERT: AYE
BERGTHOLD: AYE
FADNESS: AYE
BARCA: NO
HARROUN: AYE
MONTGOMERY: NO
JOHNSON: AYE

DELAPENA: 5/2.

PLANNING COMMISSION DELIBERATIONS

JOHNSON: 5/2 passes. Moving on. La Center UGA, de-designate agricultural resource lands and expand the UGA to the southwest for additional employment capacity. Discussion or a motion?

HALBERT: Commissioner Halbert.

HOLLEY: Karl, can you slow down just a little bit, please.

JOHNSON: Yes, I sure will. No problem. I was just reading, Cindy, sorry. Go ahead.

HALBERT: Commissioner Halbert here. Hey, on this one I just don't recall again like you were asking, Kyle, how did we deal with this particular one last time? I couldn't even find that we voted on this one last time.

JOHNSON: I thought we did.

FADNESS: We did.

FADNESS: Yeah, this is Commissioner Fadness.

JOHNSON: Another doughnut; right?

FADNESS: No. This was the one that goes down to the south on the west side of the highway and I know that Commissioner Barca had brought up a point I believe of La Center getting hemmed in by the

Tribe, and correct me if I'm wrong Commissioner, and, you know, this one I -- I had trouble with seeing bringing this one into the La Center urban growth area, it just, it seems like an expansion like way off kind of not within the La Center or of the La Center development there. I do understand the concern of getting hemmed in by the tribal lands expansion, but I do have difficulties with seeing this one come into the UGA myself.

JOHNSON: I've seen La Center with schools and everything constantly try to go from the town down the hill and up towards the casino, so I understand that it's out there, but there's a history of La Center and La Center schools and everybody else trying to get that connection to I-5, so I think this is the attempt as best I can see, that was just my two cents. So, either way we're still back to where we were, it's an agricultural de-designation. Again, I'll look for a motion and a second.

HARROUN: This is Commissioner Harroun. I will **move** that we accept the Number 7, La Center de-designation of agricultural resource land to the southwest for additional employment capacity.

JOHNSON: We have a motion. Can I get a second, please.

BERGTHOLD: Commissioner Bergthold. I'll make a **second**.

JOHNSON: We have a motion and a second. Jeff, can we get a roll call.

ROLL CALL VOTE – ITEM NO. 7, MOTION TO APPROVE

HALBERT: AYE
BERGTHOLD: AYE
FADNESS: NO
BARCA: NO
HARROUN: AYE
MONTGOMERY: NO
JOHNSON: AYE

DELAPENA: 4/3.

PLANNING COMMISSION DELIBERATIONS

JOHNSON: Moving on to Number 8, Ridgefield UGA, this is the first de-designation for Ridgefield agricultural resource lands and expanding the UGA to the north for additional employment and housing capacity. Discussion?

HARROUN: Oh, which one was this? This was the little one or the big one?

JOHNSON: Big blue.

HARROUN: Big blue, okay.

JOHNSON: Any discussion? I think Steve did a pretty good job of explaining this I thought, it was really he was like made a good point. So, a motion.

HARROUN: This is Commissioner Harroun. On Number 8 I **recommend** that we approve the de-designation of agricultural resource lands and expand the UGA to the north for additional employment and housing capacity.

JOHNSON: We have a motion. Can I get a second, please.

HALBERT: Commissioner Halbert. I'll **second**.

JOHNSON: We have a motion and a second. Can we get a vote, Jeff.

ROLL CALL VOTE – ITEM NO. 8, MOTION TO APPROVE

HALBERT: AYE
BERGTHOLD: AYE
FADNESS: NO
BARCA: NO
HARROUN: AYE
MONTGOMERY: NO
JOHNSON: AYE

DELAPENA: 5 or 4/3.

PLANNING COMMISSION DELIBERATIONS

JOHNSON: Number 9, the second Ridgefield expansion of de-designation of agricultural resource lands and expand the UGA to the southwest for additional housing capacity. This has been referred as the Maul property that little piece right there, I believe. Again, discussion or a motion.

HARROUN: Is that the doughnut hole?

HALBERT: Commissioner Halbert. I was going to ask the same question, is that the doughnut hole property that we talked about?

JOHNSON: I think that's one of the many doughnut holes we've talked about.

ALVAREZ: That's correct. Yes.

JOHNSON: So, any discussion? Motions, seconds, something.

HALBERT: Commissioner Halbert. I'll make a **motion** that Number 9, Ridgefield UGA to de-designate agricultural resources lands and expand the UGA to the southwest for additional housing capacity and that this has been referred to as the Maul property.

JOHNSON: We got a motion. Can I get a second.

BERGTHOLD: Commissioner Bergthold. I'll **second** that.

JOHNSON: We have a motion and a second. Can we get a roll call, please.

ROLL CALL VOTE – ITEM NO. 9, MOTION TO APPROVE

HALBERT: AYE
BERGTHOLD: AYE
FADNESS: AYE
BARCA: NO
HARROUN: AYE
MONTGOMERY: NO
JOHNSON: AYE

DELAPENA: 5/2.

PLANNING COMMISSION DELIBERATIONS

JOHNSON: Motion passes. We move now to Number 10, Yacolt UGA, we're expanding the UGA to the southeast for additional employment capacity to compensate for employment land converted to park lands. Jose, did anything change on this since we dealt with it before, is this still the same reason and rationale?

ALVAREZ: That's correct.

JOHNSON: Any discussion on the Yacolt? Motion.

FADNESS: I **move** to approve Number 10 as presented.

JOHNSON: Can I get a second.

HARROUN: Commissioner Harroun. I'll **second** it.

JOHNSON: We have a motion and a second. Roll call please, Jeff.

ROLL CALL VOTE – ITEM NO. 10, MOTION TO APPROVE

HALBERT: AYE
BERGTHOLD: AYE
FADNESS: AYE
BARCA: AYE
HARROUN: AYE

MONTGOMERY: AYE
JOHNSON: AYE

DELAPENA: 7/0.

PLANNING COMMISSION DELIBERATIONS

JOHNSON: Motion passes. We are now done with the first page. Cindy, how are you doing?

HOLLEY: I'm fine.

JOHNSON: All right. I'm going to go a little bit longer and we'll give you a little break if you need it, we're trying to just get going here.

Number 11, the Vancouver UGA, we're going to amend the zoning of the urban medium and urban high residential districts from five residential and office residential districts to three residential and office residential districts.

R-12 to R-24; R-18 to R-22 to R-36; R-30 and R-43 to R-50; OR-15 to OR-24; OR-18 and OR-22 to OR-36; OR-30 and OR-43 to OR-50. There's a lot there. Okay.

So, Jose, can you just give us a little quick on this, this was just, help me out on this one, Vancouver.

ALVAREZ: So currently we, as you've read, we have five different multi-family essentially zones and there's some overlap between those, we thought it would be best to consolidate that and remove some of the overlap and the densities between those and this is part of the housing strategies to try to accommodate more housing and also the affordability with the multi-family zoning and to meet our requirement to provide housing for at all income levels.

JOHNSON: Okay. Any discussion on the Vancouver?

FADNESS: So, this is Commissioner Fadness. And I've spoke about this before, I have really strong objections to the minimum housing densities proposed in these. You know, the R-30 upzoning to R-50, I'm all for the upzoning, I think it's great to give the options, but upzoning R-30 to then have a minimum of 40 units per acre it's just not feasible by the market.

We're also encouraging because, and DEAB brought this up in their letter that they sent to us, we're encouraging building studio and one-bedroom apartments because we don't have the density bonuses proposed, as I understand we don't have the density bonuses proposed like the City of Vancouver does where you get, sorry, not density, but the unit bonuses where you get a bonus if you build a two, a three bedroom, and so we're building these apartments and they're not going to be able to serve families and in -- it's going to be hard to meet these minimum densities.

I really think that we need to take a look at what DEAB had sent over, you know, they're the experts in this kind of planning and they know what the market can support.

And it almost seems like a lot of these minimum densities were brought in to make the VBLM make sense and work for not having any UGA expansion, but in real, in the real world just things aren't going to get built now so now these lands are just going to sit because it's not feasible to build, nobody wants, there's not going to be people flocking to the fairgrounds area to live in a studio apartment, there are not going to be developers flocking to build out there and so I think that what we have proposed here is really flawed and it needs to go back and more time needs to be spent on any of this before it gets implemented.

JOHNSON: Thank you.

HARROUN: This is Commissioner Harroun. I would agree with that. DEAB sent over a series of recommended changes that they approved a few hours before our meeting here. I would -- I mean I would propose accepting their recommendations and then adjusting the proposed land use plan with the zoning presented accordingly.

That would take a fair amount of work from a -- from this, but I think -- I think that needs to be -- I would move that we would accept their recommendations and to direct staff to adjust the proposed land use plan to reflect DEAB's recommendations.

And then -- and then however that either we have to table this section until then and then go to the next section, but it is really really significant that the difference in how the City of Vancouver approached the development of high density land was a very stark difference than how the County approached that where the City came in and said, hey, these are the zoning changes that we need to do, what development community what do you need from us to make this feasible and it was a very collaborative process.

The County I, you know, I think either lack of resources or time or vision hasn't done that, and I think we really do need to listen to DEAB's recommendations.

HALBERT: Commissioner Halbert here. And I may be wrong, Jack, and correct me if I am, but Number 11 here that we're voting on is the Vancouver UGA changes and DEAB's letter is all about the County not the City.

FADNESS: DEAB's letter is about the Vancouver UGA in the county. When Jack and I are speaking on what the City of Vancouver did that's within the city limits of Vancouver.

HALBERT: Okay. Thanks.

BARCA: This is Commissioner Barca. So, understanding what Jack is proposing it feels like once again I think we rushed into the idea of the city boundaries without going through the chapters where what could have been in the context of DEAB's recommendations were pulled out one by one and we could have gone through them.

It's not realistic to get such a lengthy document hours before the hearing and expect us to have an opportunity to go through it and I'm not going to just accept the DEAB's recommendations cart blanche and just say that whatever they said should be an accepted practice, but I do think there is an opportunity you can choose to turn something down and say review the DEAB recommendations before it goes before County Council, that to me feels like a realistic proposition on how to go forward if you're not satisfied with that, but this, I don't know, it's got to be close to 20 pages --

HARROUN: Well, yeah, 7 or 8 with the recommendation.

BARCA: With the idea that you need to go into each one of those, yeah. I just -- I think we're at this place right now that we're going to say either we accept it or you're able to pull from the recommendation specifics or we turn, you turn it down and say there's too much that needs to be done for us to accept it in its current condition.

HARROUN: Well, I'm going to take a harsh perspective here, staff didn't work with DEAB or didn't listen to DEAB. Staff has a tendency in my perspective to punch the boxes, hear us and then not take any of the recommendations because rarely do I see any of our recommendations reflected in the code before us.

We are consistently having a workshop and then 14 days later have a hearing with no code changes and then we're told that we have then the opportunity to make any recommendations to their code changes but it's force fed, completely different than the other planning commission, the city that I was part of where we would have multiple work sessions, they would answer like any, anything like this would come before us, we would work together, there would be recommendations, they'd say Commissioner Harroun you had concerns with this, Commissioner Barca you had some concerns with this, staff has shown that we can say, hey, could you please go back and work with DEAB and come up with something better and they won't.

So, it kind of forces your hand here when you have, you have DEAB which is really it's, it is the leaders of the development community and really the land use planning and extremely technically savvy, you know, proficient and then this is their formal recommendation and so I'm -- I'm -- I'm very much for them.

Like I would -- I would lean on them over staff and so that would be my position is I would recommend, I would recommend that we adopt this.

MONTGOMERY: This is Commissioner LeDuc Montgomery. I would push back on some of that in that I do think throughout this process the staff has been on other pieces receptive to our feedback for example on the TDR program.

I think initially staff was explaining that we've tried this in the past, it hasn't worked and yet when we passed our recommendation and then it was, you know, we just looked at a proposed multi-paragraph policy they developed that was just approved.

So I do think that there is, you know, our feedback is heard and policies are developed and I just think that that same reasoning you propose about why the DEAB memorandum should just be quickly accepted, adopted because they're the experts in that area, I mean that same rationale could have been applied to the Agricultural Commission in adopting their recommendations and report regarding agricultural lands, conservation and no net loss and no de-designation but we didn't really take that just at face value after a lot of discussion. So, I just --

HARROUN: And I appreciate that. I appreciate that. And I'm not saying that staff never, but I'm saying from my experience with past commissions and that my experience with staff here when we get to some of this technical stuff it's very, it's very shortsighted and they don't seem to listen and it's really frustrating, so...

JOHNSON: Okay. Is there any more discussion? Just a mental note, you know, when you do get something that dense in front of you, no, and I'm as a Chairman I've been here long, Ron's been here a long time and staff has always responded to me, so I'll just keep that at that and keep my opinion to myself.

But I -- I don't -- I don't look at this like information is not being put up, I look at it like we're doing the best we can and it's very unprofessional for DEAB to drop something on us at the last minute, so they lose credibility through me by that.

So therefore, I would look for a motion to approve the Vancouver UGA, Number 11. Is anybody up for that and it could have an amendment or not?

BERGTHOLD: This is Commissioner Bergthold. And I'll approve, make a **motion** to approve recommendation on Number 11, the Vancouver UGA.

JOHNSON: Do we have a second?

HALBERT: Commissioner Halbert. I'll **second** that motion.

JOHNSON: We have a motion and a second. Jeff, can we get a roll call please.

ROLL CALL VOTE – ITEM NO. 11, MOTION TO APPROVE

HALBERT: AYE
BERGTHOLD: AYE
FADNESS: NO
BARCA: NO
HARROUN: NO
MONTGOMERY: NO
JOHNSON: YES

DELAPENA: 3 to 4.

PLANNING COMMISSION DELIBERATIONS

JOHNSON: Motion fails 3 to 4. Moving on to Vancouver UGA amend Number 12, oh, sorry.

FADNESS: Just I guess a point of order is so since we vote no on this as approved, do we have an opportunity to recommend something else to Council whether it's what like Jack was saying, whether it's accepting the DEAB as written or whether it is exploring, you know, maybe some of the code changes that DEAB had presented here?

JOHNSON: My hope is from a practical standpoint that they listen to our testimony because I wrote, you know, that was what I was kind of looking for was a DEAB recommendation, but we got a straight up or down vote on it.

So hopefully they listen to this and say, okay, look, look at the DEAB, they'll have time and my hope is that they'll say, okay, wait, let's try to, let's implement some of those. So, I know we're rushing through these, I'm not trying to.

What I'm trying to do is encourage if we're going to put an amendment in, stick an amendment in and we'll vote it up or down and in this case hopefully they listen to our testimony. Does that answer your question?

FADNESS: Yeah. Yeah, I do agree. I don't think that a motion straight across to accept would pass anyway, so...

JOHNSON: Yeah. Yeah. Okay.

BARCA: Okay. I did -- this is Ron Barca. I did want to just make sure that Kyle's question was answered in what I thought was the appropriate fashion. If you wanted to put an alternative motion forward, you are able to do that whether it would be seconded, whether it would be accepted, we don't know the outcome, but in the alternative if you had wanted to put something forward after that failed you are able to do that.

FADNESS: Yep. No, I appreciate that. Thank you.

ALVAREZ: Can I --

JOHNSON: Is there any more discussion on that?

ALVAREZ: Can I just clarify. So, I did read the DEAB letter. I think what their recommendation was to change the zoning, the code, these are map changes to make the map to add these zones. Their recommendation would change the densities in the new zones, not to go back to the existing zones if you'll read the letter. I don't think they were proposing to not have these zones.

What you guys are talking about are code specific things that we have other sections in Title 40 that deal with those code specific things, this is just changing the zoning on the maps and to consolidate

from five to three different zones.

FADNESS: Could you reference where in the code changes those are then, which item number that is?

ALVAREZ: I think in their letter they specified the last e-mail from Mr. Golemo this afternoon.

HARROUN: The code changes, I mean one of the -- it's -- it's keeping the minimums and then increasing the maximums, so they were, they were all for increasing the maximums but keeping the minimums.

ALVAREZ: To what zones?

HARROUN: And then these were, and I'll have to get back to that in a minute, you know, like we're going to R-12 to an R-24, the opposition isn't, isn't the upzone, it's the bringing up, it's the minimums, so that would be the thing.

I think from a functionality standpoint getting through the Vancouver thing, you know, I'm happy to make a, you know, a motion to recommend to County Council to take a strong look at the DEAB recommendations for specific stuff and they can direct staff however, but, yeah.

JOHNSON: Wait. So why don't you clarify that. So, you have a motion what now? Regarding Number 11, I mean let's get some clarity on it. 11-A maybe you want to call it.

HARROUN: So, this is Commissioner Harroun. I recommend that we recommend to County Council to look at the DEAB's proposed code language changes more thoroughly with staff.

JOHNSON: As it pertains to --

HARROUN: As it pertains to --

JOHNSON: -- Number 11.

HARROUN: -- Number 11 and any of the land use zoning.

JOHNSON: Do we have a second?

HALBERT: Commissioner Halbert. I'll second that motion.

JOHNSON: We have a motion and a second.

WARD-PALMERTON: Just to I believe that Commissioner Harroun made a recommendation but there wasn't a formal motion.

JOHNSON: Say it again.

HARROUN: Perfect, it's important. This is Commissioner Harroun. I **move** that we recommend to the County Council to take a serious look at the DEAB's recommendations as it pertains to the land use planning and their recommended changes.

HALBERT: Commissioner Halbert. **Second** that motion.

JOHNSON: We have a motion on the table and a second to ask or to recommend that County Council look at the DEAB recommendations regarding the Vancouver, specifically the Vancouver UGA and other map changes. Can I get a roll call, Jeff.

ROLL CALL VOTE – ITEM NO. 11 (AMENDMENT), MOTION TO APPROVE

HALBERT: AYE
BERGTHOLD: AYE
FADNESS: AYE

BARCA: Point of clarification, we're actually we're doing a motion to instruct the County Council to do something?

JOHNSON: No, we're asking. I said recommend, but we're asking.

BARCA: Okay. We're recommending that the County Council do something.

JOHNSON: I said, that's exactly what I said.

BARCA: I'm not in favor of giving any instruction to the County Council. NO
HARROUN: AYE
MONTGOMERY: NO
JOHNSON: AYE

DELAPENA: 5/2.

PLANNING COMMISSION DELIBERATIONS

JOHNSON: Amendment passes.

ORJIAKO: Mr. Chairman.

JOHNSON: Yes, sir.

ORJIAKO: This is Oliver Orjiako. I have been sitting here listening quietly. I take issue with Commissioner Jack Harroun. Why? I cannot sit here silently and take the criticism of my staff, and I want to put that into the record.

Why? DEAB members have served on the HOSAP study from the beginning until now, you served on it.

They have served on the housing forum members of DEAB. We have gone to them multiple times in a work session, in their meetings, we have a housing consultant who is listening online.

For you Jack Harroun Planning Commissioner to insult my staff is not acceptable. It's not acceptable and I will not accept that. DEAB is appointed by the Council, not even required by RCW. They don't build, they are not non, not for profit builders. You should be consulting VHA, you should be consulting those that provide affordable housing.

So, my point into the record is do not, do not, I know it's your opinion, but do not insult my staff, this should be your last insulting my staff, don't do that, it's unprofessional and I have to put it into the record.

JOHNSON: So, stated. Yes, you may.

HARROUN: Okay. So, my apologies if you felt your staff was insulted, that is never my intention. I -- I understand that that is not my intention. There -- I have certainly had frustrations with feeling not listened to, that my process was rushed for multiple years and so, you know, and when I look at, you know, maybe it's the best you can do, but I've been frustrated with some of the work that I've seen, it's appropriate for me to say so. It's not insulting.

I don't mean to be insulting and I'm not trying to take personal shots at anyone. So, for what it's worth, my sincere apologies because I do not intend to insult anyone, but this is an important public process and I'm trying to get it right for the community.

JOHNSON: Okay. Let's move on if we can, please.

FADNESS: Chair, I'm sorry, just going back to, I'm not against upzoning and so I would like to revisit this with Jose's clarification that he had there and so going to my issue with the minimum density requirements which outlined in the DEAB memo are in code change 40.200.040 which is Number 63 on our, on our list.

And then I also have issues with Number 65 which is also called out in the letter, but which is, which specifically goes into the minimum units per acre and so I'd like to revisit.

I would be comfortable going back and approving the upzoning if we cannot recommend the code changes in those two sections that I just outlined and so I would like to make a motion --

JOHNSON: I was just starting to say, I don't think you have to make a motion, just ask can we move to.

FADNESS: Okay. I would like to move to recommend no on Number 63 and 65 of the, in our recommendation.

JOHNSON: So, we have a motion. All right. So, this is where it gets messy.

FADNESS: I know.

JOHNSON: If we could -- hold on. Hold on. What I'd like to do is make a motion and then vote accordingly on that motion. So, if you are wanting us to move to Number 63, we're on Page 6 if anybody's lost, 40.200.040, minimum and maximum calculations.

So, if we want to make a motion to approve that and then vote accordingly, that's easier than saying no. Do you understand what I'm saying? In other words, we're doing it backwards. You can do it either way you want. I vote to not approve it, but everybody needs to understand that what we're doing is to we're voting to vote that --

FADNESS: To vote it down, yes. Correct. And I'm not going to make a motion to approve it.

JOHNSON: So do we have -- let me start off. Do we have a motion to approve minimum and maximum calculations on Number 63?

FADNESS: I guess point of order. I just made a motion I will withdraw, and I'll make a new motion. So, I make a **motion** to recommend no on Number 63 as presented.

JOHNSON: So, we are voting, if you vote yes on this motion -- well, do we have a second? So, we don't have a second.

HARROUN: This is Commissioner Harroun. I'll **second** it.

JOHNSON: Okay. We have a motion to vote no on the minimum, to not approve the minimum and maximum calculations and what we're saying is if you vote yes, you're voting this one down. I know that's confusing already.

So, what I'd like to do is get a roll call. For Number 63 the motion is that we are voting on to vote down the minimum and maximum calculations.

BARCA: Point of clarification. So, we are saying that all of the wording that's in 63 is going to be void?

FADNESS: That I do not recommend it to Council.

JOHNSON: That's the motion.

BARCA: Okay. 100 percent, everything in it. All right.

JOHNSON: Jeff, can we get a roll call please.

ROLL CALL VOTE – ITEM NO. 63, MOTION TO DENY

HALBERT: NO
BERGTHOLD: NO
FADNESS: AYE

BARCA: NO
HARROUN: AYE
MONTGOMERY: NO
JOHNSON: NO

JOHNSON: Jeff, so that motion fails --

DELAPENA: 3 to 4.

PLANNING COMMISSION DELIBERATIONS

JOHNSON: -- 3 to 4. So, we move on to, did you want to do 65, Kyle, do you have a motion for 65?

FADNESS: I feel like we're getting --

JOHNSON: Residential and office residential districts.

FADNESS: Yeah. So, 65 pertains to the minimum densities that we talked about, minimum density requirements in the multi-family housing changes, and so I make a **motion** to not recommend Number 65 as presented.

JOHNSON: We have a motion to not recommend residential and office residential districts Number 65. Do we have a second?

HARROUN: Commissioner Harroun. I'll **second** it.

JOHNSON: We have a motion and a second. Jeff, can we get a roll call please.

DELAPENA: A quick point of clarification on the previous vote Number 63, I incorrectly counted that, it was actually 2 to 5.

JOHNSON: 2 to 5. Thank you, Jeff. Let's go back down to 65, can we get a roll call, please.

ROLL CALL VOTE – ITEM NO. 65, MOTION TO DENY

HALBERT: NO
BERGTHOLD: NO
FADNESS: AYE
BARCA: NO
HARROUN: AYE
MONTGOMERY: NO
JOHNSON: NO

DELAPENA: 2 to 5.

PLANNING COMMISSION DELIBERATIONS

JOHNSON: 2 to 5 motion fails. And now we're going to go back over to our maps again. Go back around. We're getting through it. We're doing it.

MONTGOMERY: A quick I guess point of order question. Since what we just voted was like no on rejecting them, do we then need to revote on are we accepting them?

JOHNSON: I might just do that for clarification as we go through those, so just so it's not messy, either way I'm not trying to do anything, but I'll just -- I'll come back to that when I get to that.

So, we are now on Number 12. Actually, I'm going to let's give a little break here. I know we've got so much to do, but we're just going to die here on the vine and how about we get back here at about 9:00. Is that okay, Oliver, you guys good?

ORJIAKO: That's fine.

JOHNSON: All right. We're not done, so.

(Pause in proceedings.)

HOLLEY: If you're talking, I can't hear you.

JOHNSON: Sorry about that, you were muted. Our fault, my fault. All right. Vancouver, Number 15, include the capacity of residential development in the Highway 99 sub-plan area underlying commercial zoning and treat as mixed use for estimating capacity in the VBLM.

16, amend comprehensive land use zoning on Parcel No. 117896271, in the Salmon Creek Fire Station to PF from IL, CC to PF and remove the split zoning.

17, amend the comprehensive plan use zoning, Parcel No. 185957000 to UM R-24 from UL R-10. I'll just take those right now, I'll group them in two groups.

So, I'm looking at for a motion for 12 to 15 on the proposed on the map changes. Do I have a motion or is there any discussion?

FADNESS: This is Commissioner Fadness. I **move** to approve Numbers 12 through 17 as presented.

JOHNSON: As presented. Thank you. We have a motion. Do we have a second?

HALBERT: Commissioner Halbert. I'll **second** that motion.

JOHNSON: Okay. So, we have a motion and a second. Jeff, can we get a roll call.

ROLL CALL VOTE – ITEM NOS. 12 THROUGH 17, MOTION TO APPROVE

HALBERT: AYE
BERGTHOLD: AYE
FADNESS: AYE
BARCA: AYE
HARROUN: AYE
MONTGOMERY: AYE
JOHNSON: AYE

DELAPENA: 7/0.

PLANNING COMMISSION DELIBERATIONS

JOHNSON: Motion passes on all of those. Okay. So now we move to our last page of maps, 18. You guys can see these as we go, I'll just, Vancouver UGA SSR, 19, that was the, those lots and parcels, the two parcels you see there the numbers.

19, amend the comprehensive plan use zoning on parcels, there are one, two, three, four there from UL R1-10 to community commercial. Amend the comp, on Number 20, amend the comprehensive land use planning and zoning on parcels, the three there, one, two, three, from CC to UM R-36.

21, to amend the comprehensive land use plan and zoning on Parcel No. 986041825 from MX to UM R-36. 22, amend the comprehensive land use for these two parcels from MX to UM R-36.

23, amend the comprehensive land use plan and zoning on Parcel 182138000 from MX to UM R-24. And, finally, Vancouver UGA, amend the comprehensive plan use for zoning on Parcel 181200000 from OR-22 to OR-24.

What I'm looking for is either discussion or a motion on Numbers 18 through 24 as read.

BARCA: Chair.

JOHNSON: Yes.

BARCA: This is Commissioner Barca. I have a question for staff. Weren't some of these items brought up by the City of Vancouver in the context of changing the zoning they were putting in the letter specifically about the idea of trying to have more commercial activity and so I think it was the MX parcels they had a concern about?

I tried to go back and find the Vancouver letter while Karl was going through them, but I am unable to find it at this moment, but I was under the belief that it was conversion of the MX to the UM designation that they had a concern with. If you can find the letter that would be great.

ALVAREZ: I think what they were wanting us to do was to look at allowing more commercial uses and

having more commercial uses allowed when, where there is a sea of residential.

So, Hazel Dell area, east of Hazel Dell Avenue to look for opportunities to find land that could be designated commercial so it would be easier for people to have commercial next to them and they had provided some specific parcels that they wanted us to look at, but those are not included in any of these.

BARCA: Those -- okay. So, these are not those parcels, but the letter did get brought up and so it's talking in more generalization --

ALVAREZ: Yes.

BARCA: -- but without -- so it was asking for action, but the County didn't act specifically on the request?

ALVAREZ: Correct. We -- they had given us a bunch of parcels to look at for some of that and for some upzoning and we looked at that for some of the areas that we looked to upzone and incorporated some of those recommendations through that for some of the commercial areas.

A lot of the areas either were could have been churches or existing buildings that wouldn't have yielded any capacity in the Vacant Buildable Lands Model, nor did we think that they would be viable given the proximity in that area to large commercial along Hazel Dell Avenue and Highway 99, and so we didn't pursue those.

BARCA: Thank you for the clarification.

JOHNSON: Any other discussion or I would entertain a motion 18 through 24.

HALBERT: Commissioner Halbert. I'll make a motion, vote or recommend for approval Items 18 through 24.

JOHNSON: Do I have a second?

BERGTHOLD: This is Commissioner Bergthold. I'll second that.

JOHNSON: Thank you. We have a motion and a second. Jeff, can I get a roll call.

BARCA: Chair.

JOHNSON: Yes.

BARCA: Can I make a friendly amendment request --

JOHNSON: Yeah, go ahead.

BARCA: -- that pulling out Item 20 which is looking at community commercial specifically and voting on that one separately.

JOHNSON: Yep, we can do that if that's okay with your --

HALBERT: Commissioner Halbert. Let me amend my **motion** to include Numbers 18, 19, 21 through 24, leaving out 20 for this vote.

JOHNSON: Can we get a **second** on that motion, please.

BERGTHOLD: Commissioner Bergthold. I'll second that again.

JOHNSON: Motion's amended. Jeff, can we get a roll call please.

ROLL CALL VOTE – ITEM NOS. 18, 19, & 21 THROUGH 24, MOTION TO APPROVE

HALBERT: AYE
BERGTHOLD: AYE
FADNESS: AYE
BARCA: AYE
HARROUN: AYE
MONTGOMERY: AYE
JOHNSON: AYE

DELAPENA: 7/0.

PLANNING COMMISSION DELIBERATIONS

JOHNSON: Okay. Motion passes. Now we will go back to Number 20, this is Vancouver UGA SSR to amend the comprehensive land use plan and zoning on Parcel 986042747, Parcel 200147000, Parcel 200200000 from CC to UM R-36. Discussion.

BARCA: This is Commissioner Barca. I'll just make a **motion** to go ahead and deny Number 20 as staff recommends it.

JOHNSON: Can you tell me why or just an explanation.

BARCA: I'm trying to keep the commercial land commercial.

HARROUN: This is Commissioner Harroun. I'll **second** that.

JOHNSON: We have a motion to deny the zoning, or excuse me, approval of Number 20, so make sure you reverse your vote. With that said, we have a motion and a second. Jeff, can we get a roll call.

FADNESS: Can we have some discussion.

JOHNSON: Oh, sorry, yeah.

FADNESS: Yeah, could we pull this up on the map because I guess I'm just not familiar with what I'm voting on right now.

ALVAREZ: So, this is property just south of 119th along 503. I believe the issue is the proximity to the intersection where they've had difficulty getting access for commercial from the State at this location, and so the proposal would be to change it to multi-family, I believe there's access, there's alternative access through the back which wouldn't have the same implication as it would for commercial development.

HALBERT: Jose, which parcel was that?

ALVAREZ: And this is a request from the property owner, or, yes, the property owner.

HALBERT: Commissioner Halbert. What parcel was that on the map here is, and there's three parcel numbers?

ALVAREZ: Right. They're all together in this, yes, so this is all of the parcels are in that orange area.

HALBERT: Thanks.

HARROUN: And the surrounding purple zoning or whatever color it is?

ALVAREZ: That's community commercial.

HARROUN: That's community commercial. Okay. The purple - this is Commissioner Harroun - the purple is community commercial and then is it the orange one that we're looking at, is that the --

ALVAREZ: Yes, that's the proposed change.

HARROUN: Is everything else around it though is community commercial --

ALVAREZ: Yeah.

HARROUN: -- except for the -- and he's asking for that to --

ALVAREZ: Right.

HARROUN: -- on community commercial?

ALVAREZ: Yes.

HARROUN: Okay. Got it. I think we're good.

JOHNSON: All right. Any other discussion? I would entertain a motion, remember, oh, there is a motion on the table. Did we have a second? Yes. So therefore, any more discussion then? Therefore, can we get a vote. This is a vote to disapprove this.

ROLL CALL VOTE – ITEM NO. 20, MOTION TO DENY

HALBERT: (No audio)
BERGTHOLD: (No audio)

HOLLEY: I can't hear you guys. I didn't hear Bryan.

HALBERT: I'm sorry. Bryan is a NO
BERGTHOLD: Mark is a YES
FADNESS: AYE
BARCA: AYE
HARROUN: AYE
MONTGOMERY: AYE
JOHNSON: NO

DELAPENA: 5/2.

PLANNING COMMISSION DELIBERATIONS

JOHNSON: 5/2. Yeah, 5/2 to disapprove. Okay. Thank you. So, we are now through the proposed, the maps. We now go to Page 4, and we'll group a couple of these, but basically we got to go through them.

So, the first one on the table is the Freight Rail Dependent Use Overlay and this is, Jose, can you just give us a quick blurb on this just so we don't have to read all those numbers.

ALVAREZ: So, this is as a result of action that the legislature took that initially allowed freight rail dependent use as a use in two jurisdictions, Okanogan County and Clark County, the legislature took an action to rescind that and only allow that to occur in Okanogan County, so it's no longer applicable in Clark County so we're making the changes to remove this overlay and in the Comp Plan we're removing the language related to the freight rail dependent use.

JOHNSON: Okay. Thank you. Any discussion on this? I remember when this one came up, yeah, before. No discussion? I'd take a motion.

FADNESS: This is Commissioner Fadness. I **move** to approve 25 as presented.

HARROUN: Commission Harroun. I **second**.

JOHNSON: We have a motion and a second. Jeff, can we get a roll call please.

ROLL CALL VOTE – ITEM NO. 25, MOTION TO APPROVE

HALBERT: AYE
BERGTHOLD: AYE
FADNESS: AYE
BARCA: AYE
HARROUN: AYE
MONTGOMERY: AYE
JOHNSON: AYE

DELAPENA: 7/0.

PLANNING COMMISSION DELIBERATIONS

JOHNSON: Motion passes. Moving on to Number 26, Battle Ground UGA, expand the UGA to include 35-acre property owned by the City of Battle Ground containing water reservoirs. This was previously included in Alt 3 and was included in the DEIS.

HARROUN: This is Commissioner Harroun. I **move** that we approve Item Number 26.

JOHNSON: Do we have a second?

HALBERT: Commissioner Halbert. I **second** that motion.

JOHNSON: Motion and a second. Jeff, could we get a roll call please. Any discussion? Excuse me, I'm sorry. Any discussion? I'm fine.

HALBERT: Discussion. I appreciate Sam Crummett's explanation of why we need to bring this or why they asked to bring this in and so it was really helpful to hear them. Thanks. I'll be an AYE.

BARCA: Chair.

JOHNSON: Yes.

BARCA: I just want us to be really clear that we are bringing in an island.

JOHNSON: Yes, for some specific reasons.

BARCA: Okay. I mean, once again, we're looking at the aspect of we're not being contiguous in the thought process about how we're expanding the city boundaries.

HARROUN: This is Commissioner Harroun. I completely appreciate your point, and I would be more with you except this is their water reservoir and they're just trying to bring it in within their city boundary so they can do the permit so, I get it, yeah.

BARCA: Yeah. Okay. Jack, under those circumstances what prevents them from making it contiguous and bringing in their water reservoir? Nada.

JOHNSON: Any other discussion? We have a motion and a second, could we get a roll call, please.

ROLL CALL VOTE – ITEM NO. 26, MOTION TO APPROVE

HALBERT: AYE
BERGTHOLD: AYE
FADNESS: AYE
BARCA: Reluctantly AYE
HARROUN: AYE
MONTGOMERY: AYE
JOHNSON: AYE

DELAPENA: 7/0.

PLANNING COMMISSION DELIBERATIONS

JOHNSON: Motion passes. Number 27, the Battle Ground UGA to expand to include three properties totaling 17 acres for urban low density residential land. This was previously included in Alt 3 and was included in the DEIS. Can you give us a little bit on this one, Jose, I can't remember. I know you talked about this.

ALVAREZ: I think this is the City had identified there was a road I think that straddles the boundary and so they wanted to bring that in to complete the road and include the properties to the north to allow that to develop.

JOHNSON: Okay. That's right. Okay. Is there any discussion on this? I'll take a motion or a second. No motion? There are no motion.

HALBERT: Commissioner Halbert. I'll make a **motion** that we, let's see, make a motion that we vote on 27 as presented.

JOHNSON: I have a motion. Can we have a second, please.

BERGTHOLD: This is Commissioner Bergthold. I'll **second** that.

JOHNSON: We have a motion and a second. Jeff, can we get a roll call please.

ROLL CALL VOTE – ITEM NO. 27, MOTION TO APPROVE

HALBERT: AYE
BERGTHOLD: AYE

FADNESS: NO
BARCA: NO
HARROUN: AYE
MONTGOMERY: NO
JOHNSON: AYE

DELAPENA: 4 to 3.

PLANNING COMMISSION DELIBERATIONS

JOHNSON: Passes. Number 27, La Center UGA to de-designate agricultural resources land and expand the UGA to include the five-acre parcel owned by the Clark County Public Utilities. Would make expansion request to the north described above contiguous on all sides. This was not included in the DEIS. Jose, can you give us a quick update on that one.

WARD-PALMERTON: Commissioner, just a point of clarification, you listed that as Line 27, it's actually Line 28.

JOHNSON: Sorry, Line 28. I just did 27, excuse me, thank you. You'll be seeing more of those --

HARROUN: As we get later.

ALVAREZ: So, this is a parcel that's, there's one in the center here, yes, in here where the City realized late that they omitted this from their expansion, and I believe it's one of the utilities that owns the property. It was late and it wasn't included in the EIS.

JOHNSON: Okay. Great. Any discussion on this?

BARCA: This is Commissioner Barca. I just want to make sure that I'm clarifying for the record because it's surrounded by urban development by itself is not reason enough for me to bring a piece of agricultural land in, but its current use is the reason why I'm going to go ahead and vote for this. It has no reflection on any of the other de-designations of agricultural land that we have been discussing this evening.

JOHNSON: Any other discussions?

MONTGOMERY: This is Commissioner LeDuc Montgomery. I echo what you just said, Mr. Barca. I'm also concerned that it wasn't studied in the DEIS, but given the parcel size and, you know, the utility use, I think again I would treat it differently than some of the other de-designation requests.

JOHNSON: Any other discussions or motions?

BARCA: This is Commissioner Barca. I'll make a **motion** to bring in its Line 28 --

JOHNSON: Yes, Line 28.

BARCA: -- as written and by staff for de-designation.

JOHNSON: Do we have a second?

HARROUN: Commissioner Harroun. I'll **second** it.

JOHNSON: We have a motion and a second on Line 28 as written. Jeff, can we get a roll call.

ROLL CALL VOTE – ITEM NO. 28, MOTION TO APPROVE

HALBERT: AYE
BERGTHOLD: AYE
FADNESS: AYE
BARCA: AYE
HARROUN: AYE
MONTGOMERY: AYE
JOHNSON: AYE

DELAPENA: 7/0.

PLANNING COMMISSION DELIBERATIONS

JOHNSON: Motion passes. The final one here in the purple on Page 5 will be Number 29.

ALVAREZ: Second to last.

JOHNSON: Second to last. And this is the mobile home park overlay to create a mobile home park overlay on the existing mobile home parks within the unincorporated Vancouver UGA that would be subject to new development regulations, those are all the parcels that we're talking about and any discussion.

I know we had a lot of people here earlier and they're probably still here from the mobile home parks, but I'm sorry that we got going so far down.

FADNESS: Yes, this is Commissioner Fadness. And I want to commend the, I know the three that are out in the audience are supporters of the overlay, so I commend you for sticking through this for three hours. I'd like to make a **motion** to approve Number 29 as presented.

BERGTHOLD: This is Commissioner Bergthold. And I'll make a **second** to that.

JOHNSON: We have a motion and a second. Any discussion?

HALBERT: Yeah, Commissioner Halbert here. I, you know, appreciate the language that is intended here so intended to preserve the existing manufactured home parks and protect long-term

affordability, prevent the displacement of existing residents.

And the district promotes community stability by limiting redevelopment of manufactured home parks while allowing the continued repair, replacement and expansion of manufactured homes in accordance with the standards of this title, that will be Title 40.250.250 (sic).

So, I think I, maybe it doesn't prevent everything or protect them from everything that could happen in the future, but it's certainly a step in the right direction and, yeah, if it wasn't for so many of the residents that were here two weeks ago, I don't think we would have looked into it as diligently as we did, so thanks.

HARROUN: Great job guys.

JOHNSON: So, we have a motion and a second. Jeff, can we get a roll call please.

ROLL CALL VOTE – ITEM NO. 29, MOTION TO APPROVE

HALBERT: AYE
BERGTHOLD: AYE
FADNESS: AYE
BARCA: AYE
HARROUN: AYE
MONTGOMERY: AYE
JOHNSON: AYE

DELAPENA: 7/0.

PLANNING COMMISSION DELIBERATIONS

JOHNSON: Motion passes. Now --

HARROUN: Chair.

JOHNSON: Yes.

HARROUN: A quick question. There was a 29-A.

JOHNSON: I read that, yeah. So, Jose, we're on 29-A which is the Arterial Atlas. Can we get an explanation when you get a chance.

ALVAREZ: So, this is the -- an appendix of the comp plan, but it identifies all of the roads in the county road system. There were a series of changes that were made, we discussed that with you at a work session.

There was some feedback we got from the community in terms of when a development happens, a

road on the network and identifies the location may not always stay the same when development comes and so there are some things that are lines on the arterial atlas that no longer warrant because the development's happened.

So, we're going through a series of changes that were being made to clean-up a lot of those types of mistakes and then there was, we're showing all of the new, any new proposed roads that are part of the Comp Plan Update and so that's the gist of the arterial atlas, it's just the mapping of the road network that the development community relies on and that we look to enforce.

HARROUN: Do we have any documentation on the arterial atlas, like was there a map or anything that that was -- I mean, just for the record, I mean I think it's fine, but, you know.

ORJIAKO: They need to take a revote on this because this is an overlay, overlay map to put this on the comp plan, it's an overlay. What he read was something from the code was from 68, that is the --

HUSTING: Sorry. For the record, my name is Harrison Husting, I'm a Transportation Planner with Community Planning. So this document right here this is linked in the meeting materials and it's about 95 pages and each page is basically a section of the road atlas and there are sections here that just kind of display, well, it displays the whole county, but once you get into the unincorporated parts it does show the comp plan designation for roadways in the unincorporated areas and so these kind of tie back to, you know, we have comp plan designations for different roadway types and then these designations tie back to kind of the standards that they're built out to in the future.

So, the arterial atlas really depicts the future, what the future of the roadway really looks like and it's really the main implementation tool of our CFP and kind of other transportation related documents. And so, you can kind of go through all these, this is kind of the static map of the arterial atlas.

And then I'm just going to kind of jump to the back of the arterial atlas, and it will take a long time to load. I apologize; I'm trying to figure out how far I need to go. But I guess my main point in the back of the arterial atlas we do have kind of listed any circulation studies that have been previously adopted by Council.

So, as you can see this is kind of the outline of the county and how it's broken up by page and then we kind of have conceptual levels of our different cross sections for the different types of roadway and then these are codified basically in Title 40 with the exact dimensions for every aspect of the roadway, but these are just kind of the conceptual, you know, high level understanding of these roadways.

And then in the back we do have our circulation studies that have been previously adopted. So, there are a number of these circulation studies, so I think Exhibit 63, Exhibit 64 and then I think this would be Exhibit 65, these have all been adopted since our last 2016 update, so these were new circulation studies that we added to the document in the back.

HARROUN: Thank you.

JOHNSON: Thank you. Any other questions regarding the arterial atlas updates, changes? Okay. With

that said, could I get a motion and a second.

BERGTHOLD: This is Commissioner Bergthold. I'll make a **motion** to accept Item 29-A, the arterial atlas updates.

JOHNSON: Do we have a second, please.

FADNESS: Commissioner Fadness. **Second**.

JOHNSON: We have a motion and a second. Jeff, could we get a roll call. Oh, any discussion?

BARCA: This is Commissioner Barca. I just think in the context of the same reason like getting the DEAB's letter this is the same kind of scenario, I don't doubt the work, I haven't had a chance to go through it in any fashion. I will let County Council go through it, and they can make their determination about what they want to do with it.

Looking at our capital facilities plan I'm not quite sure how much the arterial atlas is going to weigh in on the final discussion about what gets built or doesn't get built, so I'm not too worried about it. So, I just wanted to have a clarification why I'm going to be voting the way I'm going to be voting.

JOHNSON: Any other discussions? Okay. We have a motion and a second on the table. Jeff, can we get a roll call please.

ROLL CALL VOTE – ITEM NO. 29A, MOTION TO APPROVE

HALBERT: AYE
BERGTHOLD: AYE
FADNESS: AYE
BARCA: NO
HARROUN: AYE
MONTGOMERY: NO
JOHNSON: AYE

DELAPENA: 5/2.

PLANNING COMMISSION DELIBERATIONS

JOHNSON: Motion passes. Okay. Now we will move on to the proposed comprehensive plans and chapters. So, Jose, on things like Table of Contents, Introduction, is that just going to be like do we group those together or are those something we vote on?

ALVAREZ: I think it might make sense to see if anybody has anything that they object to.

JOHNSON: I'll just go like that. Okay. All right.

ALVAREZ: And just ask your fellow councilors.

JOHNSON: So, 31 and 32, is there anybody that has any objections to grouping those together, it has Table of Contents, Introduction and Community Framework Plan?

MONTGOMERY: This is Commissioner LeDuc Montgomery. The only chapter I did have proposed changes or discussion on was Chapter 1, and just for purposes of voting I will be fine with putting all of them in, of all of the proposed comp plan chapters, I don't know that everybody feels that way, I'm just saying.

JOHNSON: Does anybody have any more that they want to pull out of the Chapters 1 through 15?

HALBERT: Yeah, Commissioner Halbert.

JOHNSON: We'll pull out, we'll revote on 1 just because to make it clear.

HALBERT: I'm with Alicia on 33 and I'd like to amend or propose an amendment for 40, 33 and 40.

JOHNSON: Okay. So, we'll, I propose we vote on everything unless there's others except for 33 and 40. Is that all right? Do you have anything?

BARCA: Yes. This is Commissioner Barca. I have some wording changes I'd like to see in Number 34, Chapter 2, Housing Element. I have some discussion I'd like to do concerning Number 38, Chapter 6, capital facilities planning and there was one more. Where did he stop on our discussion? Oh, all the way.

JOHNSON: I'm just going through 6- -- I'm looking through 61 right now. I'm trying to just take care of the --

BARCA: Then it would be Number 46, the climate element as well.

JOHNSON: Are there any others that need to be pulled out? With that said, what I would like to do is lump 30, 31, 32, 35, 36, 37, 39, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 47 and then the rest of those with all the appendixes. Is there anybody opposed to us grouping those together and making a singular motion to pass those chapters?

Hearing none, may I get a motion, and you can either say them or, you know, basically what I'm looking at, I can -- I can tell you which ones they are, but to make reference to them again. Ready. 30, 31, 32, 35, 36 and 37, 39, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 47 and then 48 through 61 which is just all the extra, the appendixes, okay. So can I get a motion for that unless there's discussion.

MONTGOMERY: This is Commissioner LeDuc Montgomery. I'll **move** to approve those items.

JOHNSON: As stated.

MONTGOMERY: As stated.

JOHNSON: Okay. Is there a second to that?

BERGTHOLD: This is Commissioner Bergthold. I will **second** to that.

JOHNSON: Okay. We have a second for the approval of stated chapters in the proposed and appendices too in the comprehensive plan. Is there any discussion on those? Hearing none, Jeff, can we get a vote on that.

ROLL CALL VOTE – ITEM NOS. 30-32, 35-37, 39, 41-45, & 47-61, MOTION TO APPROVE

HALBERT: AYE
BERGTHOLD: AYE
FADNESS: AYE
BARCA: AYE
HARROUN: AYE
MONTGOMERY: AYE
JOHNSON: AYE

DELAPENA: 7/0.

PLANNING COMMISSION DELIBERATIONS

JOHNSON: Motion passes. So now we will go back to the ones that we want to pull out starting with Number 33 and it sounds like we wanted to get some clarity on that, this is the Land Use Element. So, discussion on that.

MONTGOMERY: This is Commissioner LeDuc Montgomery. And I just want to clarify; did we already approve this chapter like can we revote it?

JOHNSON: Well, we voted it down, so I don't know. I was going to vote it like do we pass or not, but it's been voted down so I guess we don't have to, right.

MONTGOMERY: I thought it was voted to approve it as written and proposed by staff, but my proposed change to it was not accepted.

WARD-PALMERTON: You already voted on 33.

JOHNSON: Okay. So, 33, thank you for the clarity. 33 is already voted on, so now we go to 34. Ron, was that yours, Housing Element?

BARCA: Yes.

JOHNSON: Okay. Can you, discussion on Chapter 2, Housing Element.

BARCA: Give me a moment, I'm looking for my notes right here.

WARD-PALMERTON: Just for point of clarification before we move on, on 33 the council or Commission voted to pass as-is but if Commissioner Montgomery wanted to make a motion with respect to --

ORJIAKO: That particular policy.

WARD-PALMERTON: -- that particular policy she certainly could do so.

MONTGOMERY: Thank you. I'll do that for record.

HOLLEY: Is that Ms. Ward-Palmerton speaking?

WARD-PALMERTON: Yes, I'm sorry.

JOHNSON: Yes, that was, yeah, Ms. Palmerton, yes, Ward-Palmerton. So, we'll go back to 33 and clean that one up. Alicia, did you want to do something there?

MONTGOMERY: Thank you. Yeah, Commissioner LeDuc Montgomery. And I would **move** to amend Item 33, Chapter 1, to include replace the currently approved policy language in 1.1.24 and instead replace it with the following, 1.1.24, Clark County and participating cities shall cooperatively adopt and implement a countywide Transfer of Development Rights, parenthesis, TDR, program to permanently conserve agricultural lands while accommodating the urban growth adopted through the 2025 comprehensive plan periodic update.

UGA expansions that include de-designated agricultural lands shall be subject to an urban holding designation until applicable TDR requirements are satisfied. The County and affected city shall enter into an Interlocal Agreement establishing TDR requirements, implementation responsibilities, conservation objectives and timelines.
The countywide TDR program shall be fully operational no later than December 31, 2027.

The program shall ensure the permanent conservation of that minimum one acre of agricultural land for each acre of designated agricultural land converted through UGA expansion, while also ensuring no net loss of agricultural resource lands resulting from adopted UGA acreage or planned housing, population or employment capacity resulting from implementation of the TDR program. The program shall include a mechanism for identifying and evaluating rural lands for suitability of designation or redesignation as agricultural resource lands.

If sufficient TDR credits are unavailable or if a TDR program is not operational by the implementation deadline, the County and affected city shall use purchase or Transfer of Development Rights, permanent conservation easements or another mechanism providing substantially equivalent permanent agricultural conservation. Failure, delay or insufficient participation in the TDR program shall not result in removal, reduction or reversion of an adopted UGA expansion or reduction in its

planned urban capacity.

Future UGA expansions involving designated agricultural resource lands shall participate in the TDR program and provide permanent agricultural conservation at a minimum one-to-one acreage ratio or provide an alternative mechanism achieving substantially equivalent permanent agricultural conservation.

JOHNSON: Can we get that submitted no matter what happens for the record so at least the County, because it's on your computer, right, does the County have that or does the Councilors have that?

MONTGOMERY: I can provide a copy of it, yeah.

JOHNSON: Yeah, I just thought it would be nice that they because there's a lot there whether you agree with it or not, all I'm saying is, is it appropriate to go here Councilors maybe you ought to just look at what she's writing because --

WARD-PALMERTON: The text on what was voted on can certainly be provided.

JOHNSON: Yeah. Okay. Yeah, that's it. So, we have a motion adding state, what was stated, LeDuc Montgomery, her -- what she said. Do we have a second?

BARCA: This is Commissioner Barca. I'll **second** it.

JOHNSON: We have a motion and a second for an amendment on Chapter 1, Land Use Element, to update the TDR section, and I can't remember the numbers, but 1.1.24 I believe. So, can we -- is there any discussion on that? I know we did a lot already, but...

HARROUN: Yeah, this is Commissioner Harroun. Just reiterating that, that, a, there's a lot there to unpack. B, it blows up a TDR program and makes it nonfunctional, and we can't do that to our cities. So that's the, I'm going to appreciate so much which is why I'm for the TDR and preserving farmlands, but so I'll be voting no.

BARCA: This is Commissioner Barca. Just as a opposing thought process on that, every one of the cities came forward and asked for a TDR program, every single city that was getting de-designated land came forward and said they were for having the TDR program. So, when you say it blows up what the cities want to do, I don't think we have -- is it data?

HARROUN: It's the no net loss provision, that's the issue.

BARCA: That this is our professional disagreement, but it isn't what the cities asked for.

HARROUN: The cities never asked for no net loss.

JOHNSON: So, this is it's good debate. In the spirit of keeping it moving, is there any other discussion on this?

I just want to say one thing that I want this for the record that the TDR is in there and I was concerned with why wasn't the TDR, like why did that get removed when we did push that forward, it wasn't staff, it was the Councilors said, no, they don't want that, but I think the devil's in the details. I think it's somewhere in the middle.

I think it's mostly about, hey, you can't just be doing this and not -- and tell us you're going to have a TDR, but I agree with the spirit of what you're doing. I too think it's -- we really start to hem it in but let that be. I want it for the record to go whatever we're doing with the TDRs, it's obviously we've done this before, I mean we've talked about it till we're blue in the face, but the reality is is that I want Council to hear it from the Commission that, look, all of us agree that TDRs need to be there, staff did a great job of presenting what this is.

I think now the question becomes they've got to work out what it is and my voting for it is not saying no because I kind of like what you got there but some of that stuff I really feel like maybe we're there. So, I don't want to debate it and be mean, but I'm just saying I think there's something there. Is there any other discussion on this?

MONTGOMERY: This is Commissioner LeDuc Montgomery. And agree, I appreciate that we've been able to take the TDR point this far by generally consensus and a lot of these finer points I've been putting on it are for my particular concerns about legal defensibility in terms of the legal challenge as well as a lot of the community feedback, and so I appreciate this, you know, agree to disagree positions been presented, but I am glad we've been making some progress at least.

JOHNSON: We just, we do need a mechanism, and I think we're all working for it. With that said, if there's no more discussion, I have a motion and a second. Can I get a roll call, Jeff.

ROLL CALL VOTE – ITEM NO. 33 (AMENDMENT), MOTION TO APPROVE

HALBERT: NO
BERGTHOLD: NO
FADNESS: NO
BARCA: AYE
HARROUN: NO
MONTGOMERY: AYE
JOHNSON: As my friend -- oh, I'm sorry. As my friend Ron Barca says it's hard but I'm going to vote NO but reluctantly, Ron.

DELAPENA: 2 to 5.

PLANNING COMMISSION DELIBERATIONS

JOHNSON: Okay. We are off of Number 33, excuse me, yeah. 34, who had 34? Ron, was that you again? Yeah, you were working on it. Let's go to 34.

BARCA: Yeah. So, Chapter 2 I want to I think present this in the context that there's a lot in Chapter 2 but what I want to work on specifically was there's a component of it that talks about ideas for reducing cost of development and I want to make sure that we're targeting specific areas and the homeownership aspect, 80 percent to 100 percent AMI because our limited funding I think is not going to be able to go across the board.

We in the county have a one percent tax now that's specifically for what I believe is 60 percent AMI and below but there's nothing that covers the 80 percent to 100 percent nor is there anything specifically around a mechanism to help homeownership.

So, what I'd like to do is propose a few things that I believe we could add that would genuinely reduce cost. One is waive permit fees for qualified buyers that hold the house for a period of time, I can suggest five years, but perhaps there's a different time frame that makes sense to people, but I would look at the aspect of qualified buyers in the 80 to 100 percent AMI, they're not going to flip the house, they're going to live in it for at least five years.

We could use a portfolio of pre-approved plans where we know that staff would be able to have that at their disposal and if the developers come in with a specifically already pre-approved plan that should get them to the top of the list and help move them through.

I believe that we could look at the aspect of implementing outcome-based approval for site development and not get into the aspects of following the code as written. Now I think there's an opportunity for us to modify code much more for outcome-based procedure, and that would give any of the developers more opportunity to do it in different ways rather than the prescribed way that a specific planned examiner expects it to be done.

I also believe that we need to have interagency agreements to lower these barriers just as we're asking County Planning to do, I think the utilities and Department of Health need to come forward with the same kind of program for the 80 percent to 100 percent AMI ownership opportunity.

And the last thing I've got I think I wrote down at 2.3.8 we use the word encourage and I think we need to work that out into some very firm incentives. And the last thing is what we don't have in our Housing Element right now is specific metrics that are going to be measured and reported out on with the idea that adjustments would be made within the time frame of the comp plan so we have some targets about how many houses we want to build, but we don't have mechanisms that says what do we do if we're not getting there and how are we measuring whether we're getting there or not.

So, I know that's a lot. I can try and put it into more specific words for incentives and go back over it as a motion, but I wanted to kind of lay that out on the table to see how people were thinking about it, and I believe my fellow Commissioner Bryan Halbert had some additions that he wanted to put in on the same element.

JOHNSON: Bryan.

HALBERT: Yeah. Thanks. Commissioner Halbert here. And, yeah, Ron, I like what you're saying and as

you were talking I was putting those notes under 2.1.9, it seemed like that was the place for --

BARCA: Yep.

HALBERT: Is that where you were talking about?

BARCA: Yep.

HALBERT: And then before I go into some of my other ones, there is a housing planning tool that was part of the appendixes that seemed like that was a tool to track how we were doing. Did you have a comment on that, or did you see that as a tool that would --

BARCA: I didn't see it as a firm requirement.

HALBERT: Okay. Yeah, I don't know if it was a you shall do this or just a tool that could be used to show the how the process is. Maybe Jose could help us out with that one.

ALVAREZ: So, the appendix that --

HALBERT: Appendix J, the Housing for All Planning Tool.

ALVAREZ: Okay. So, the legislature essentially we have to have a requirement to plan for by income bands, I think there's a check-in at the five-year mark where we're supposed to report out how we're doing and sort of address some of those concerns of why, why we have or haven't met our targets and what our plans are to achieve those goals and to come into compliance with that.

HALBERT: Correct. My 2.1.9 suggestions really were covered even better by what you said, Ron. I was, you know, saying let's reduce impact fees and tax burdens on all Clark County people to make housing more affordable but your suggestion about permit waiver fees for a five-year ownership is an awesome incentive for a buyer and then the pre-approved plans also should, you know, help a developer move quicker.

JOHNSON: Paradise, the fire, where the fire was, they have like, that's what they do, they're all predawn so people don't, you can go build your house back up, but you could also go in there and just, here it is, you can submit a plan, so there's no fee for that, so I think that's a different thing, but it's very effective that preset plans.

I don't know, we might be getting too far in the weeds with this, but I get what you're saying, affordability I think is the big premiere. Is there any other discussions on this as Ron has crafted the amendment?

HALBERT: Yep. I got one other one. On Policy 2.1.11 and just a language change, I have it written out or I think or handed out, it's about promoting homeownership opportunities for low income and moderate-income families and individuals while recognizing historic inadequacies and access to homeownership opportunities for communities of color, and I want to strike "of color."

When we saw this back in July of 2025 the CAG recommended this, the community group that wrote these policies, and it wasn't until July of 2026 that we saw an update on Chapter 2, the Housing Element Code changes, and in 26, Chapter 2, talks about racially disparate impacts and displacement, so Table 2.13 use the words, "and households of black indigenous and people of color, so BIPOC groups," as those were all the groups that were, had that were substantially under the income ability to purchase homes.

So, I want to just strike the words "of color" and add in "and households of black indigenous and people of color, the BIPOC groups" in that language because it wasn't just one group, there was five groups in there that were, that did not meet the income standards. And if it helps I'll hand it out, take one and pass it down.

And then I'm handing out the language written out and then also Table 2.1, 2.13, here's one for everybody, I'll keep that. And in 2.13 the table based on race and ethnicity just shows the percentage of median income of these different groups and uses the words that, yeah, BIPOC, yeah, households of black, indigenous and people of color. Okay. That's my amendment for --

JOHNSON: Okay. Is there any other discussion on that?

BARCA: Chair, before I go ahead and make a recommendation for wording, I want to make sure that the Commission understands my focus is specifically homeownership towards the 80 to 100 percent AMI for the aspect of coming up with ways to go ahead and lower the cost of housing from what is capable within the county looking at the idea that the income bands below that for affordable housing are going to be handled within the tax structure that has already been passed by County Council for 60 percent and below.

If that's agreeable then that would be when I put the wording in and that's what you would be voting for, and if there is some disagreement with that, I'm open to understanding your point of view before I do the wording in case we wanted to modify it in any fashion.

JOHNSON: So my understanding is basically where you're going is you support what's there, but what you're really looking for is affordability targeted towards changing the threshold just a little bit, but basically you're just looking at affordability, you still are in support of on the basis of the work done, the chapter done on this one, add a little bit of clarity to it and I'm kind of asking both of you, that's what I kind of got out of it.

HALBERT: Yeah.

JOHNSON: Yeah. And I don't know, if it's me I'm inclined to say, yeah, that doesn't sound, but you got to craft the --

BARCA: Yeah. So, in generalization the answer's yes. I'm just trying to be a bit more focused on who we're able to actually help in some fashion. There's limited resources and we're going to be in a position of having to pick and choose where those resources go and so if we're strongly of the belief

that homeownership is better and supporting that middle class, that 80 to 100 AMI is important for us, then that's my direction.

JOHNSON: Any responses? It's yours to go if you want to make a motion, Ron.

BARCA: All right. Thank you, Chair. So, this is Commissioner Barca. So, my **recommendation** in Chapter 2, 2.1.9, we're looking at homeownership in the 80 percent to 100 percent AMI, waive the permit fees for qualifying buyers that hold the house for a five-year period. Use pre-approved plans to lower the approval time. Implement outcome-based approval for site development. Craft interagency agreements to lower the barriers as stated above.

And then at 2.1.1 incorporate Commissioner Halbert's request to change the wording to include BIPOC. In 2.3.8 remove encourage and come up with some firm incentives that I don't have enumerated. And the last item was in the appendix where we were talking about metrics and tracking, I'm interested in staff flushing that out to talk about what they're going to do with the information since most of it was considered encourage and propose or promote, so I'm looking for the metrics being able to actually have some levers that would say we would go back and do something different if we're not hitting our targets.

JOHNSON: Discussion? We have a motion. Do we have a second for that?

MONTGOMERY: This is Commissioner LeDuc Montgomery. I'll second.

JOHNSON: Okay. Here's what we have, we have a motion regarding approving Chapter 2, right, which is -- which is Chapter 2 which is the Housing Element with the amendment as stated. Now, is there any discussion on what Commissioner Barca just advanced?

HARROUN: This is Commissioner Harroun. I'm not opposed to it, but the what we're voting on got kind of askew at the end there because it was all in the, when you starting directing to staff. So, the first couple I'm like tracking. The last section I got a little bit confused on what you are asking for us to approve. So maybe, maybe we just do bump bump bump and then kind of cleanup the last one but that's kind of my --

BARCA: I'm open to a friendly amendment to pull the aspect of the metrics that were in the appendix.

HARROUN: I would make that friendly amendment.

JOHNSON: Okay. We have a motion on the table. Any discussion with the friendly amendment? I know this is dense.

MONTGOMERY: **Second** as stated.

JOHNSON: Oh, there's a second. Any discussion? Seeing no discussion, let's get a roll call on approving Chapter 2 on housing, Line-Item Number 34 with Commissioner Barca's amendment.

ROLL CALL VOTE – ITEM NO. 34 WITH AMENDMENT, MOTION TO APPROVE

HALBERT: AYE
BERGTHOLD: AYE
FADNESS: AYE
BARCA: AYE
HARROUN: AYE
MONTGOMERY: AYE
JOHNSON: AYE

DELAPENA: 7/0.

PLANNING COMMISSION DELIBERATIONS

JOHNSON: Motion passes. We now move to number 30- -- let's see, you were on was it, Ron, did you want 38 or 37? 38, Capital Facilities Plan. So, we are looking to approve, I'll either take discussion or a motion on Capital Facilities Plan Element, Chapter 6, Number 38.

BARCA: So I want to just to bring this one up from the standpoint I don't have a specific amendment to bring forward, I wanted to clarify my vote and that is based on the testimony that has been put into the record over the last couple of months it has the appearance that many of our projects from our previous comp plan have been stacked on to the concurrency on this comp plan, the half a billion dollar transportation package I don't believe is realistic and it has the appearance that Public Works has been approving projects that would not be passing in the context of the test of concurrency.

So, from the funding aspect I don't believe the capital facilities plan is well-developed or realistic for the funding that's available within the County and I'll be voting no on the capital facilities aspect.

JOHNSON: Any other discussion on Line Item 38, Capital Facilities Plan? If not, I would hear a motion or -- go ahead.

MONTGOMERY: Commissioner LeDuc Montgomery. And I would say just I share some of the same concerns in re-reviewing some of the public comment today to prepare. I mean, there was a lot of testimony from folks about concerns of new development where the existing infrastructure, you know, wasn't going to be able to be service it from their perspective and then as we had heard in prior meetings there's a very long list and it seems like a lot is getting added to it and so I would like to be able to come forward with a solution to the problem but I am just concerned about adding more in if we're not able to keep up with that type of development, so...

JOHNSON: Okay. Any other discussions on that? If not, I would hear a motion for Chapter 6, Capital Facilities Plan Element.

BARCA: This is Commissioner Barca. I'd like to make a **motion** to deny the capital facilities plan as written.

JOHNSON: Do we have a second?

MONTGOMERY: Commissioner LeDuc Montgomery. I'll **second**.

JOHNSON: Okay. So, we have a motion to deny the Capital Facilities Plan Element, Chapter 6. Any, is there any discussion? No discussion. Jeff, could we get a roll call please.

ROLL CALL VOTE – ITEM NO. 38, MOTION TO DENY

HALBERT: NO
BERGTHOLD: NO
FADNESS: NO
BARCA: AYE
HARROUN: NO
MONTGOMERY: AYE
JOHNSON: NO

DELAPENA: 2 to 5.

PLANNING COMMISSION DELIBERATIONS

JOHNSON: 2 to 5. So, in this case Council, this I don't -- it passes then; correct? So, it doesn't --

WARD-PALMERTON: But you need a motion to deny it as written so you'll need to --

HARROUN: Motion to approve this, right.

JOHNSON: Okay. So, let me, so we need to do another one then.

WARD-PALMERTON: You do need to do another one.

JOHNSON: Okay. So can we get a motion to approve Chapter 6, Capital Facilities Plan Element.

FADNESS: Commissioner Fadness. I **move** to approve Chapter 6 as presented.

JOHNSON: Do we have a second?

HARROUN: Commissioner Harroun. I **second**.

JOHNSON: Is there any discussion? Hearing none, can we get a roll call please.

ROLL CALL VOTE – ITEM NO. 38, MOTION TO APPROVE

HALBERT: AYE

BERGTHOLD: AYE
FADNESS: AYE
BARCA: NO
HARROUN: AYE
MONTGOMERY: NO
JOHNSON: AYE

DELAPENA: 5 to 2.

PLANNING COMMISSION DELIBERATIONS

JOHNSON: Motion passes. Now we go, Commissioner Barca, to Number 40, Chapter 8, Historical, Archeological and Cultural Preservation Element. What do you got?

BARCA: I don't have anything on that one.

JOHNSON: Oh, I thought you did. We didn't vote on that one.

HALBERT: Commissioner Halbert. I had just one word amendment on it I think it's (inaudible)

HOLLEY: I can't -- I can't understand you, Bryan.

HALBERT: Is it my mic or is it (inaudible).

JOHNSON: I think it's your mic. Just lean forward, pull it closer to you.

HALBERT: I'll try again and if not I'll use my neighbor's mic. I think I'll just try my neighbor's mic. Okay. So, Policy 8.1.3 says, "Facilitate nomination of historic and cultural resources" but I believe that the heading is "Historical, Archeological and Cultural Preservation Element," so I think it should have the word "Archeological" in there, "Facilitate nomination of historic, archeological and cultural resources," that's my proposed amendment.

JOHNSON: Okay. So, we have amendment to Chapter 8 changing and making sure we're adding the word "archeological." Is there any discussion on that? If not, can we get a motion.

HARROUN: This is commissioner Harroun. I **move** to --

JOHNSON: Approve it.

HARROUN: -- approve adding the word "archeological" to 8.1.3 and accept the chapter as a whole or the which number is it, in Number 40.

BARCA: This is Commissioner Barca. I **second** it.

JOHNSON: So, we have a -- is there any discussion? We have a motion and a second. Seeing no

discussion, Jeff, could we get a roll call.

ROLL CALL VOTE – ITEM NO. 40 WITH AMENDMENT, MOTION TO APPROVE

HALBERT: AYE
BERGTHOLD: AYE
FADNESS: AYE
BARCA: AYE
HARROUN: AYE
MONTGOMERY: AYE
JOHNSON: AYE

DELAPENA: 7/0.

PLANNING COMMISSION DELIBERATIONS

JOHNSON: Motion passes. Moving finally to Chapter 14, the Climate Element. There was some, Ron, was that you?

BARCA: Yeah. So, Commissioners, I initially was going to add language about the no net loss in ag land for the current use taxation policy to promote local food production, but I already understand the winds that are blowing here about no net loss, so I'm going to withdraw that.

I want to go to 14.20 which has to do with solid waste and I would like to **make an amendment** that solid waste system becomes owned by the County and then we can use that aspect of solid waste collection system for the aspect of being able to help facilitate our climate element requirement by having direct control over the solid waste system as opposed to having to contractually request changes to the policies that the solid waste operator uses now.

So, the amendment would be for the County to pursue ownership of the solid waste system in Clark County.

JOHNSON: Any discussion?

HARROUN: Is there a second?

JOHNSON: Oh, do we have a second? I'm sorry. Thank you. Is there a second to that motion, that amendment to that the climate?

HALBERT: Yeah, I'll **second** that amendment.

JOHNSON: Okay. So, we have a second now. Is there any discussion?

HARROUN: So, this is Commissioner Harroun. So just to clarify, we're directing the County to pursue or to look into purchasing or developing the waste program, not we're not directing them to take it

over, but we're directing them to, you're asking to take a look at taking it over, is that --

BARCA: I believe we're in contract negotiations now and there's an opportunity to buy the facilities at might be a dollar, but the cost comes in the aspect of operations.

The opportunity as I see it comes in the idea of helping protect the County in the context of the climate model where you could use the TIP fee for promoting behaviors that are beneficial in the county whereas right now once you lease it out you are unable to affect the TIP fee and how it is handled.

FADNESS: Commissioner Fadness. I guess I would be hesitant to support such an amendment until I saw what the operating cost differences and the rate differences might be with the County operating the solid waste versus contracting it out.

So, I'm not -- I don't really think I can support this just because, you know, I think there's a lot that goes into this that we're not considering.

JOHNSON: Any more discussion? Okay. So -- oh, I'm sorry. Go ahead.

HALBERT: Commissioner Halbert. You know, Ron, you mentioned that the County's in negotiations now, I think I read that they're looking at purchasing the waste transfer stations, not the waste handling necessarily of it. Is that how you saw it?

BARCA: Yeah, this is Commissioner Barca. Yeah, that's how I saw it was taking over the transfer stations for handling the vast majority of the solid waste that comes in and out of the county or comes out of the county.

HALBERT: So, they're already in that process. How would we word that in this policy then or the goal, it's a goal?

BARCA: I would put it into the context of adding it to the policy.

HARROUN: This is Commissioner Harroun. I appreciate the goal but there's a lot to unpack here and so I'm hesitant to just throw something at this late hour that's substantially different than what's there.

JOHNSON: So, we -- oh, go ahead.

HALBERT: Okay. I also wanted to propose a potential amendment to this chapter and then we can come back and maybe lump them together for a vote.

JOHNSON: Well, let's right now we have one amendment right now and we'll come back and we can try another one. So, what I'd like to do if there's no discussion on this motion, which is acceptance of Chapter 14 with the proposed amendment that Commissioner Barca put forward. Is there any discussion on that? Seeing none, can we get a vote on this, Jeff.

ROLL CALL VOTE – ITEM NO. 46 WITH AMENDMENT, MOTION TO APPROVE

HALBERT: AYE
BERGTHOLD: AYE
FADNESS: NO
BARCA: AYE
HARROUN: NO
MONTGOMERY: AYE
JOHNSON: NO

DELAPENA: 4 to 3.

PLANNING COMMISSION DELIBERATIONS

JOHNSON: It passes, correct. So that amendment passes. Okay. So now we move forward adding an amendment, and by the way that was with Chapter 14 passes with the amendment put forward by Commissioner Barca. Now --

HARROUN: That was just the amendment because wasn't there another Chapter 14 amendment?

JOHNSON: Yeah, I but the way I worded that was this is acceptance of the chapter with his amendment. So therefore, now we can make another amendment to the chapter which is now go forward now. Yeah.

HALBERT: Sure. One of CAG members, Don Steinke, put together a climate element e-mail to us regarding scale, grid scale batteries, something that wasn't even in the language two years ago when CAG made all their recommendations and just as a goal or a part of a policy is for the County to work with the PUD and the fire department to develop regulations that welcome grid scale batteries in as many places as possible while protecting public safety and establish an emissions reduction goal.

So, we know like grid scale batteries can help reduce energy, greenhouse gases and it was something that wasn't even considered a couple of years ago. So, I would say we add it to Chapter 14.15.5 as a --

HARROUN: That's your motion?

HALBERT: Sorry. This is my motion to --

HARROUN: Could you read the specific motion because I would like to be clear on that.

HALBERT: Let me write that out. Okay. Commissioner Halbert. I'd like to make a motion that we add to Chapter 14.15.5 that we work with the PUD and the fire department to develop regulations that welcome grade scale batteries in as many places as possible while protecting public safety and establish an emissions reduction goal.

JOHNSON: So, we have a motion for an amendment to Chapter 14. Do we have a second?

BARCA: This is Commissioner Barca. I second.

JOHNSON: We have a motion and a second. Is there any discussion?

HARROUN: This is Commissioner Harroun. I would like to potentially change the language of that, that work with the PUD and the fire department to develop regulations to allow for grid scale batteries and just to make it real clean versus the to welcome grid scale batteries in as many as possible while protecting public safety, I mean just to me for code language it doesn't --

BARCA: Is that a friendly amendment?

HARROUN: -- you know, that makes more sense to me.

BARCA: Is that a friendly amendment?

HARROUN: That would be a friendly amendment.

JOHNSON: So, what was the word you wanted to change there?

HARROUN: I would say work with, work with the PUD and the fire department to develop regulations that allow for grid scale batteries.

JOHNSON: Allow for. Would you accept that, is that something you're --

HALBERT: Yeah, Commissioner Halbert. I'd accept that friendly amendment.

JOHNSON: So, we have an amendment and the only thing we're doing with that is we're changing welcome to allow for to his amendment. Okay.

WARD-PALMERTON: You would need a motion on that.

JOHNSON: On that. Okay. I got a motion on a motion here, so... So, let's deal with this first motion first. Okay. So, we have a motion and a second on just this, we'll get to yours in a minute, and so is there any discussion --

HARROUN: No. Friendly amendment changes it, the original.

WARD-PALMERTON: Correct. But I didn't hear a motion on your original.

HALBERT: Well, okay. I did. I thought I did. So, Commissioner Halbert. I'll make a **motion** that we add to Chapter 14.15.5 that work with the PUD and fire department to develop regulations that welcome grid scale batteries, period.

JOHNSON: Is there a second?

BARCA: This is Commissioner Barca. I **second**.

JOHNSON: Okay. Is there any discussion on that amendment? All right. We have a motion on the floor with a second. Jeff, can we get a roll call.

ROLL CALL VOTE – ITEM NO. 46 (AMENDMENT), MOTION TO APPROVE

HALBERT: AYE
BERGTHOLD: AYE
FADNESS: AYE
BARCA: AYE
HARROUN: AYE
MONTGOMERY: AYE
JOHNSON: AYE

DELAPENA: 7/0.

PLANNING COMMISSION DELIBERATIONS

JOHNSON: Okay. So that passes. So now we're going to want to go back to you, Jack, and you want to make a friendly amendment or just --

HARROUN: We're close enough. We're close enough.

JOHNSON: Okay. All right. So now we are done, am I right, yeah, because that was climate change. So, we have completed all of the Proposed Comprehensive Plan Chapters and Appendices. Right on. Okay.

So, let's go down now, these are the code changes. So, I'm going to do the same thing and I'm going to ask you, and I know we've got a couple in here that we try to do things with, but I want to go through these, are there any from 62 to 91, is there any of those that need discussion? I know we've dealt with the other ones; we'll revote it to pass it, but for now it's that.

FADNESS: Yeah, I'll say I'd like to pull out obviously 63, 65 and 67.

JOHNSON: So, we're going to pull out 63, 65 and 67. Are there any more?

BARCA: Chair, I have some wording changes that I was looking for on the manufacturing home park, but I'm concerned that I needed to actually have done that earlier. I don't -- with -- yeah. 40.250.120. Well, let's roll with it, manufacturing home park overlay.

JOHNSON: So, you want to pull that one out?

BARCA: Yeah.

JOHNSON: So, I'm pulling out 63, 65, 67 and 74. So here we go, we're going to vote on this page right -- oh, sorry.

HALBERT: 68. You said overlay.

JOHNSON: Hold on. Hold on. Hold on. Let me just get this right. 63, right, 65, 67, he wants 67. Hold on. And, Ron, did you want 74 or 68?

HALBERT: 74 is Standards and Requirements.

BARCA: I stand corrected it looks like I want 74.

JOHNSON: That's what I thought you said. So, I have four of these that we're pulling out. Once again, 63, 65, 67 and 74. Correct? Okay.

So, we're going to just go right now and block these out, so we got definitions. I'm going to go 62, 66, 68, 69 and 70. So I'm looking at, and 64, yes, sorry. Thank you. So, 62, 64, 66, 68, 69 and 70, I'd like to block those together. So, I would take a motion to pass just on this page so I can move to the next page and see what I'm looking at.

BERGTHOLD: All the way to 90.

JOHNSON: What's that? No. No, I'll go to that page next, I just want to make sure we're looking at every one of these. Go ahead.

HALBERT: Commissioner Halbert. I'll make a motion that we vote on the numbers that you've listed.

JOHNSON: Thank you. All right. Could we have a second?

BERGTHOLD: Commissioner Bergthold. I'll second.

JOHNSON: Okay. We have a second and we are voting on Definitions, Low Density Residential Districts, Commercial Districts, Manufactured Home Park Overlay, Ambulance Dispatch Facility and Co-Living Housing. Is there any discussion?

FADNESS: Yeah, this is Commissioner Fadness. I just want to point out that, Bryan, you said that we vote on you didn't say approve.

HALBERT: Change my **motion** to approve the numbers that you've listed, Karl.

JOHNSON: Okay. And a second on that again, please.

BERGTHOLD: **Second**. Commissioner Bergthold.

JOHNSON: Okay. So, we have the proper motion and the second. Jeff, could we get a roll call on that

please.

ROLL CALL VOTE – ITEM NOS. 62, 64, 66, 68, & 70, MOTION TO APPROVE

HALBERT: AYE
BERGTHOLD: AYE
FADNESS: AYE
BARCA: AYE
HARROUN: AYE
MONTGOMERY: AYE
JOHNSON: AYE

DELAPENA: 7/0.

PLANNING COMMISSION DELIBERATIONS

JOHNSON: Motion passes. Moving to the next page for now, we'll come back to those ones. So now we're going to do all, we're going to group 71, 72 and 73, Community Buildings, Social Halls, Lodges, Fraternal Organizations, Clubs, Public and Private Schools, Private Recreational Facilities, we're going to do Compact Lot Developments.

73 is Emergency Shelters, Transitional Housing, Emergency Housing, Permanent Supportive Housing. 75 is Multifamily Residential Amenity Area Standards. 76 is Nursery Schools, Preschools, Kindergartens, Child Day Care Centers, Family Day Care Centers. 77 is Zero Lot Line Development. 78, Sign Standards. 79, Landscaping and Screening on Private Property. 80, Parking and Loading Standards. 81, Street and Road Standards. 82, Uses Subject to Review and Approval. 83, Planned Unit Development.

And the Appendixes, Definitions, Traffic Impact Fee Formula, Impact Fee Revisions, Impact Fee Schedule, Collection of Impact Fees, and Impact Fee Credits. So, I'm going basically with the exception of 74, I'm going from 71 to 91. Is there any discussion on that or a motion?

MONTGOMERY: Commissioner LeDuc Montgomery. I **move** to approve 71 through 73 and 75 through 91 as stated.

JOHNSON: Awesome. Thank you. Can we get a second, please.

BARCA: This is Commissioner Barca. I **second**.

JOHNSON: We have a motion and a second as stated. Is there any discussion? Okay. Jeff.

ROLL CALL VOTE – ITEM NOS. 71-73 & 75-91, MOTION TO APPROVE

HALBERT: AYE
BERGTHOLD: AYE

FADNESS: AYE
BARCA: AYE
HARROUN: AYE
MONTGOMERY: AYE
JOHNSON: AYE

DELAPENA: 7/0.

PLANNING COMMISSION DELIBERATIONS

JOHNSON: That was quick. Okay. We go through this. Now we're going to go back to the page before, we're going to come back to 63. We're going to have to -- Minimum and Maximum Calculations. Kyle, that was your first one; correct?

FADNESS: Yeah, that's correct. I'll just I'll go back to that I believe that the minimum density requirements are flawed as presented. I think they need to have another look taken at them. Obviously my motion didn't pass last time so I will let somebody else make a motion.

JOHNSON: Is that the same or is that the same discussion like on 65 too?

FADNESS: That's for 63 and 65, yes. 67 just relates to some of the mixed use.

JOHNSON: All right. We'll pull out Number 67. So, I'd like to start with 63, Minimum and Maximum Calculations. Is there any discussion, any more discussion or motions? This is to pass not the one we had before. Anything?

DELAPENA: Chair.

WARD-PALMERTON: Previously just because it looks like Commissioner Barca had a question Item 63 and 65, there was a motion to recommended not passing, so this would be --

JOHNSON: This is what I'm saying, yeah, this would be the opposite of that.

WARD-PALMERTON: -- appears to be a question. So, I apologize.

JOHNSON: I'm sorry. No, that's okay because I'm getting loopy, so...

WARD-PALMERTON: So, this would be to vote in the affirmative to pass these.

JOHNSON: So, do we have a motion?

DELAPENA: Chair, we have our housing development, Elizabeth Decker, who has her hand raised.

JOHNSON: Okay. No, wait. We -- have we --

HARROUN: You shouldn't take testimony.

JOHNSON: No, she's not, she's staff, right, she's staff, yeah. Yeah.

DECKER: Good evening. I just wanted to offer - Elizabeth Decker, JET Planning, consultant for the County working on these housing code updates and I just wanted to offer one clarification.

Item 63, the Minimum and Maximum Calculations is only about methodology, it is not the actual minimums and maximums proposed for each of the districts which is included in Item 65.

FADNESS: Thanks, Elizabeth. Part of my reason for including Item 63 is that the family size unit credit calculation would have been included in that discussing, back to my discussion of as currently written, the proposed changes they, they lead developers towards having to build studio and one-bedroom apartments versus getting that, that credit for building two, three and four-bedroom apartments that would help support families.

DECKER: Absolutely, Commissioner. I just wanted to offer that clarification that despite the name of Item 63 a lot of what you've been discussing is also in 65, but, thanks.

JOHNSON: Great. Thank you, Elizabeth. Thank you. So, did we get a motion, do we have a motion for approval for Minimum and Maximum Calculations?

HALBERT: Yeah, Commissioner Halbert. I'll make a **motion** that we approve Item 63.

JOHNSON: We have a motion. Do we have a second to approve Item 63?

BERGTHOLD: Commissioner Bergthold. I'll **second** that.

JOHNSON: We have a motion and a second. Is there any discussion? No discussion noted. Can we get a roll call, Jeff, please.

ROLL CALL VOTE – ITEM NO. 63, MOTION TO APPROVE

HALBERT: AYE
BERGTHOLD: AYE
FADNESS: NO
BARCA: NO
HARROUN: NO
MONTGOMERY: AYE
JOHNSON: AYE

DELAPENA: 4 to 3.

PLANNING COMMISSION DELIBERATIONS

JOHNSON: That passes 4 to 3. We go down to 65, the same thing. Commissioner Fadness, I'm assuming that was the same thing that you're talking about.

FADNESS: That's correct. This is the zoning.

JOHNSON: Okay. Yeah. So Residential and Office Residential Districts. Is there any discussion on that one? Hearing none, can we get a motion, please.

BARCA: Chair, I'll make a **motion** to accept Item 65 as presented by staff.

JOHNSON: We have a motion. Could we get a second.

HALBERT: Commissioner Halbert. I'll **second** the motion.

JOHNSON: We have a motion and a second. Is there any discussion? Hearing no discussion, Jeff, can we get a roll call please. Thank you.

ROLL CALL VOTE – ITEM NO. 65, MOTION TO APPROVE

HALBERT: (NO AUDIO)
BERGTHOLD: AYE
FADNESS: NO
BARCA: NO

HOLLEY: Hold on. I cannot -- you need to start over, Jeff. I can't hear Bryan and I can't hear Alicia. You guys are mute on my end.

JOHNSON: Okay. We're working with microphones. We'll get you straightened out. Can we go through the roll call again please, Jeff. Thank you.

HALBERT: AYE
BERGTHOLD: AYE
BARCA: NO. What happened to Kyle?

DELAPENA: Sorry.

FADNESS: NO
HARROUN: NO
MONTGOMERY: AYE
JOHNSON: AYE

DELAPENA: 4 to 3.

PLANNING COMMISSION DELIBERATIONS

JOHNSON: Passes 4 to 3. Okay. So now 67, we go down to Mixed Use District, that was a different thing we were talking about; correct?

FADNESS: Yeah, that's correct. And I'm not going to fight with this one, I don't think I'm going to win, I just don't agree with some of the changes that are made and so I wanted a chance to vote no on it.

JOHNSON: Okay. That's great. Can we get a motion to approve Number 67, Mixed Use District.

BERGTHOLD: This is Commissioner Bergthold. I'll make a **motion** to approve Item 67 as written by staff.

JOHNSON: We have a motion. Can we get a second, please.

BARCA: This is Commissioner Barca. I'll make a **second** if I can understand what Kyle's concern is.

JOHNSON: Discussion, please. We have a second. We got a second. We have a second. We can do discussion.

FADNESS: So, some of the changes were removing housing options in the mixed use. I did like that some of the suggestions that DEAB had provided allowing some detached dwellings with a limit there. I know that it's probably not the most, it may not be the best use of a mixed development completely, but to have to include the detached, but I just don't want to get rid of the options of housing and so I'm just a fan of less restrictive zoning and so overall that's why I just really don't want to vote yes to restrict where housing can be built.

HARROUN: So, for clarity, is this where they banned homeownership of townhomes, they made them all apartments, from a lower, is that the, is this the chapter or was it the other?

FADNESS: I believe that was included in 40.220.020, but staff may correct me.

HARROUN: Residential.

JOHNSON: Residential and Office Residential Districts, that's 65.

HARROUN: But then it went corporations and not individuals owning the houses.

JOHNSON: So, we have a motion and a second. Is there any more discussion?

BARCA: Yes, Chair. This is Ron Barca. I do want to ask staff in regard to that, there was the aspect of townhomes being removed in the MX design standards and the other part of it I was trying to have an understanding, what's our trigger point when residential is built, can we build residential without any commercial development in an MX zone?

ALVAREZ: So mixed use currently requires 20 percent. Oh, one way or the other, a minimum of 20 percent, so you could do 80 percent commercial, 20 percent residential or vice-a-versa. The -- one of

the proposals is to change that to a 90/10 split.

BARCA: 90 percent meaning 90 percent residential?

ALVAREZ: The same either way, it could be --

BARCA: Either way.

ALVAREZ: -- 90 percent commercial or 90 percent residential, mostly what we get is majority residential.

BARCA: So, can you maximize your residential without any of the commercial being built?

ALVAREZ: I don't believe that's a provision that's in the code that's allowed currently or proposed.

BARCA: So just for my understanding then, do they have to be built simultaneously even though you have this stated?

ALVAREZ: No. We have a couple of the site-specific requests that you approved were mixed use designations where the residential had been built and the commercial hadn't come online and so the proposal was to change that from commercial to residential.

Those were some of the site-specific requests that you approved earlier today, they were mixed use, they were going to residential because the commercial component wasn't built.

BARCA: All right. So, for me to understand about how this fills out, if we end up with land that's designated MX, somebody comes forward with a proposal to build out the residential side with no proposal to do the commercial aspect, do we go forward?

ALVAREZ: We have -- we would -- we approve the development with the anticipation that the commercial would come subsequent, so the residential would be built and then the commercial there's a, it's platted out and sometimes it doesn't get built or it takes a long time and so, yes, the residential can happen.

BARCA: Okay. So, it takes a long time is okay, not desirable, but it's okay. Okay. All right. And then the discussion about taking townhomes out, what was the rationale behind that?

ALVAREZ: To be consistent with what we've done for the R and OR zones to make a more of a focus on the multi-family.

BARCA: Okay. Thank you.

JOHNSON: Okay. With that said, is there any more discussion on Item Number 67? I'll take a motion. Do we have a motion? I thought do we have a motion already? I said I just said that do we have a motion.

WARD-PALMERTON: There is a motion to approve and then it proceeded to discussion.

JOHNSON: Sounds good. So, we have a -- okay. So, we have a motion and a second, we just discussed, let's vote on it. I'm sorry. I'm getting tired.

ROLL CALL VOTE – ITEM NO. 67, MOTION TO APPROVE

HALBERT: AYE
BERGTHOLD: AYE
FADNESS: NO
BARCA: AYE
HARROUN: NO
MONTGOMERY: AYE
JOHNSON: AYE

DELAPENA: 5 to 2.

PLANNING COMMISSION DELIBERATIONS

JOHNSON: Passes 5 to 2. Okay. We now go to Commissioner Barca, Number 74, Manufactured Home Parks and Standards. Ron, what do you got?

BARCA: Okay. Commission, there was a couple of items in the wording I wanted to be clarified so I'm going to bring this to staff. In A.2, it says recreational vehicles are allowed, specifically I believe that means coaches and then it has no park models, there's no reference of tiny homes, and I'm wondering why we're making that particular distinction. So, I would like some clarification on that from the existing manufacturing home park.

JOHNSON: They got wheels, right, or they got axles.

BARCA: Well, so does a park model but park model is not included any longer.

DELAPENA: We have Elizabeth Decker who has her hand raised.

JOHNSON: Elizabeth, go ahead.

DECKER: Yes, good evening. Thank you for the question, Commissioner Barca. And the answer, I'm sorry, at this hour I cannot quote RCW's, but there is a State law that requires RVs to be permitted in certain configurations within manufactured home parks and that's why that particular use is permitted.

I have not looked into whether that definition of RVs includes park models or not, that's something I could continue to look at, but tiny homes don't fit under the RCW definition of RVs in most cases so that's why they're not included.

BARCA: Okay. So, I think in the context that tiny homes are approved by L&I it feels like they get a sticker just like any other item on wheels and I would see our ability on existing mobile home parks to be able to include the aspect of park models and tiny homes meeting the criteria. I have no opposition to the idea that RVs are included, so that's one item that I'll be putting forward in a motion.

And the other item that I'm wondering about for new manufacturing home parks is why aren't we just adopting the cottage development requirements in a mobile home park overlay rather than have a whole different set of criteria?

It feels like cottage development goes up to 1800-square feet and it feels like since it's a new development we could be handling it with the same criteria and not have to have a whole set of development regulations that's exclusive to a mobile home park that hasn't been built yet.

Is there anything from staff that you would like to talk about in that supposition on my part?

DELAPENA: Elizabeth, go ahead.

DECKER: Yeah, thanks. Elizabeth Decker, JET Planning. What obviously we want the code to cover as many eventualities as possible, but for consideration the County has not seen an application for a new manufactured home park since the '90s, so it just hasn't, you know, standards for new parks are not necessarily ones that get exercised frequently.

So, if that influences your decisions, that's sort of why we propose to just maintain the existing standards for new parks rather than spending a lot of time revising those and throwing them out or aligning with cottage housing or any other standards.

BARCA: All right. Thank you for the clarification. So, this is Commissioner Barca. I'd like to make a **motion** to amend the mobile home park regulations for Item A.2 to include park models and tiny homes that have been approved by L&I, State of Washington.

And then in Item C and D I would just look at the aspect of including cottage development requirements and not have a separate set of development standards.

JOHNSON: Can I just get a clarification. You started out by saying an amendment, are you putting forward that acceptance of Number 74 with an amendment?

BARCA: With, yes, an acceptance with the amendment.

JOHNSON: So, we are voting on acceptance of Number 74, Manufactured Home Park Standards, with amendment the two, the amendments with the two items that Commissioner Barca added. Do I have a second to that?

HALBERT: Commissioner Halbert. I'll **second** that motion.

JOHNSON: Great. So, we have a motion and a second. Is there any discussion on this? Seeing none,

Jeff, could we get a vote.

ROLL CALL VOTE – ITEM NO. 74 WITH AMENDMENT, MOTION TO APPROVE

HALBERT: AYE
BERGTHOLD: AYE
FADNESS: NO
BARCA: AYE
HARROUN: ABSTAIN
MONTGOMERY: AYE
JOHNSON: AYE

DELAPENA: 4, or I'm sorry, 5 to 1 with 1 abstention.

PLANNING COMMISSION DELIBERATIONS

JOHNSON: 5/1 to 1, okay, so that passes. Okay. So that completes that section. We now go to Proposed Impact Fees of which we have done all the schools, the fire.

We have one, 101 which is Transportation of Impact Fees - See page 46 in Appendix A. What am I looking at here, Jose, 46? Can you give me some clarification on that one, 46 in Appendix A. Where's 46? 32. 46 in Appendix A, Transportation Capital Facilities. They're already done. So, every, check me if I'm wrong on this, 92 through 100 are already approved.

ORJIAKO: Right.

JOHNSON: So, all we have left the last one is 101, it says Transportation Impact Fees - 46 in Appendix A. So, I go to 46 and look at Appendix A, what is this? I don't -- are we approving traffic impact fees again or -- oh, there you are. Sorry. Maybe I should look. Okay.

So, for clarification we are talking about the Proposed Base Rates as you see on the table in front of us for the TIF districts, oh, yeah, I remember this now. Hazel Dell, Mt. Vista, Orchards, Rural and 179th with the surcharge on there too. I remember this now. Thank you. All right.

So, is there any questions on this? I think staff brought this to us in a work session. They did have it, it was before and after too somewhere, I remember.

HARROUN: Yeah. Do we have the before and after?

ORJIAKO: Yes.

JOHNSON: Do we have it? Do we have it now or no? Oh, sorry.

ALVAREZ: I'll pull it up.

JOHNSON: I'm on 101, man. We're almost there. I see the end. I see the end of the tunnel. Oh, thanks, Ron. Do you want to pass it down. It smells like candy. There we go. I guess not. There we go. Okay. It looks like we have something there, ladies and gentlemen, here. So, these are the ones before and the proposed now; correct?

ORJIAKO: Yes.

JOHNSON: Red being what it was. Okay. With that said, is there any discussion on 101? Sorry. 101 which is, I keep messing it up, so this is the Appendix A for Traffic Impact Fees. Any discussion?

FADNESS: So, I just wanted to ask I noticed that in the updated fees that they are adjusted for inflation, has that always been the case?

HUSTING: Do you want me to answer it? For the record my name is Harrison Husting, I'm a Transportation Planner. So, kind of right now within the code and in the proposed code changes that you approved earlier there's a process that's spelled out about annual adjustments to inflation, so these are really the base fees that we would set any inflation adjustments in the future off of.

So in that formula it asks for a base year and this is kind of that the base year which would really be I think we set it at 2025, so I think if I, I'm sharing, if I go up a little bit more there is a methodology that's kind of laid out right here, so 17 through 24, and really what we do is we measure that base year, we measure kind of the base year and the construction cost index and then any changes in that index we basically adjust the base rate of that index.

FADNESS: Yeah. My question was, and it looks like this is all in yellow, the formula didn't exist before, so before the rates were just set, what, ten years ago or so and then haven't been updated since, I'm just asking because the rates are now doubling now, right, and then we're adjusting for inflation so that's why if they haven't been adjusted and now you're catching up for not, that's my question.

JOHNSON: I think that's what we talked about before (inaudible).

HUSTING: Right. Like the rates, yeah, rates have been frozen since I think 2022 they haven't been adjusted.

JOHNSON: So, we knew this day was coming up.

HOLLEY: I'm sorry, what was your name one more time?

HUSTING: Sorry, Harrison Husting.

JOHNSON: Okay. Is there any more discussion on Number 101, Transportation Impact Fees - Appendix A? Hearing none, I would sure entertain a motion and second.

BERGTHOLD: This is Commissioner Bergthold. I will make a **motion** to approve Number 101, Transportation Impact Fees, as presented.

JOHNSON: Can I get a second.

FADNESS: Commissioner Fadness. **Second**.

JOHNSON: We have a motion and a second. Any discussion? Green lights on. Okay. No discussion. Jeff, last time, can we get –

ROLL CALL VOTE – ITEM NO. 101, MOTION TO APPROVE

HALBERT: AYE
BERGTHOLD: AYE
FADNESS: AYE
BARCA: AYE
HARROUN: AYE
MONTGOMERY: AYE
JOHNSON: AYE

DELAPENA: 7/0.

JOHNSON: Motion passes. Ladies and gentlemen we just went through since 2013, right. Is there anything else, Oliver?

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None.

NEW BUSINESS

ORJIAKO: Yes. This is Oliver. I want to thank the Planning Commission, this is a very tedious work, and I also want to extend sincere thanks to my staff and all the local jurisdictions we've been working with.

I will also add all the consultants that have been working with us, Elizabeth is here tonight, others, this is not their issue like environmental and those that worked on the ag study, they're done, so I want to sincerely thank everyone.

We will take your recommendation to Council on September 16 and you're welcome to attend that work session or you are welcome to attend their hearing. Their hearing, the Council hearing will start October 1st which is a Thursday at 4:00 p.m. and then they may continue that to the 2nd which is a Friday at 10:00 a.m. and then to the 5th if needed. Our goal is to complete the process at least by October 13th so that we can respond to the Growth Board and find a way to come into compliance.

If the plan is appealed, we'll start dealing with that, but I want to really commend all of you. I may have busted, you know, temp, you know, temperament or whatever earlier, but I it's my responsibility to defend my staff because I have worked with them for over 36 years and know what they can do and

I trust them, and if I leave this post, they're very resilience, they can handle any future work.

I would, Jack Harroun, I accept your apology, but publicly I do not want anyone to disparage my staff and I stand by that. Thank you all.

JOHNSON: Thank you, Jose, special thank you, every time I look over there to where I'm at to our new counsel, thank you. I love looking over -- okay, it is what it is. This is -- they're messy, we've been, you know, thank you guys, I know you're working hard, I know it's late, you got kids and family and it's tough and again thank you to everybody here.

Is there anything else from the Planning Commission that is of relevance?

COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION

JOHNSON: So, coming up I'm sure you'll have a schedule for us, Jeff, but don't worry about it now, but I'm just saying we'll have something, but it won't be this grueling, so... Thank you for staying late. And if there's no more questions or comments this meeting is adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

The record of tonight's hearing, as well as the supporting documents and presentations can be viewed on the Clark County Web Page at:
https://clark.wa.gov/community-planning/planning-commission-hearings-and-meeting-notes

Television proceedings can be viewed on CVTV on the following Web Page at:
https://www.cvtv.org/program/clark-county-planning-commission

Minutes Transcribed by:
Cindy Holley, Court Reporter – Holley Court Reporting
Jeffrey Delapena, Program Assistant – Clark County Community Planning