



## Clark County Planning Commission

Karl Johnson, Chair  
Bryan Halbert, Vice Chair  
Steve Morasch  
Eldon Wogen  
Jack Harroun  
Jeremy Baker  
Mark Bergthold

---

### CLARK COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION THURSDAY, MARCH 21, 2024 MINUTES OF PUBLIC HEARING

Public Service Center  
Council Hearing Room, 6<sup>th</sup> Floor  
1300 Franklin Street  
Vancouver, WA  
6:30 p.m.

#### **CALL TO ORDER**

#### **Planning Commission Rules of Procedure**

HALBERT: Good evening. I'll call this to order. Good evening, Planning Commissioners, members of the public and staff members. I would like to call this hybrid public hearing to order for Thursday, March 21st, 2024. Where is the feedback? My name is Bryan -- that's even worse. My name is Bryan Halbert and I'm acting Chair tonight 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 use related to 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 to consider our recommendations and make a final determination.

Planning Commission rules and procedures. The Chair -- the Planning Commissioner -- the Planning Commission will conduct a public hearing tonight and take testimony. If any public comments were received before tonight's hearing, they will have been sent to the PC members and entered into the public record.

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

When we go 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 by way of the sign-in sheet at the back of the room.

During 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 the public testimony, staff and the applicant may respond to comments and the public portion of the hearing will be closed. The Planning Commission will then deliberate and make a recommendation to County Council.

For both the 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 a second motion, please state your name for the court reporter.

Conflicts of interest. Do any members of the Planning Commissioners have any conflicts related to tonight's hearing items?

Seeing none, we'll move on for a roll call.

### **ROLL CALL VOTE**

HALBERT:       HERE  
BERGTHOLD:     HERE  
MORASCH:       ABSENT  
WOGEN:         HERE  
HARROUN:       HERE  
BAKER:         HERE  
JOHNSON:       ABSENT

Staff Present: Oliver Orjiako, Community Planning Director; Jose Alvarez, Program Manager II; Christine Cook, Deputy Prosecuting Attorney; Sonja Wisner, Program Assistant; Larisa Sidorov, Office Assistant; and Cindy Holley, Court Reporter (Virtual).

### **GENERAL & NEW BUSINESS**

#### **A. Approval of Agenda for March 21, 2024**

HALBERT: Okay. Next step. Approval of our agenda for tonight March 21st, 2024. Can I get a motion.

WOGEN: This is Eldon. I **move** that we approve the agenda for tonight.

BAKER: This is Jeremy Baker. I **second** that motion.

HALBERT: All right. We have a first and a second. And, Sonja, can we get a roll call, please.

**ROLL CALL VOTE**

HALBERT: AYE  
BERGTHOLD: AYE  
WOGEN: AYE  
HARROUN: AYE  
BAKER: AYE

WISER: 5/0.

**B. Approval of Minutes for February 15 & February 29, 2024**

HALBERT: Okay. The motion passes. And I'd like to get a **motion** for the approval of our minutes for February 15th, 2024.

BAKER: I move - this is Jeremy Baker - I **move** to approve the minutes for February 15th and February 29th, 2024.

BERGTHOLD: This is Mark Bergthold. I'll **second**.

WISER: There were two sets of minutes, so...

HALBERT: Is there?

WISER: They're on the next page.

HALBERT: So let's can we just amend that?

BAKER: Well, I moved -- I moved both.

HALBERT: We have a motion and a second to approve both minutes February 15th and February 29th. I couldn't turn my page fast enough, so... Sonja, would you take a roll call.

**ROLL CALL VOTE**

HALBERT: AYE  
BERGTHOLD: AYE  
WOGEN: AYE  
HARROUN: ABSTAIN  
BAKER: AYE

WISER: 4 with one abstention.

HALBERT: Yeah, so you guys need to be -- help me through this as I just got this paper about five minutes ago, if that. Okay. Communication from the public. Sonja, do you read the instructions at this time?

### **C. Communications from the Public**

WISER: Okay. Hold on. We need to make somebody a host.

SIDOROV: I'll do it.

WISER: Can you do it. Larisa, can you share the comment instructions on the screen. Thank you.

For attendees using their computer or Webex application, if you'd 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 is only for items not listed on tonight's agenda. Are there any raised hands on Webex, Larisa?

SIDOROV: I do not see any raised hands.

WISER: Is there anybody in the audience wishing to come forward? Okay. None? So, we'll return it to you, Karl (sic).

### **PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS**

#### **PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS, Continued from February 29, 2024**

**Population, Housing and Employment allocation for Clark County's 2025 Comprehensive Plan update:** The purpose of the hearing is for the Planning Commission to take public testimony and recommend to Council the population, housing and employment allocation for the 2025 Comprehensive Plan update.

**Staff Contact: Jose Alvarez, Program Manager, jose.alvarez@clark.wa.gov, 564-397-4898**

HALBERT: Okay. So, tonight we're here for a public hearing item, and if you're providing public testimony in person, please sign up on the sign-in sheet in the back of the room. And if you're joining remotely, instructions will be provided once again at the appropriate time by the staff.

So, let me, making sure I got this right here. Tonight's agenda item is a public hearing continued from February the 29th on the Population, Housing and Employment allocation for Clark County's 2025 Comp Plan update.

The purpose of this hearing is for the Planning Commission to take public testimony and recommended to Council the Population, Housing and Employment Allocation for the 2025 Comp Plan update. And so, I think at this time we turn it over to Oliver and Jose.

ORJIAKO: Good evening, Planning Commission members. For the record, Oliver Orjiako, Community Planning Director. Chair, you did accurately say that the hearing tonight is on Population, Housing and Employment Allocation for the Clark County 2025 Comprehensive Plan update, and this hearing was continued from February 29th to tonight.

What is before you is an allocation that for the past three or four months since December of last year we've been having meetings and coordination with our local jurisdictions on how to allocate the population and employment decisions that the Council have already made.

What is new this year is following the recent bill passed by the legislature and directing the Department of Commerce on how to not plan, not encourage, excuse me, but to plan for housing unit in very different income bands, that is what is new and that is before you as well.

So what we are really at the end of your hearing we will ask you to forward a recommendation to Council on the allocation before you and that will kick off the local jurisdictions as well as the county moving forward on development of different land use alternative that needs to be studied and the environmental impacts that met which is going to be the next step in the process.

So, with that I will turn it over to Jose Alvarez who will go over the staff report and both I and Jose as well as our legal counsel in case if there are legal questions are here to answer any questions that you may have. So with that, I'll turn it over to Jose Alvarez.

ALVAREZ: Good evening, Planning Commission members. Next slide, please. So, this is just an overview of the background where we are in the overall Comp Plan process and then get into more specifics regarding the allocation process and the next steps. Next slide, please.

So, this is a high-level overview of the components of the periodic update. Community Planning has divided these into four different elements of the project. Each phase has different tasks and activities that are planned to engage the community, members, and key stakeholders in identifying key issues, developing policy concepts and shaping the final recommended plan that's going to be considered by the County Council in 2025.

The first column there is the "Project initiation" and that circled item is where we are in the allocation process. Once that allocation is done, then we can have the cities know what they're planning for in terms of population, jobs and employment and they will go and "Shape the plan" for their specific jurisdictions.

We've sort of hired, we've hired an environmental consultant to do our, help with our EIS. I think just last week we had our property owner submittal deadline, and we received a lot of interests in that and

so we're sort of in that the first two phases of the plan at this point.

And then the "Review & Refine" will happen in the fall of 2024 as we move into winter of 2025 and then the "Adoption Process" will be in the spring/summer of 2025. The legislature did amend our timeline so that our deadline is now December 31st, 2025. Next slide, please.

So, the "Decisions to Date," in March of 2023, the Council adopted a "Public Participation Plan & Preliminary Scope of Work," and the Council in May of 2023 adopted the forecast for 20 years. They did a range from the Office of Financial Management and chose a population number. And then in August they chose a "2045 Employment Projection" number that we'll be planning for. Next slide, please.

So, in terms of "Possible Allocation Methodologies" we've considered the first two options. In the past Option 3 is the option we've used in the past and what is being proposed to continue to feed into the tool that developed by Commerce, Housing For All Planning Tool.

So, as you can see we've used this methodology since 1994, it's really based on the Vacant Buildable Lands Model and input and feedback from the local jurisdiction. Next slide, please.

Again, these are some of the "Considerations" that went into selecting that methodology. It's consistent with the other comprehensive plans. Like I said, we've already adopted the population forecast and the employment projections have been selected by Council.

The VBLM capacity is being used for the allocation of the growth targets, we think this allows for some flexibility in the planning process. We are using an updated urban/rural split of 95/5 is one change. And then again utilizing the population allocation as an input for the tool developed by Commerce, the Housing For All Planning Tool. Next slide, please.

So, the Vacant Buildable Lands Model is the VBLM, and we've updated that recently due to an update to the housing Bill HB 1220 that required us to look at capacity by zoning. The model previously was based on a more aggregated Comprehensive Plan designation, so there were multiple zones in each comp plan designation.

One of the things that it allowed us to do is to implement some of the changes that were considered when we were looking at in 20- -- from 2019 to 2021 we had a buildable lands review, buildable lands report that was due and as part of that process we engaged an advisory committee and hired a consultant to vet some of the assumptions that are in the Vacant Buildable Lands Model.

As some of the changes we couldn't put into effect because of the way the model was based on the Comprehensive Plan and not the zoning, so our GIS staff has really worked hard to update the model to be able to likely incorporate that logic to calculate the capacity based on zoning.

They have also updated the VBLM configuration to reflect allowed residential densities in the yield

assumptions and incorporate yield estimates from the local jurisdictions which vary, and then to document special cases and exceptions to the established logic in the model.

I wanted to touch on again some of the comments we've received related to the Vacant Buildable Lands Model. And as I mentioned, we had a process with the consultant and advisory committee that looked at some of these assumptions in the model.

The Council approved those underlying assumptions in the model in June of 2022. We submitted the report to Commerce in June of 2022 to be in compliance with the deadline that we had to submit that three years before the completion date of our Comprehensive Plan update which was at the time June of 2025.

And subsequent to the report being submitted there was additional legislation that was passed that required some of the jurisdictions, three jurisdictions specifically in Clark County, Vancouver, Camas and Washougal to allow for an increase in densities within their single-family zones on a lot basis.

For the smaller jurisdictions at least two dwelling units per lot. In the case of Vancouver is four and they could go up to four and/or six, while in Vancouver's case up to six if it's near transit line or for affordable housing.

So those were specifically for Vancouver, some of the changes that were in the model reflect that legislation where they were looking forward and adopting those higher density yields. Next slide, please.

So these are the estimates created by our county demographer using the 2023 OFM county total. It provides a population estimate, well, OFM only provides population estimates by jurisdiction and county total.

The difference of the unincorporated county estimates, which includes the rural area and all of the unincorporated, all of the population in the unincorporated urban growth areas, so the urban growth areas consist of city limits and a portion that's unincorporated urban growth area. So these are the projected totals out to 2045 assuming five percent growth for the rural area and then what the county total would be. Next slide, please.

These are the population estimates and allocation by urban growth area. Again, it's using the sort of OFM base population and then using the 2023 to 2045 VBLM population allocation and that gets us to that 2045 total. Again, this is for the urban growth area, so it doesn't include the rural area in there. Next slide, please.

So, this is background information on the factors used by the Department of Commerce to estimate housing need that results in the Housing For All Planning Tool that they have created, a housing needs projection for each county planning under the GMA within the state and that the county is required to use.

So, again, these are developed at a countywide level. Some of the assumptions that go in, into it, the six percent vacancy rate, a different household size projection looking at 2045, so they really created an estimate for our housing needs at that 2045 period and then subtract out what our existing capacity is, and that will be shown on the next slide, but also the "Housing Units by Income Band" that are shown here and the range that we're required to plan for under new legislation. The next slide, please.

So, this is the tool provided by the State. If you look at the three different steps on the left-hand side where you can choose your "County," like I said, this applies to all jurisdictions like a planning under the Growth Management Act, the "Population Year" and the "Population Target in the Range" is the population that was adopted by Council last year, the 718,154.

The next column over under Table 1 it provides the range that OFM provided for Clark County, and then how that filters into the "Projected Countywide Housing Needs" is those that population target of 718,000 is used and it yields a "Total Future Housing Needed" of 309,711 units.

Again, this is -- and then it's based on a 2020 so it uses the 2020 supply which is showing at 194,000 countywide and a total housing need from 2020 to 2045 of 115,000.

In conversations with our local partners and jurisdictions we had available to us new, the data from 2020 to 2022 that showed the number of new units that were added during that time period, so in the next slide what you'll see is that we've added about 12,000 units in that time period, so what we're planning for is 115,000 minus those 12,000 units which is roughly the 103,000 that shows up in the slides going forward.

We didn't have an estimate of how those 12,000 units fit into those income ranges, so those were all deducted from the last column, the 120 percent which is essentially the most market rate housing. So, the assumption is that all of the housing in the last three years was market rate housing.

The other caveat in here is that the State is really looking at those income brackets, they're not -- they've included the 120 plus percent so that the numbers add up, but that's not something that they're going to be evaluating jurisdictions whether they're achieving that market rate housing, they had the assumption is that they'll be able to meet that target. The next slide, please. Okay.

So, this chart is just like the previous except it's been updated again to reflect that the 2023 OFM estimate of housing supply. And so again, like I mentioned, we increased the "Estimated Housing Supply" so that number went up to 206,000 and so the "Net New Housing Needed" is 103,000 which is that bottom row.

The other item on this chart is that we've also included the "Area Median Income" from HUD which is as of May of 2023 and those are the numbers there. The 33,850 or less than 30 percent; from 30 to 50 percent it's 56.4 thousand; and then 50 to 80 percent, the area median income is a little over 90,000; and then at 80 to 100, 114,000; and greater than 100,000 -- greater than 100,000 -- greater than 100



percent of area median income is 136,800. Next slide, please.

So, this chart is also an expansion of the previous and breaks down the housing needed by urban growth area. In order for the fields to populate in this tab of the Housing For All Planning Tools, we used a percentage of the VBLM capacity for each UGA, so that's how these numbers are derived.

So, we took the estimated capacity of each urban growth area and so the essentially the percentage is -- the percentage of the total is what's applied to each UGA to get an estimate of these numbers. And it also includes in that very first row the Vancouver Unincorporated and Rural Clark County.

The rural area is not included in our Vacant Buildable Lands Model but we do have a separate capacity estimate that estimates that total capacity and that was added to the unincorporated area so to distinguish that portion because this tool it applies countywide and so we had to include it all there.

Again, this is Method A. There's two methods that Commerce has provided jurisdictions to account, to allocate housing, and essentially this methodology sort of evenly spreads across all of their jurisdictions.

They get the same percentage of growth at each income band, but it's a little off because of the deduction from the -- going from the 2000 to 2000 -- the 2020 to 2023, but the idea is to spread it out evenly across all of the jurisdictions, we were starting from scratch. Next slide, please.

So this is the same chart as the previous but it collapses the columns to better illustrate the total amount of housing needed at the less than 80 percent median income, the 80 to 120 and the greater than 120. You can see that the total countywide 54 percent of the housing supply needed for the next 23 years is less than 80 percent of that area median income; the 80 to 120 is about 20,000 units; and then greater than 120 is 27,000. And, again, the percentages in those columns aren't equal because of the growth in the last three years and how we had adjusted those. Next slide, please. Okay.

So this is, this chart is Commerce's, reflects Commerce Method B where the distribution of the housing need is done such that in 2045 there's more equity among jurisdictions in providing housing at the lower income levels.

And in this chart the negative numbers in red indicate a surplus of housing in that income band based on the current number of units within that income band. So based on the numbers here, Vancouver has a surplus of housing units in that 50 to 80 percent area median income; and Camas has a surplus in the greater than the 100 and greater than 120 percent categories. Next slide, please.

And, again, this is the same chart as previous but aggregated to show the combined income brackets and what the totals will be. So you can see regardless of the methodology the total numbers have to add up and the percentages are roughly the same overall, it's just the distribution between jurisdictions and how they're going to be allocated, some allocated.

And, again, these are only the two methods provided by Commerce and the County's not bound to either, but can choose to do something in between, but we do have to show that we are providing for those housing units in those different income bands. Next slide, please.

So, this table shows the number of net new jobs based on again the allocation method we discussed at the beginning just the VBLM. The Council chose the plan for a total of 269,000 total jobs by 2045.

The Employment Security Department provided estimates of net new jobs based on two baseline years, one was 2022 and one was 2045. So the 2022 number shows a need of 88,100 units and that's what's reflected here. We use this because it was more aligned with what the Vacant Buildable Lands Model is based on the 2022 Assessor's data as for 2023.

The 2025 numbers would have been 73,500 is the estimate from the Employment Security Department, so there's a 15,000 job difference in those three years, but we decided to use that again, the 2022 number, because it better aligns with the Vacant Buildable Lands Model year. So according to the Vacant Buildable Lands Model the county has a capacity for 65,091 jobs.

Historically when we've done this employment allocation we've excluded government employment from that allocation because our Vacant Buildable Lands Model excludes publicly owned land, so this building, any publicly owned school it's not included in the model whether it's vacant or not, so our assumption is that most of those public sector jobs will occur either within existing facilities and therefore won't require any additional lands.

And the other thing we looked at was the rural and we got data that shows that roughly 5 percent of the employment existing is in rural area, and so since we're doing a 95/5 split for rural it just made sense to also have the 5 percent employment go to that, the rural area, so that wouldn't -- also would reduce the amount of land, it wouldn't account for any land within the urban growth boundaries for those jobs with that 5 percent total.

The other two categories that we addressed here were the "Work From Home". The current countywide estimate is somewhere between 20 and 21 percent for work from, for folks that are working from home. We got some estimates, there's a memo from our labor economist at the Employment Security Department, we in his initial memo it showed that maybe about four percent growth in that, in his estimate for work from home, but we used a, we're showing that four percent we think it's a very conservative estimate and it's based on the conclusion in that memo that work from home is a relatively new phenomenon with too little data to base any conclusions on and that changes in remote work will be minimal going forward.

We did follow up with our labor economist just to there were some discrepancy about whether the four percent, what he meant by the four percent figure, and so what he suggested was following up with our local employers to determine how they're adjusting to the new reality whether they're keeping excess space to expand into in the future or whether there's going to be a shift to smaller quarters and we haven't engaged in that process yet, but that would be the recommendation we got

from our labor economist when we followed up on that.

The last item is the "Construction", the 6500 number is based on essentially the projected growth in that 23-year time period that we received from the State, the Employment Security Department. The assumption was that the majority of this employment growth would not require any additional lands.

When we followed up with Scott on this assumption, he suggested we identify what the existing ratio of construction employment to land is and carry that forward, we're working on seeing if we can get that data. Next slide, please.

So in terms of the "Next Steps" after the Council completes the allocation process this will go to the cities so that they can plan for their population, employment and housing and actually develop plans that show how they're going to accommodate that growth over the next 20-year period.

As those land use scenarios are developed, they'll be included in our environmental assessment that we'll be scoping once the allocation is done, that's going to be the next step is the EIS scoping and having the "SEPA Threshold Determination" there will be a no action alternative.

Typically, a cities alternative of how they're going to accommodate that strategy and then an additional scenario where the County is looking at how they're going to allocate their urban and unincorporated area as well as some of the suggestions from the cities. With that, do you have any questions?

HALBERT: Thanks, Jose, that's a lot of info. So, I think that, you know, the Commissioners will have some questions and I'll, how about I just go down my list here and see where you guys are at and I'll start with you, Jeremy. Do you have any questions?

### **Questions from the Planning Commission**

BAKER: Yeah, I got a lot.

HALBERT: You can work them over and then we'll take over from there.

BAKER: Okay. This is Commissioner Baker. Thank you, Jose, and, Oliver, for, and, Chris, for being here and presenting this information to us. And I also appreciate the time allotted for me to get up to speed on this with that continuation three weeks ago. By no means do I have it all figured out nor do I think it should be expected, but there are some questions that I have had, so...

So right now, we haven't -- we're not talking about growing the urban growth area or anything like that, we're just talking about the housing allocation in the current growth area; correct?

ALVAREZ: It's the allocation for population, housing and employment whether additional land is needed, the cities will once they get the allocation make that determination, that proposal, and the

Vacant Buildable Lands Model there is the guiding.

BAKER: Okay. Thank you. And the next question I have, so I was going over Issue Paper 5 that was published for this hearing and so I just had some questions on the variances between the VBLM data, the numbers in that, in that portion of the packet, with the numbers presented, that you presented this evening.

So specifically like for "Projected Housing Units by UGA and Income Band Method A, Table 4a." each incorporated and unincorporated area has a certain number allotted to it and so when I go back and I look at your VBLM capacities, they don't match. Like every -- every -- every incorporated area that says that has housing units available in the capacity it seems to be lower. Am I reading the tables wrong or is it --

ALVAREZ: Which table?

BAKER: So, for example, I go, we go to, let me get to the page, so if I look at Camas incorporated area residential housing units available 3,225, that's in totality I believe, yes, and then when I go to Table A or Table 4a. the total 2023 to 2045 allotted, what we are allocating for the City of Camas is 4,226, and so that's a discrepancy of like around 1,000 housing units and I'm just wondering where that, how that discrepancy is getting, like, why am I reading it that way?

And so, I mean that's, that was, I went down the, I went through the list in those tables, and I might be reading it wrong, I don't know, but for Battle Ground it seemed to indicate that there was available units of 5,327, we are allocating 6,979. I had already mentioned Camas. La Center there was, each one of these allocations versus the VBLM was lower and so I may be -- I may be looking at the data wrong, but I would just like some clarification on that.

ALVAREZ: So, you're looking at Issue Paper --

BAKER: Number 5 dated, Issue Paper Number 5, Population, Housing and Employment Allocation 2025 Comprehensive Plan periodic Update, March 21st through 2024 which also included in that packet was the VBLM 2023 dated 2/16/2024 at 11:57 a.m. and so from that data, so I'm just kind of, I just kind of was comparing the two pieces of information that was provided to me and so I was just looking for some clarification because each one of these incorporated and unincorporated areas there was a discrepancy.

The only one that was not, did not have a discrepancy we actually, you -- and for the Vancouver unincorporated and rural county we are allocating in this presentation 44,038 and comparing that numbers with the VBLM 2023 we have an allocation of 46,391, and so we in that instance there is more than is allocated for, but every other instance it's less.

ALVAREZ: I'm sorry. The VBLM number that you're looking at, what was the --

BAKER: So, when I go just look at the, so on the VBLM "Capacity and Yield by Zoning: Incorporated" areas you have the Gross, Constrained, Market, Infrastructure Buildable and then it has Housing Units and then it has Jobs and so they have these rows on this. Do you want me to show you?

ALVAREZ: Yeah. What's the --

BAKER: So, page, like so Page 12 of 24 for Vancouver incorporated says 31,726 but that does not --

ALVAREZ: Let me see if I can -- so it's the VBLM output --

BAKER: Yeah.

ALVAREZ: -- that you're looking at and comparing it to this. Okay. It should be the same, but I'll --

BAKER: So could you put, look into that and clarify it for me because it just didn't add up to me and I was wondering if I was reading that wrong.

ALVAREZ: Yeah. Okay. And so in that, is it the VBLM 2023 Capacity and Yield By Jurisdiction?

BAKER: By zoning and then it has each jurisdiction highlighted out, like, I'm not necessarily looking at the front page, Page 1 of 24, I was looking at every, each page after that where it listed out Page 4 lists Battle Ground's housing units at 5,327; Page 6 lists Camas's at 3,225; Page 7 lists La Center's at 1,964.

ALVAREZ: Yeah. So those, there are two different groupings, that first one that says like you're saying it's 1,000 off, it's that's the capacity within the city limits, and then there's another table that should have the Battle Ground unincorporated and together they total what's on the front page.

BAKER: But those unincorporated areas are included in the unincorporated UGA which so those were that came up to the 46,391 that I assumed was in the Clark County because La Center, Ridgefield unincorporated areas, all those unincorporated areas that you're speaking of, they have -- they're on the back of this, this table, this report starting at Page 19 which goes through the jobs, mostly the jobs on Page 19, but then from 20 through 24 it's listing out Battle Ground, Camas and, you know, it allows for vacant underutilized properties and lists them out in that way.

And so, all those unincorporated areas it seems like they're being accounted for in that 46,000 that I attributed to the UGA for Clark County. Vancouver unincorporated and rural Clark County lists 46,391 per the VBLM on Page 24. And I might be reading this wrong, I just need help with --

ALVAREZ: Oh, I see. All right. So, there are, so again it's, they're broken out into the two. So on the second page where it says Battle Ground, the VBLM 2023 Capacity and Yield By Zoning: City, UGA, so their 6978 is the total, the unincorporated cities, the 5327, and then the unincorporated UGA is the 1651, okay, and so they're broken out into two different sections of the report and that bottom is just all of the unincorporated area and there shouldn't be, and I think that's where that 43,000, so it's the

unincorporated Vancouver UGA and then in the unincorporated portion of all of the other UGAs summed together.

And it's not really that total, it's summed there as a total but not used anywhere else because those are really like the Camas UGA is within the city limits and that unincorporated portion of the Camas UGA.

BAKER: Okay. Thank you. Thank you for that explanation, Jose, I appreciate that. So, I think so we assume six percent vacancy rate, do we know what historical vacancy rate is?

ALVAREZ: Yeah. I think it varies over time and I think it's, that's an assumption that the State's built into the model.

BAKER: But do we have any data on Clark County, like, last 5 years, 10 years, 20 years, it just it varies?

ALVAREZ: I mean right now it's a very tight market, that's probably much lower than six percent.

BAKER: Okay. And so, you had made a comment in your presentation that higher densities for Vancouver in the incorporated area were authorized, is that also authorized in the unincorporated UGA, like the urban boundary that the County is in charge of?

ALVAREZ: So, we had just gone through a process to update our code, zoning code, within the unincorporated area to allow for duplexes, triplexes and four-plexes in all of those urban low density zones and we included an assumption based on that in the VBLM to account for that, that change.

BAKER: And would it, is it similar to what Vancouver is doing like with the requirements this has to be on transit lines and/or affordable housing?

ALVAREZ: It's a little different. The code that we have adopted we I think made an assumption for the R1-5 through R1-7 because we were allowing for townhouses on each lot and so the density of that is kind of what we sort of used which is somewhere in the middle of the range which is about 21.8 dwelling units per acre.

BAKER: And then you had made a comment that all the government jobs will come on public, already public owned land, and I was just, I wanted clarification on that. Is that something that's just like set in stone or is it because I think of like the training facilities, maybe we need a new jail, something like that and we don't necessarily own the property. I mean, there might be an opportunity where we need in the next 20 years the government might need land.

ALVAREZ: Right. And I think like I said historically that's the assumption that we've used and part of that is that that the transactions go both ways where publicly owned land is sold, school districts sell land all the time and so that was the assumption.

BAKER: Over historically it's fairly close to net zero?

ALVAREZ: Yeah.

BAKER: And then you answered, well, you addressed my next question which was the construction jobs and you said that you were going to survey on what currently is the current --

ALVAREZ: Yes. Correct.

BAKER -- the land need for the construction jobs and then extrapolate that to --

ALVAREZ: Right.

BAKER: And then my last question, and I thank you for explaining this to me, so the remote work portion of this employment allocation, we're basing that as on a base of 20 percent work from home and then we're just growing from 4 percent, is that how you said it?

ALVAREZ: The current data shows that it's about between 20, 21 percent, and like I said we took a very conservative approach to only use 4 percent and that is based on essentially the input from the labor economist and uncertainty of what's going to happen in the future and his recommendation to talk to employers to see where they are with that and sort of to firm up that assumption or not.

BAKER: So, right now basically we're kind of assuming that we've kind of got a threshold of remote work and so from here on out we're going to conservatively assume 4 percent and then we'll address it if needed later? I mean, the worst-case scenario is you would have too much employment land --

ALVAREZ: Capacity, yeah.

BAKER: -- capacity than there is. Okay. Yep. Thank you, Jose. That's all.

HALBERT: Thanks, Jeremy. How about Jack.

HARROUN: Thank you. This is Commissioner Harroun. So just, I'm just going to jump out and clarify on the government not needing land. I'm wondering if we're using history as an example, and we go back a ways, we didn't buy all of our land for Clark County at once, we started out with a little county courthouse and then over the decades acquired more land and then grew and acquired more land and grew and acquired more land and grew.

So I'm troubled with just saying historically this is how we do it when historically we've always increased our land capacity as our county has grown because we've had facilities and jails and buildings and -- and -- and then you had mentioned that schools, so I guess that's kind of my, you know, my the juxta of my concern there that we're not allowing for that.

When we look at schools you had mentioned that schools sell land all the time, I'm not really aware of a lot of school districts selling land, I'm aware of school districts acquiring lands, I know they did just at like 179th I believe that was Ridgefield and there was another parcel there that is now basically permanently taken out of any kind of jobs inventory calculation.

So how is that being accounted for and how are we looking -- looking at that versus -- it seems to make a pretty aggressive assumption so, I guess that's my concern there.

ORJIAKO: This is Oliver. I think you look at, you're making a good observation, but you look at it in terms of the model does not include publicly owned land where most of these government jobs are going to occur.

It's true that schools acquire property that they have not yet developed, and true we do identify those lands but do not assign, it's not included in the Vacant Buildable Lands estimate because we assume that those publicly owned land will eventually that's where the government jobs will go.

Remember that there are some schools that are in the rural area predominantly and that's why again we are allocating some jobs in the rural area because some of that will occur naturally speaking.

Yes, governments do acquire land, but if you look back in the last 10, 20 years not a whole lot have been acquired, let's say Clark County and other jurisdictions where they build their city hall, some of them is where they still are, some have relocated but predominantly they're always adding jobs on existing facilities or existing land that they own or what you might see is government moving from one building to the other, they're not really expanding what they are doing what I may call a musical, moving from one building to the next, it's not really expansion, it's more of they are relocating.

You may still relocate having the same number of jobs, and that's the same number of employees, just moving them from one building to the next without actually adding capacity. So, depending on how you look at it, we have looked at it in terms of the fact that it's not likely that future government jobs will require additional land that we have to plan for.

If you look at some government jobs, you can look at those that if you work in the rural area, but their office may be downtown, for example, DNR those that work in the forestry and so many other sectors, that doesn't really necessarily need lands to be allocated in terms of how we do this work, but that will be my response.

HARROUN: Okay. Thank you. Could you just clarify to me, like, just on the chart, the 95/5 percent rural urban split, is that just looking at 95 percent of everything that we're looking at is just in the urban environment and then 5 percent is rural, is that kind of how that, am I reading that right, that was my assumption?

ALVAREZ: So, the increment of growth for the next 20 years we assume 95 percent of it would happen in the urban area and 5 percent in the rural.



HARROUN: Okay. And then the -- amongst the stack of public testimony that I've been reading through, one of the ones that I was, kind of found an interest which was from the Northwest Partners and basically they have a whole series of questions, I'm sure you've seen it, I think you were copied in on it, but largely the point that seemed to be brought up again and again is basically where are the numbers coming from, like show me the data, where is all this data drawn and you've made reference to some things, but I haven't seen the math behind this and then what is the -- is that available to the public to look at because when I'm reading testimony saying, hey, we're not, we don't know where you guys are coming up with your numbers, we're having our own studies and they're not showing us the same numbers and we don't know where the County's getting their information. So, is that available, like, is that the, I guess the math formulas that you're using, is that readily available?

ALVAREZ: Could you be more specific.

HARROUN: Sure. So, I'll just pull out a comment. So "The issues of a) overestimation of employment in mixed-use zones and eliminating land for construction employment are just two examples of many variables that had been modeled in various ways by different groups, and that have not yet been ground-truthed by testing the modeling against what in real life is available."

HOLLEY: Slow down. Slow down, please. Slow down. Don't forget there's a court reporter on this end trying to keep up with you.

HARROUN: My apologies. So, a lot of their comments are based on, so "This study is based on wetland and critical area conversion for actual development projects rather than simple modeling."

So, I guess as I was reading through all of the comments, and I'm not trying to read the whole thing, it just seemed like they are looking for the data available and I'm just wondering where that information can be found. And this is specifically it's from Schwabe from Stephen Horenstein and on March 20th, 2024, so... Yeah. So those are just kind of my, yeah, was just kind of where -- where is the -- where is the repository of information that we're collecting from, I guess.

ALVAREZ: So, the development on critical lands is something that we've looked at again back when we were doing the buildable lands report where we looked at growth from 2016 through 2020.

In particular, we hired a consultant to look at development over time on critical lands, we've had our GIS staff monitor development plats over 20-year period and consistently show that we overestimate our critical land and so we, that's why we've changed the assumptions over time in the model to reflect that the land that's identified as critical is something that shows potential critical lands.

So, there's a lot of hydric soils, when folks go out and do delineation they may or may not find that there's critical land there. When we are looking at plats that have been developed, we are still seeing what our critical lands layer is showing as critical but there's housing and roads all through it.

And so, that's how we're doing our calculation and it's in the buildable lands report from 2022 if that's the area that's of interest, that's mostly focused on residential.

I know there's been some interest in the same issue with industrial and commercial land and we, you know, updated the model, we shared it with the jurisdictions, the jurisdictions haven't told us that that land's not buildable, they haven't changed the zoning from industrial to something else that could be used and so sort of short of that that's where we are with that.

If we have information and there's a delineation, we've made adjustments in the past to, you know, remove areas that have been used for some other purpose that's, you know, it's going to be a wetland mitigation bank and if that's the case we'll exclude it from the inventory, we've done that.

HARROUN: Okay. Thank you.

HALBERT: Are you all good, Jack?

HARROUN: Yeah, I'll be fine.

HALBERT: Are you sure? We got time.

HARROUN: No, I'm good. Thank you.

HALBERT: Thanks, Jack. Okay. Eldon.

WOGEN: Jose, on the Employment Capacity and Allocation when I look at the jurisdictions, what they're allocated for the next 20 years versus what VBLM capacity is, they're all full up, basically all jurisdictions according to this model they've used up all of their vacant buildable land.

ALVAREZ: I'd say that they have the capacity to accommodate that.

WOGEN: Right. But the allocation is right at their capacity.

ALVAREZ: Correct.

WOGEN: Right. And so just with that it gives us about what, 65,000 new jobs created from the allocation, but that doesn't meet the Council's goal of 73,500, so in order to meet that you have to consider government, construction, rural work from home to come up with 88,100.

ALVAREZ: Correct. So, I think what we were showing here is that the difference between the 88 and the 65 is that there's not, not that that the number of jobs aren't going to be, it's not reflected here in the allocation to those jurisdictions, it's essentially showing that land isn't needed for those jobs.

WOGEN: Land is not needed for them, right.

ALVAREZ: Correct. But it doesn't reflect, so those 23,000 jobs should be distributed amongst those jurisdictions and then they would show that difference.

WOGEN: Basically, this whole thing is showing that there's no land, no new land needed to meet these requirements.

ALVAREZ: Correct.

WOGEN: It seems, I don't know, I have a hard time believing that. It seems like there should be some more planning ahead that there might be some more land needed to accommodate the growth that some of these jurisdictions would probably like to have.

ALVAREZ: Correct. And so, once the allocation does and the jurisdictions, and we've had preliminary conversations with them, some of them have identified that they would like to do some expansion for employment, so they'll take this allocation and go and look at their land and make that determination to see whether --

WOGEN: They have them there. They may come out and say that they need more land.

ALVAREZ: Okay. This land is critical, we can't do anything with it. And so, yes, that will be input feedback that goes back into it and will justify a potential expansion.

WOGEN: Okay. And then you mentioned about going back to the housing allocation Method A and Method B, these are from a Commerce tool; right?

ALVAREZ: Correct.

WOGEN: And Method A was when you say it was equally distributed amongst the jurisdictions?

ALVAREZ: Yes, percentages.

WOGEN: And then Method B was more equitable? Is that -- I don't even know what that means.

ALVAREZ: Oh, so at the end year in 2045 those jurisdictions that haven't been providing land or capacity to low income, they're trying to get more equitable at the end of that 20-year period. So essentially, you're rewarding folks who, the jurisdictions who have provided some with not having to provide as much in some of those and the others who haven't have to --

WOGEN: Like Vancouver in some instances.

ALVAREZ: Right. Correct.

WOGEN: But you don't have to use either one of those Method A or Method B?

ALVAREZ: No.

WOGEN: As long as you can show that you're establishing housing by the income throughout the jurisdiction right now.

ALVAREZ: Right. So countywide we have to allocate those numbers whether it's Vancouver doing 9,000 and Camas 1,000 or vice-a-versa, it doesn't matter as long as we --

WOGEN: I mean, what you've done with Method A and Method B is here's the goalpost.

ALVAREZ: Right.

WOGEN: Somewhere we're going to narrow it down and I'm assuming that's going to come from discussions with the jurisdictions and fine-tune to how it actually turns out.

ALVAREZ: Yes, I think that's the goal to --

WOGEN: That's the goal.

ALVAREZ: -- no pun intended. Yeah. I think we've had the conversations, and the jurisdictions have to have the conversation that those jurisdictional conversations have to happen.

WOGEN: And you've seen all the comments --

ALVAREZ: Yeah.

WOGEN: -- nobody really likes Method B, there's a lot of A method. So, I'm just wondering how this, what the process is going to be to figure out where that weak spot is.

ALVAREZ: And that's -- and we've talked about so essentially the horse-trading and so who has capacity, who's a buyer and who's a seller, how do you guys want to allocate that, and it's not the County doesn't want to be in a position dictating that, we want those jurisdictions to come together and resolve that.

WOGEN: Okay. And that would have to happen fairly soon then.

ALVAREZ: Yes.

WOGEN: All right. I'm done.

HALBERT: Thanks, Eldon. All right. Mark, on to you.

BERGTHOLD: Okay. I feel like a clean-up batter with all the questions, they were really great, a lot of

detail. So, I'm going to take a step up and I too appreciate the time that the two of you, Jose and Oliver gave me this last week to go over and to respond to my pretty pointed questions.

Having been in public service my entire life and being an administrator in public schools and fire department and a lot of surveys and projections the number one thing that always killed or affected negatively the projection was accuracy of data and assumptions. So I recognize the factors that staff is dealing with because a lot of the data that you'd really like to have is not captured by anybody anywhere.

I put that burden on the State because the State it's a great thing to push, you know, for more affordable housing and to take care of the lesser, that's admirable, that's a great goal, but when you mandate and, you know, it really requires a whole redo, a remake, reevaluation of where all your data is coming from.

And I know from my experience that just to take one dataset whether it's the working from home or rural or whatever, it requires a major effort, you encounter privacy laws and all sorts of stuff in trying to get accurate data and then you have people or public comments that are basing business decisions on that and they're trying to, you know, make their goals and their future plans and in the middle you guys you're up there, you're the target, I mean and it really should be the State.

I mean, I think the staff did really I appreciate you revising things, taking a look at it, taking the comments to heart, I think you did a very good job, but like you've mentioned we're not at that point where we can say with a high degree of certainty these are good.

It does require to get more input from cities and work and there's so much collaboration that needs to be done with the governmental stakeholders basically, jurisdictions that I wish there was an easier way.

But I, I really I'm, I think the State needs to be aware that there are issues, you can't get this data out of assumptions, and every time you make an assumption that's on a brand-new data, it's totally up for being torn apart and that's just what it is, an assumption.

So, I think there's a lot of work that needs to be done. I think you've done the best from what I can see and what I've heard with what you have and I think there needs to be some action at the State to either extend deadline or modify what they're expecting this time or what they're going to hold us to as a county, there's a lot of issues. Anyway, so I really honestly don't have any questions for you out of that, so thank you.

HALBERT: Thanks, Mark. I just have two easy questions hopefully. One is on the population projection on Page 4 we have 718,154 population projection but on Page 11 we're only at 639, I wondered what the, where I missed that difference in the population projection there?

ALVAREZ: Oh, that's -- that doesn't include the rural, that's total rural.

HALBERT: Okay. Yep. It keeps throwing us here doesn't it. Okay. And then one other question, you know, what are we specifically recommending to County Council, is it Issue Paper Number 5 and are we going to discuss more about the methodologies and the employment allocations and VBLM in this position Number 5?

ORJIAKO: This is Oliver again. I think you're going to hear testimony from some who are online and some who are here. As I stated it what is different this time is that the State have estimated that statewide, the State need to produce 1.1 million new housing units and they have really said that is up to the counties and the local jurisdiction to figure that out and that that is going to be based on the two methodologies that they have provided us as a guide and that is what is before you.

As I stated earlier we've been having discussions with our city partners since December, you have two letters here before you, the County have chosen someone as where do we get the data, the County have, Council have chosen the population to plan for, they've chosen the employment number to plan for, the State like in the case of OFM doesn't provide us employment number, we generate that locally, but it matches very close to the population number that the Council chooses.

So, what is new is calling the County Chair of that housing unit that we have to plan for in the next 20 years. So, what is before you is how we have used the tool to allocate that housing unit. Using the decisions that have already been made that; i.e., the population as an input, we've also relied historically on first what is our current capacity, if you will, we've made that determination and then we said here's how we are going to allocate that whether it's Method A or Method B.

So based on the testimony tonight you may decide to make a recommendation that the Council consider the allocation as showing Method A for example, that is what is before you tonight.

HALBERT: Thanks, Oliver. That's helpful. And so, at some point we'll be recommending and/or amending Issue Paper 5?

ORJIAKO: No. Issue Paper 5 was completed as a supporting document basically and a background information. If you look at the first page of the staff report it references Issue Paper 1 as an exhibit. So taking it as a package but it is all just for considering the two methods before you, Method A and Method B in terms of the housing.

Before, when I say before what I mean by that is in the past what we used to do is just after the Council makes a decision on population and employment, we allocate that to the cities and we are done, they go and start planning on how to accommodate that growth.

What is new this time is the housing by allocating that through the, by the income bands that each jurisdiction will then have to consider how to plan for that going forward, we are not dictating that for them, this is just if we use, take it if you use this formula here's where you'll land, you decide.

HALBERT: Okay. Great. Thanks. I know we're going to hear more about this and if it's okay --

BAKER: I have one more question.

HALBERT: Yeah, Jeremy, go for it.

BAKER: Thank you. This is Commissioner Baker. I had one more question on the employment allocation and capacity therein, but going over the VBLM report, most of the allocations for the employment, the new jobs is in underutilized areas, like the underutilized land is and I know you had mentioned to me about the percentages of underutilized land versus how much is actually going to get used, could you refresh my memory on how that calculation gets in because you're assuming a certain amount of underutilized land will become available for new jobs, but it not necessarily the whole amount of underutilized land; correct? Sorry.

ALVAREZ: So, in our residential we have distinction. We have a never to convert factor for vacant and underutilized 10 and 30 percent. For employment we don't. We have previously used market factor where we've added land to the total sort of at the end of the process we're estimating how much land we need and we increase that by a certain percentage, but the model currently doesn't have that built in the way it does for the residential.

BAKER: So, we're assuming that all underutilized land is available for employment, is that what you're saying?

ALVAREZ: Right. I don't think there's a --

BAKER: That's what you're saying?

ALVAREZ: Yeah.

BAKER: Okay. Because the reason I ask that question because I was going over the VBLM and looking at how the jobs were allocated and it seemed that there was only a small percentage around 12 percent of the jobs were going to come from the Vancouver UGA, from the -- if like if the Vancouver UGA was going to get 15,168 jobs in the next 20 years, 18- -- 1,834 of those said jobs were from vacant land, that's what we assumed the vacant land that was in the UGA was going to produce 1,834 jobs which is about 12 percent, so the other 88 percent is coming from underutilized land from people that may or may not want to utilize it; correct?

ALVAREZ: Correct.

BAKER: Okay. Thank you.

HARROUN: One more question.

HALBERT: Jack, did you have a question?

HARROUN: Just a follow-up question. On when we were, and I'm just trying to get a full grasp of kind of what we've been covering here, but we're being asked to look at for, you're being asked to plan for the cost range of housing and so this is specifically housing types.

I know in our workshop we had asked you to reach out to Council or to get some policy direction of what percentage of ownership that we wanted for, that we wanted to plan for because each housing type takes a certain type of landmass, right.

So, if we're doing single-family housing, it takes X amount of square feet; if we're doing high density housing, we get more units per acre. How is that, like is there any policy direction for us on -- I'm looking at or I guess guidance that we're saying, well, we want the next 20 years to have 80 percent of rentals built so we can meet our housing demand or do we want, and we want to shape our community that they're mostly low income rentals or apartments or is there some policy direction on, no, we want, we still want the American dream, we want, you know, families want backyards, families want a homeownership and is there a percentage that we're trying to hit there.

Are we're looking at trying to get 50 percent of our community to be homeowners? Where does the County stand on that and what's the direction for us on that or do we just like just trying to put as many beans in the jar and say here's the jar with the available land and we don't care that they're all going to be in apartments? Does that make sense?

I'm looking for some policy direction. I'm like what is the County's planning because you're the planning staff, so what are we looking at for housing because that housing types relate to landmass and that landmass seems to be pretty critical here when we're saying we don't need anymore landmass into the urban growth boundary.

ALVAREZ: So, the direction that we've gotten from the State in that Housing For All Planning Tool breaks down those different categories by area median income, correct, and so the percentages of that below 80 percent makes up more than half of what we need to plan for. The other categories make up about 45 percent.

I think the State's been very clear in their direction to local jurisdictions about how they have to accommodate that. Once the allocation's done, these jurisdictions will take that allocation to determine how they want to grow within their jurisdiction.

HARROUN: I understand that the State is directing us, you know, to hit these targets, though my understanding is there's no enforcement mechanism from the State, it's just a guidance, but my question is more local, it's a local question, it's from, yeah, I'm asking the local authorities --

ALVAREZ: Right. So, we're not --

HARROUN: -- what is our policy on --



ALVAREZ: Well, the only thing we can control is the land that's zoned and how it's zoned and what's, what you can do with that land, right, and to meet that capacity. We're trying to increase capacity and trying to achieve those other targets whether they're, if there's an enforcement mechanism from the State will be evaluated based on that we have to show why we did or didn't, couldn't meet those objectives.

HARROUN: I appreciate that we have a directive from the State but I'm here as a representative of our community, right, I'm a dad, I have kids, I want housing for my kids, I don't want apartments for my kids, I want homes that they can grow, they can own and I -- I guess what I'm looking for is, is I want our planning staff, which I consider I'm also part of, to really consider what we are planning for in our land allocations. Are we allowing for the different housing types that are going to provide homeownership opportunities that all of us already have that we want for our kids, so...

And that's, so and that's kind of really where my, there's a push/pull, right, the State's saying, well, just do this and -- but then from a community member standpoint I'm like, hey, this is -- this is -- this is our home, this is where we all live, this is where we all played baseball and T-ball in the backyard and are we saying nope, no more for anybody else from a planning standpoint or are we going, no, this is important and how do we allocate for that, that process and is there any mechanism in our planning that allows for that. That was my question.

ORJIAKO: This is Oliver again. Good questions and good observation and the answer is, no. In the past the community had a policy of 60 percent on the new single, of the new housing type is going to be single-family and 40 percent will be multi-family, over time that policy changed to 75/25 single-family, multi-family ratio.

It's hard to comprehend that we don't have that flexibility anymore because the goal of this effort and this new legislation is to going forward to plan for housing in this various housing income band from included in that is emergency housing and shelter, extremely low, very low, low, moderate and other, that is what we have in front of us.

So, yes, you might call it a dictation from the State; however, they have also recognized that in the single-family zone you can characterize that as being exclusively zoned for single-family so you're excluding other opportunities.

What they're asking us to do now is to, they're not saying that homeownership is not significant or not important, what they are saying is that we have a growing state, a growing county that we have to provide for a variety of housing type just to provide housing units, for those that unit that needed it may be homeownership, it may be rental, but you have to plan differently, that's what this new State guidelines and new housing.

In the last legislature I believe in 2023 they passed a ton of housing bills and we have no choice except to see how we are going to plan for those housing units.

As I said earlier, and this is not, don't take it from me, this is what the State is saying those that have looked at this that the State and by additional counties has been underproducing the number of housing unit needed to accommodate the population that we are seeing. So, it's going to be a variety on how to go about doing so, so that is what we have.

If we were to go back to 75/25, then you have the choice to say, yeah, maybe that 75 that's in single-family will get opportunity for homeownership. What the State is saying is you've been trying it local government it's not working, let's try something differently and that's what this is really in a sense asking us to do. Whether they monitor this over time, I'm sure.

As Jose indicated we used to look back five years after the plan is adopted how well are we doing and we report that back to the State and that information goes back to the legislature, then they use that to repeal some of the bills or makes changes to it. So that is my response to you, sir.

HALBERT: Thanks, Oliver. So, Commissioners, we've been at this about an hour and a half, would it be okay if we took a ten-minute health break because we have the public hearing, the public portion of this hearing coming up and it will be also a long time, so let's take a ten-minute health break if that ten minutes is an appropriate amount of time and be back here at just a little around 8:20. Thanks.

(Pause in proceedings.)

### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

HALBERT: Okay. So, thank you for that break. And next is the public testimony portion of the hearing and we will now open it to public testimony. And, Sonja, you have some instructions to go over.

WISER: Thank you. Members of the audience and public, 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. If written comments were received prior to March 21st, 2024, they were submitted to the PC 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 is limited to three minutes.

So, we will begin with those participants that have joined remotely via computer or the telephone. Please raise your virtual hand or press star 3 on your phone to let us know you would like to provide comment. Are there any people wishing to provide comment?

SIDOROV: I see David Ripp you have your hand raised. I will go ahead and unmute you now.

RIPP: Good evening, Commissioners.

WISER: Go ahead, David.

RIPP: Oh, can you hear me?

SIDOROV: Yes. Thank you.

RIPP: Good evening, Planning Commission. I'm David Ripp, I'm the CEO for the Port of Camas/Washougal. I'm here to provide testimony regarding the Employment Allocation and Vacant Buildable Lands Model capacity topic.

For the Port of Camas/Washougal this is a critical issue for the Commission and the Port community. The amount of vacant buildable land is debatable as you have heard and will continue to hear. More important than the amount of land that is assumed to develop, it is the quality of the land that will make the difference between a future based on imperfect assumptions and one based on practicality and reason.

In the case of the Camas UGA, the staff report concludes that there is capacity of 11,360 jobs while the Vacant Buildable Lands Model show a capacity of 11,663 jobs. The affect of those numbers means Camas has enough vacant buildable land to accommodate all the employment growth for the next 20 years.

As someone who has searched for property in Camas for the Port to possibly acquire, I can tell you firsthand that the quality of the vacant land, buildable land, particularly in the western portion of Camas, is lackluster.

Between habitat conservation areas, slopes and wetlands, much of the property in west Camas is not suitable for industrial development as assumed in the model. Industrial properties with critical areas will develop at 50 percent of the acreage. With many properties heavily encumbered by critical areas, it is not realistic to think that those properties will develop as the model assumes.

What this means effectively is that Camas will not have the capacity for the 11,360 jobs allocated to the City. Without changes to the land inventory, Camas will likely fall short of the 20-year allocation.

Because economic development is central to the Port, we submitted a site-specific request to add 12 parcels to the Camas UGA. Located near Grove Field, the 12 properties total just under 85 acres with 32 acres use for runway, taxiway and hangar space.

We understand that the Planning Commission will not rule on site-specific requests; however, the allocation of employment projections in the Vacant Buildable Lands Model capacity is under consideration.

We understand the difficulty of considering the assumptions of the Vacant Buildable Land Model. Rather than rely on some future work, another way to address the employment allocation and capacity issue is to look more carefully at the deduction of jobs related to construction and work at home. The

deduction of 10,024 jobs attributed to these employment segments negatively influences the capacity of the land inventory.

It is not realistic to think that construction jobs need no land and it is unrealistic to think that work from home will be 100 percent work from home. There is more evidence to suggest that a hybrid work from home model where there is a split time between home and workplace is becoming the norm. Those workplaces need land for their employees.

If the County assumes 30 percent of the 10,024 jobs need no land to accommodate those jobs, the County will still need to accommodate 7,017 jobs in addition to the 65,071 jobs allocated to the land -- to the UGAs.

With the Vacant Buildable Lands Model capacity at 65,091, the County could be short on land inventory for nearly 7,000 jobs, the exact calculations by city and UGA would need to be reconfigured or refigured; however, it is fair to suggest that Camas will be short of land by significantly more than three jobs and would need additional land inventory to accommodate its share of the employment allocation.

As I mentioned before, the Port submitted a site-specific request to add nearly 85 acres to the Camas UGA and we believe that changes to the employment allocation are reasonable justifiable. If staff is directed to revise the employment allocation numbers as suggested, the Port's 85 acres could be an option for the City of Camas to add to its UGA in terms of accommodating its 20-year employment projection.

In closing, it is imperative for the County to look more closely at two things related to land capacity and employment allocation; one, the assumptions of the Vacant Buildable Lands Model to address properties with critical areas need to be revisited; and two, the deduction of jobs related to construction and work from home needs to be reconsidered in terms of meeting land inventory. Thank you for your consideration.

HALBERT: Thank you, Dave. Larisa.

SIDOROV: I see Alan Peters you have your hand raised. I will go ahead and unmute you now.

PETERS: Alan Peters, A-l-a-n, P-e-t-e-r-s, and I am the City of Camas's Community Development Director. I submitted comments prior to the February scheduled hearing which I hope you were able to review.

And I just want to reiterate tonight that these growth allocations are incredibly important to cities including Camas and the future of our region as a whole. The City of Camas generally does support the overall adopted growth targets and the total population and employment allocations with the caveat that Dave Ripp just mentioned from the Port that our own local experience has shown that environmental constraints particularly in our grass valley area have shown significantly lower use than

those assumed by the VBLM.

So, with that we believe that we can still support modest UGA expansion for employment because of that discrepancy in actual use versus the VBLM.

More importantly is the housing crisis and the housing needs in our community. In this update it's different because we do need to ensure that we are meeting the needs of all the community. Camas believes that we can most successfully contribute to those housing needs in Clark County with the allocations in Method A.

We recognize the incredible need for additional housing development and especially for affordable housing and are prepared to do our part. Each city does play a unique role in contributing to the county's housing supply and for Camas the numbers in Method A would require us to contribute a significant amount of multi-family housing, middle housing stock while still being able to plan for single-family detached units in Camas.

Conversely, Method B effectively says that we have already surpassed our needs for detached single-family units and need to direct all our future growth towards multi-family and middle housing.

So, Camas requests housing allocations consistent with the numbers in Method A. This could be achieved through countywide adoption of Method A and the Planning Commissions recommendation to do so or alternatively perhaps some adjustments to Method A or B in negotiation with the other cities that provide more realistic targets for each jurisdiction and will help us better meet our housing needs through 2045. Thank you.

HALBERT: Thank you, Alan.

SIDOROV: Okay. I do not see any more hands raised.

HALBERT: All right. Thanks, Larisa. Okay. So, tonight until now we will start our in-person comments and I have the sign-up card. If you haven't signed up and you wish to give testimony, we'll accommodate that, but I'll start with the list here and the first person on the list is Ezra Hammer. Do you wish to give testimony? Sure.

HAMMER: This is very good. Good evening, Commissioners. My name is Ezra Hammer, I'm a lawyer with the law firm of Jordan Ramis. Forgive me if I'm a little bit emotional tonight, I just found out that we had a passing in the family, so I'm going to do my best here.

Jordan Ramis has been working with property owners in Clark County and has worked with the County on four GMA processes, so we're well versed in this process and appreciate the County's rigor in approaching these difficult topics.

We recognize that there have been some legislative changes in recent years but we do believe

conceptually that some of the assumptions being made tonight are overly conservative and not in align with what the State law requirements are.

It's important to note that making the right sort of assumptions will have tremendous impacts and for the county over the next several decades and if we are overly conservative in our assumptions and do not allow for the continued job and housing growth to occur in this county, we will create tremendous disadvantages for future generations.

We will have the effect of preventing Washingtonians and future Washingtonians from forming their households here in Clark County and we would have the effect of limiting the ability to existing companies to grow and other companies to reallocate.

So, we've come before you tonight to ask for four recommendations. To further elaborate on what staff mentioned, you have wide discretion tonight and you can make any number of recommendations that relate both to the allocations and the underlying VBLM numbers.

While the VBLM numbers were not highlighted in the description of what tonight's presentation was on, those numbers were just shared with the public recently over the last month and this is the first public hearing where there's an opportunity to provide comment on them. So, I'm going to provide my four recommendations.

The first is as you heard from Camas the adoption of Method A. Every county that has gone through this process before you has chosen Method A, it provides the greatest level of flexibility for its cities and it avoids overly constrictive regulations that may prove impossible for local jurisdictions to meet.

Number two, we ask for construction jobs to be accounted for. There is ample evidence on the record both in the form of existing companies within the county that provide construction services as well as the county's various zoning code which calls for these companies to have land and be zoned appropriately, so we find it inappropriate that they are removed.

We also ask that for mixed use housing and low density housing in Vancouver that those numbers be normalized with every other city and that we not assume greater capacity than is otherwise called for based on the underlying zoning and the regulatory framework that is currently in effect. Thank you very much.

HALBERT: Thanks, Ezra. Sorry to hear about your family. Mr. Horenstein.

HOLLEY: Could they please spell their names.

HORENSTEIN: Thank you, Mr. Chair, members of the Commission. For the record my name is Steve Horenstein, H-o-r-e-n-s-t-e-i-n. This is the fourth update of the Growth Management Plan I've been through, I've been through, I think Oliver and I may be the last men standing from that very first process.

I want to make some suggestions for your recommendations to the Board of County Councilors tonight. I would suggest adopting Option A or a variation of Option A that the cities come up with and present to you because of the flexibility it provides, I think that's a common theme you're hearing tonight.

I think it's important to add back the construction jobs to the number of jobs being planned for. I think that's a small piece of the jobs problem and I'm beginning to hear other concerns about jobs and that's mostly the one that I want to talk about tonight.

The third thing I would ask is that you direct staff or your recommendation direct the Board through your recommendation to ask staff to take a much more detailed look at the inventory of available lands with more outreach to the economic development, commercial and industrial developer community.

The reason I say that, this is the one area in all this planning that's been going on where there's such a divergence between what the marketplace sees, practitioners like me, commercial industrial realtors, developers, land is not there for jobs. We need to do a much better job of digging into this as we go forward here.

You know, staff's doing exactly what the Growth Management Act and the State such as it is asking them to do with their efforts at modeling, but it's very one dimensional, it's primarily based on the existing zoning and it's just more complicated than that in the real world.

We have practitioners in the field disagreeing with staff on the impact of wetlands and critical areas. There's a great deal of pressure on the land supply to create housing. Vancouver staff is saying we would even consider converting commercial land for residential if we need to do that to meet our statutory requirements. There's no evaluation of the inventory beyond zoning, big difference is on critical areas, you've seen that in the memo I sent you.

Availability of infrastructure is land for sale. Underutilized land, I don't think it's good enough with all due respect, Jose, to use anecdotal information about underutilized land. So many people in Clark County live on 10 acres, live on 20 acres and that's what they're going to do and they're going to leave it to their kids and it's not going to be available for development.

We in the past in prior planning sessions two and three of the four I think we've done a lot more looking at the quality of the land as Dave Ripp said. We don't have enough land for employment, I see it every day in my practice, others tell me the same thing, that's something that's going to take a lot more work than we've put into it so far. Thank you.

HALBERT: Thank you, Steve.

HORENSTEIN: Yes, sir.

HALBERT: Erik Paulsen.

HORENSTEIN: Oh, you're not asking me a question?

HALBERT: Sorry, Steve, no.

HORENSTEIN: I'm glad.

PAULSEN: Good evening, Chair, and Planning Commissioners. My name is Erik Paulsen spelled P-a-u-l-s-e-n, Mayor Pro Tem for the City of Vancouver. I'm here tonight to testify on behalf of the City of Vancouver in overall support of the most recent Clark County staff growth allocation recommendations.

We appreciate the Planning Commission considering these allocations following some important decisions that were made by the Council last year. As you know, the County Council adopted an aggressive long-term countywide population forecast to accommodate 20,000 more persons than the State projects as most likely to occur in Clark County.

Based on that forecast, the Council also adopted an aspirational long-term countywide employment forecast of one job per household or about 88,000 new jobs. The countywide housing supply is set by the State based on the selected population and is extremely aggressive.

Collectively we are required to plan for and accommodate more than 100,000-housing units including over 50,000 new units affordable at 80 percent or less of area median income.

For the allocations to individual jurisdictions we support the most recent County staff recommendation which would allocate the new housing units and jobs to areas in a way that recognizes and reflects their current growth capacities and goals, this same approach was taken in past local Comp Plan updates.

We oppose attempts to have all jurisdictions grow at the same rate regardless of their capacities, this would cause chaos on the ground with some jurisdictions forced to shrink their existing UGAs and others to expand theirs or undergo rezones far more extensive than what is currently contemplated.

For the allocation of housing units by specific income band, we're comfortable with a compromise allocation halfway between Methods A and B. Similar approaches have been used by Puget Sound counties and the joint letter from local cities before you tonight also supports this approach.

We do not believe an allocation that moves any closer than halfway to Method A is appropriate because it does not meaningfully recognize the existing housing that communities, not just Vancouver, had already provided.

Land capacity estimates and their methodology are not advertised as part of this hearing and that's



how we've prepared. We can however say that despite recent improvements pursuant to State law the results of the VBLM and some of the many assumptions that go into it suggest that actual long-term growth capacity is still being underestimated particularly for employment.

Our February 27 letter to the Commission indicates why and identifies some of the assumptions that are likely causing the undercounting. We can also say that some of the outside written testimony to you in the last day about various capacity assumptions in the City of Vancouver is not consistent with our understanding of and data about recent development or newly adopted laws which will shape development going forward. Thank you.

HALBERT: Thank you, Mr. Paulsen. Bryan Kast. Did I get that right, Bryan?

KAST: Got it.

HALBERT: Thank you.

KAST: Good evening, Commissioners. Bryan Kast, that's B-r-y-a-n, K-a-s-t. I am the Public Works and Community Development Director for the City of La Center.

In La Center we started working on our Comprehensive Plan update close to a year ago and after eagerly awaiting the growth allocations from County staff we received those this fall. As County staff has mentioned, we have been meeting collaboratively since December; however, during those several months there was pretty minimal changes to the numbers, the both allocation and capacity numbers.

However, just before those numbers were submitted to this body for their review, La Center saw a drop in close to 500 jobs allocated to the City with very little communication or coordination with between county and city staff. Then again last Friday we lost another 20 jobs bringing us to about within one job of our capacity versus our allocation which seems very convenient at best.

So, at this point La Center is requesting to continue to work with the County staff and have an open and transparent process and communication between jurisdictions and we are also hoping to continue to work with County staff to support modest and reasonable growth of employment and job lands for the City of La Center and other small jurisdictions.

Those jobs and that employment land is really key, it's the heart of our small cities economic development opportunities and it's critical for our future growth and sustainable income for our city. Thank you.

HALBERT: So, Bryan, could I ask you a question. Just looked at the presentation tonight and it shows allocation, job employment allocation of 2,095 here, you're saying that that was reduced from recent --

KAST: Yes. So we again had a meeting in December, we had about 470 more jobs than that and again there was, you know, those were preliminary numbers but there was, you know, very minimal

fluctuation and then basically when the Council, or the, yeah, the Planning Commission packet went out those significantly dropped and again, you know, we actually had to go and look in the numbers that were presented in the staff packet to see that drop, we didn't get a lot of direct communication from staff.

HALBERT: Thank you, Bryan.

KAST: Thank you.

HALBERT: Okay. Next Justin Wood.

WOOD: Testing. Oh... Good evening, Chair Halbert, and fellow Commissioners, my name is Justin Wood, W-o-o-d, and I'm here testifying on behalf of the Clark County Association of Realtors.

Before you tonight is a pivotable decision that will impact our community for the next 20 years. As you know the free market is governed by supply and demand. Clark County has seen a massive increase in population coupled with a sharp increase and demand for additional housing. This is because Clark County is a fantastic place to live, work and play, we can see this in the numbers.

According to the Office of Financial Management from 2000 to 2022, the City of Battle Ground and La Center increased their population by 135 percent. Camas increased its population by 119 percent. Washougal with 103 percent. Vancouver with 39 percent. Unincorporated Clark County grew at 44 percent. Yacolt grew at 58 percent. And Ridgefield grew at a whopping 607 percent.

While the population forecast has already been determined, please keep these numbers in mind as you recommend what allocation method the County will use. With that, I encourage the Commission to adopt Method A for the Housing For All Planning Tool passed down from the Department of Commerce and administered by Clark County Community Planning.

According to tonight's presentation 36 percent of new housing units will need to accommodate incomes between 100 percent and 120 plus percent area median income. The demand for detached housing product in various forms will be immense within this demographic. As of right now given the Washington Uniform Common Interest Ownership Act, condominiums will not be built. Homeownership provides housing stability and high-rise apartments do not provide avenues to ownership.

One comment I did want to make to the Commission tonight is to really scrutinize those VBLM capacity assumptions within some of the data that was referenced tonight. Specifically, I would really look into the mixed-use assumptions for the City of Vancouver along with the low density assumptions for the City of Vancouver.

We need to construct a diversity of new housing and that requires land. We need to facilitate what ECONorthwest and others call filtering within the housing market. A new study from the Federal Bank

Reserve of Minneapolis showed that construction of market rate housing units leads to more available affordable housing units.

Kayla Carmicheal outlines this, and I quote, "When high-income residents move into new market-rate housing, their previous homes are freed up for other renters or homebuyers. When those residents move, their old place is then available for others and the price on it may lower because of a shift in demand. This process is known as filtering."

Jurisdictions should be empowered to make decisions and plan at the local level, Method A does that while Method B does not. In light of this and other points, the Clark County Association of Realtors urges the Commission to recommend Method A to the Clark County Council. Thank you.

HALBERT: Thanks, Justin. So next up, if I get this right, Noelle Lovern. Did I get that right, Noelle?

LOVERN: Yes, you did.

HALBERT: Okay. Thank you.

LOVERN: I guess I don't have to say it now. Thank you. My name is Noelle Lovern, N-o-e-l-l-e, L-o-v-e-r-n, I am with the Building Industry Association of Clark County. We signed on to a comment that was submitted by Northwest Partners, so I am just going to go over a few details from tonight.

So first I'd like to thank you all for the seriousness at which you guys are approaching this topic. Obviously, it's a really important decision and process that you're going through, and I know a lot of you are new to this, I am as well, I haven't had the three rounds like Mr. Horenstein has, so...

But as we sat here tonight and I heard Commissioner Wogen think about, you know, do we have enough land capacity, so... Earlier today I was thinking 181,000 people and 88,000 jobs is a substantial city in itself, and we're going to take that and put it in the land that we already have, that is baffling to me.

And then thinking really towards what we have to do to house those folks, I believe Jose said the other day that we currently produce about 4,000-housing units a year and doing the math on the 103,000 units that we need to produce over in the 20-year planning cycle, that puts us at about 5,100-units per year, an additional 1100 units, that's a lot, it's a huge undertaking, so...

I will echo the concerns that I heard tonight as to whether we do actually have the capacity to accommodate the additional equivalent of a medium sized city and what that would, how we would do that and what that would look like for us in 2045.

If you cannot say with all certainty that staff has not only provided you an appropriate amount of data but that you understand that data and how they arrived at it, then I think we -- that's where we have to determine if there's more work that needs to be done whether that comes, whether there's data

that's not coming from the State or whether it's having County show their math. I think it's important for a transparent process to be able to look at where the data is coming from.

So, from the information that's been presented tonight we recommend going with some version of Method A and then a scrutinizing of the employment allocation which I don't feel is in position yet. Thank you.

HALBERT: Thank you, Noelle. Mr. Snodgrass.

SNODGRASS: Good evening. It's Bryan Snodgrass with the City of Vancouver here to just follow-up on Council Member Paulsen's testimony with a couple of I think technical, but I think still important points to be made.

One is just in response to what we heard tonight one partial help to this issue of not having enough ability to plan for additional single-family homes is that the State and Department of Commerce has confirmed this in discussions I've had with them provides flexibility on how you may account for the land, the housing units rather, that were built from 2020 through now.

I understand from what we heard earlier that all of those in the current numbers before you were assumed to have fallen in the 120 plus income bracket. Most probably did fall in there or in the middle of the market, not all necessarily though.

So it would take a little more work but with an allocation that spreads that out you would have the ability to plan for a little on a countywide basis, a little bit more single-family housing and we would all as individual jurisdictions have to plan for a little bit less of the below market housing which is going to be the biggest challenge for us all.

Secondly, I think the -- we would have pro- -- this hearing is advertised for the allocations only and we would have prepared differently if we thought there was going to be a recommendation coming from you on the land capacity assumptions, not that it's not a very important issue and your questions are fully fair game, but our understanding and what our lawyers have advised us that your recommendation on allocations can consider the capacity issues but that you're not in a position to make a recommendation on capacity at least not tonight, maybe you should be but you're not. I would stand to be corrected by County Counsel, that's what we've been advised.

Regarding how you treat some of the capacity information we just wanted to clarify some of the information about the City of Vancouver, and this is captured in my letter at the end of the day, I don't know if you had a chance to read it, but there was just response to testimony submitted this morning I think need some further clarification.

The assumptions for future development densities in single-family zones there's a recommendation, you've received testimony today that that should -- we should, Vancouver should be the same as the other jurisdictions. Right now, per the buildable lands report, county densities in single-family zones

are significantly higher.

Per HB 1110 which we are required to adopt and as a self-executing mechanism if we don't adopt it, the State's buildable lands, excuse me, the State's model ordinance supersedes and goes into play, requires us to allow in all single-family zones four units to six units if it's near transit. Our estimates attempt to account for that reality which we have no way of escaping from even if we wanted to.

And as you'll -- if you look at the numbers carefully, we cannot assume that every property will use that new allowance. We take into account that for redevelopment most probably won't, the numbers will be higher otherwise.

I also would like to speak to the question which was raised in testimony about mixed use assumptions in the City of Vancouver. The mixed use be it vertical in which case buildings, a single building can accommodate both employment and housing or horizontal where on a site they're separate buildings, they're close together and related typically at higher densities is an increasing reality in the City of Vancouver, less so but on an increasing basis elsewhere.

The assumptions before you in some cases use, or excuse me, the testimony saying that the share of the land to be devoted to housing and the share of the land assumed to be devoted to employment should never exceed 100 percent ignores that reality.

The recommendation, or excuse me, yes, I guess it would be the County staff recommendation embodied in the vacant lands is slightly exceeds 100 percent, in some cases up to 125 percent in the examples that were cited, we think that's appropriate.

Lastly in terms of construction jobs all we would say is that certainly there are construction companies that need land, that's -- that's -- that's I think that's indisputable. I don't think there's been any evidence or even assertions in the record that those companies would account for all of the 6500 construction jobs countywide that the county materials indicate.

That 6500 figure may in fact be a little bit low because if you look at Scott Bailey's memo that originally generates some of this information he projects in the future construction jobs to account for 9.1 percent, if you do the math, that's over 8,000 jobs. So just wanted to clarify those technical points. Certainly, available to answer any further questions.

HALBERT: So, I think - Bryan Halbert here - Bryan, you're saying that if construction jobs should really be closer to 800,000 that would, what percentage of that would you allocate to land, jobs for land or vacant buildable land?

SNODGRASS: I don't know. I think it's a valid point being raised that some of the construction jobs on the administrative side of construction or other sides that are in facilities that need land, I don't know that anyone's presented any evidence at all, but again, those big numbers that are projected in construction are going to be physically accommodated other than a fraction of them on those lands.

HALBERT: Okay. I think it's been brought up to study that a little more too, hasn't it, or we'll make a recommendation to do that, so we know the percentage. Should all 8,000 be allocated to the buildable lands model or employment allocation or a percentage of that?

SNODGRASS: Probably a large percentage of it, probably the majority of them, I don't have a number for you.

HALBERT: Great. Thanks.

HOLLEY: I can't hear you, Bryan.

HALBERT: Yeah. Sorry, I was trying to decipher a name here.

HARROUN: I think it's Ms. Baker.

HALBERT: Ms. Baker. Thank you. Sorry.

BAKER: I'm certainly not winning any handwriting awards this evening. Good evening, Chair, and members of the Commission, I'm Jennifer Baker, B-a-k-e-r, for the record, and I'm here with the Columbia River Economic Development Council where I am the CEO.

So, the Columbia River Economic Council has participated in the County's comprehensive planning and Vacant Buildable Lands Model and report processes in several iterations in decades past and now currently at the start of this planning cycle initiated in 2020.

I'm going to lead with something that hasn't been mentioned tonight that I think is impactful for consideration, you know, growth management is a balancing exercise, balancing population growth, employment, housing and why do we do it, we do it so that jurisdictions have planning tools to budget appropriately, it's a capital operations planning exercise as well, and we haven't talked about the tax base and how some of the assertions about jobs that do not need land impact the tax base and our ability to reinvest in ourselves as public agencies.

Businesses bring in sales tax revenue, real property tax, property tax, utilities tabs and other contributions that allow us to reinvest in ourselves as a community, so I think that is, is also a consideration that has not been mentioned.

Based on our practice of attracting businesses and supporting existing business in the region, CREDC has presented case study materials over the course of the last four years that show how land is being used, what opportunities we have to turn away from and we would conclude also that the critical and -- the critical lands conversion factor is indeed too high as we've heard a lot of testimony on this evening.

There's never a perfect snapshot in time because regulations are changing, it's a dynamic environment to be making these modeling predictions, but just January this year the Washington Department of Fish & Wildlife provided a guidance that is for offsetting impacts of Oregon White Oak of which Southwest Washington is called out of having a prevalence of these protected areas and I think that is something that should be looked at when we think about the extent to which employment lands could be convertible and/or should be convertible based on the guidance, changes to State and Federal regulation on wetlands delineation, fish bearing bodies and, et cetera, also factor into that.

House Bill 1042 was adopted by the legislature in the 2023/2024 session and that encourages the conversion of mixed-use buildings for housing supply, and so not only is our model right now saying that we don't need more land for to support employment growth, but we're saying that land that has historically been made available to support employment growth can be converted for other purposes.

Such as the case also with Development Agreements where rights have been promised for the development of employment lands that are represented in our model that have a strong likelihood of not converting for employment considerations, so these are all large concerns for us.

And lastly the current model that's presented I believe the statistics have all been gathered before the economic impact data for the interstate bridge replacement and particularly the employment study was published at the end of last year and presented to the public at the beginning of this year. An economic disruptor, the magnitude of an interstate bridge replacement, multibillion dollar, a lot of construction jobs, I think that it would be prudent to look at the impact of that and the land use needs of that project support as well. Thank you very much.

HALBERT: Thank you, Jennifer. All right. Is there anybody else who wishes to testify? And, Larisa, is there anybody online?

SIDOROV: I do not see any raised hands.

HALBERT: Hearing none, then I will close this portion of the public testimony and give staff an opportunity to respond to any of the public that they've heard tonight.

### **Comments from Staff**

ORJIAKO: Planning Commission members, this is Oliver again. I don't think there is any area where I would like to focus on, but I would like to say that on the quality of the land that we are saying is available for development, particularly on the employment side, there is evidence that our critical area layer do overestimate critical areas.

Often what happens is that property owners or developers will go out and delineate their property and be able to say how much of that land is indeed usable. And you heard the testimony from the Port of Camas as well as from the City of Camas and that is why they're suggesting that you recommend Method A, there is some issues on the critical land and how much of the inventory is actually usable,

that is the work that they are supposed to do to be able to come back to us and say you know what, some of this land in the inventory is not going to be converted to what and how it's zoned and they should be able to tell us what should it be, not the County.

Secondly, that's my view on critical land and how we look at that. I can tell you that we have studied based on what have developed in the past that it's not an acknowledgement but it's what the study appears to show is that the vacant, no, our vacant buildable lands treatment of critical land really overstates how much is critical.

Having said that, I will concur that under construction job there should be some acreage allocated for that but that is something that I will continue to ask those in the development community if you have any data to support, one, that should be let us know.

We know that there are likely to be some job added in the construction that will likely occur on the existing facilities, and when you look at construction, you will agree that construction includes residential, it includes commercial, if you look at that in terms of areas that are already planned for, commercial and industrial in our inventory, you will assume that some of the construction job will occur in those areas in terms of housing construction for example.

And you also have sole proprietors, those that are engaged in service industry that may employ folks without actually needing land, if you're doing after construction clean-up for example. So, we don't, there's no way for us to capture sole proprietors or whatever the case may be.

It is hard to look at the type of industries and as provided by the regional economists it doesn't really tell us, okay, in retail this is how many acreage you have to allocate, in construction this is how many acreage, in other sectors this is how many you have to allocate by based on those job estimates.

So, what we look at this is just on the aggregate here's how much we're saying is available to develop and we apply the different employment densities to them is how we have looked at this in the past, and if there is any disagreement, we welcome any data to support that.

When we -- I know that the Vacant Buildable Lands capacity estimate is not in front of you, but I will say that we provided that information out, we did a press release that says, hey, the current VBLM run is out.

I don't know whether -- I don't think we provided a timeframe to submit comment, but that we provided to the public. I think we already received two comments which we staff responded to those that inquired about that. If anybody missed that press release that this now is out for review, I can apologize for that, but we did put that out for review and comment back to staff because this is an iterative comment or process.

I respect my colleague here Bryan Kast from the City of La Center, I don't want to take issue that we have not been communicating with our local jurisdiction. I will say that we have, and we are more



than open to hear them out.

What we shared with them is that their preliminary numbers they looked at was just preliminary numbers and we listened to them, we asked them for their input, some of the cities provided us maximum densities of given this new housing bill and some of them have come back and said, no, we no longer are going to be accepting the maximum densities, we're going -- we want to try and address that to what we think is reasonable, so we are listening and making those assumptions.

So, you may see the initial number when we come back and listen to you, I said, no, not maximum density, why not you take medium numbers, that will change your allocation to your jurisdiction. So, I again don't want to take issue with the City of La Center, but we are ready to work with them.

After this allocation the cities still have flexibility to determine how they're going to accommodate the growth that is assigned to them and that justification will come in what direction they want to go, if they want to do any delineation of what is currently within their UGA and letting us know that that will not accommodate the job numbers we are saying, that is up to them not to carry that in their inventory. Those are some of my initial responses to the comment made.

Second, we will hear the cities out, the City of Vancouver in particular. If any of the cities would want a halfway between A and B I would have loved to hear that during all our conversation with the cities honestly.

And this Method A and B is what we have been sharing with all of them until lately letter B appear to share some negative numbers and I think I will submit that that negative number depending on how you look at it one will say, yeah, negative number means negative number, but it doesn't necessarily mean that you can no longer build single-family for example, it's just a way of recognizing what is already on the ground, if you will, and asking the cities to make an adjustment in a very different housing or income band, that's what Method B is really saying.

You know, if any of the cities want more growth whether it's in job or in housing, I would like them to get together and as Jose indicated do some horse-trading and see how we arrive at that. I will stop there unless you have other questions or other deliberations or if you have questions, we'll take it. Jose, do you have anything to add?

ALVAREZ: No. Thank you.

HALBERT: Thank you, Oliver. Any other staff comments then? Jose? No?

ALVAREZ: No.

### **Return to Planning Commission**

HALBERT: Or Chris? And hearing none, I'd like to bring it back to the Planning Commission for

comments and deliberation. And let me just go down our list and see what you guys have. Mark, why don't we start with you.

BERGTHOLD: Well, thank you. Mark Bergthold. Kind of everything that's been said reiterates what my comment was about the State, we're locked into numbers it appears and yet if I was a betting man I don't -- I think I would lose tonight if I had bet that A or B or even A would be -- would be the best for the county. It's everybody seems to think from what I picked up that there should be a hybrid.

So, if we make a motion, and maybe this is more of yours, but, Bryan, were to go back, we're sending a message to the Council because we can't direct staff, we learned that and Chris informed us of that pretty good. Yeah, it just seems like it's half-baked but I'm not sure that if it ever would get baked all the way, so that's the end of my comment, I think.

HALBERT: Thank you, Mark. How about Eldon.

WOGEN: So as it relates to allocation, I heard so many people say that they think that Method A where housing is a better fit for the county, but I also heard that maybe a hybrid might be a little better, incorporate some of B and A into that, that's what I'm kind of leaning towards but I would assume that the County would be working or better help the cities guide them so that they can come up with their, how they're going to achieve it and then maybe it does lean more towards A but I certainly lean more towards A.

And then when I hear from the allocation for employment, I have a real big concern about if there's really enough vacant land. I mean, I hear it over and over and over again, just because it's, the County says it's vacant that doesn't mean it's buildable and I look at the plan that the County put together on that and to me it looks like a green light plan and that never happens, there's going to be red lights and yellow lights and I think that there's got to be a little more foresight looking at maybe there's going to need some more additional land for the jurisdictions moving forward. That's my take.

HALBERT: Thank you, Eldon. How about Jeremy.

BAKER: Yeah, this is Commissioner Baker. So, in light of all of the mass of information that we've been presented tonight and the last three weeks, I mean I've printed it all out and I've read every word because I know how important and how invested everyone in this community is on this.

And so, my take on this is that this is a very important decision, it's going to direct the growth of this county and I don't think we need to rush into something where we're trying to force this issue. I think it's more appropriate to be deliberate and make sure that we make a decision that makes everyone feel comfortable with the decision.

And so, with that in mind, I think -- I think -- I think further discussion on what deliberate blending of Method A and Method B what would that look like and see if that is something that could be agreed upon with the municipalities of the unincorporated areas in the county.

And I definitely think that we really need to go back to the drawing boards and try to make some different assumptions on available land for employment. The anecdotal stories and the view of the industry on the ground really indicates to me that that needs to be addressed, that we do not have enough, and I -- and I -- and I personally would like to see us build an industry here in Clark County and so we have all the employment that we can muster.

I appreciated Mrs. Baker's comment on the tax revenue that that industry comes on. Going through the VBLM data there's a lot of underutilized and we're looking for light industrial and some commercial, but there's not a lot of heavy industrial.

I work in the heavy industrial sector, and I know how powerful and impactful that is to an economy and maybe that's not something Clark County is interested in, but I do think that the employment portion of this piece that we're trying to push on to the Council I think that needs a little bit more consult. And with that I'll listen to you guys.

HALBERT: Thank you, Commissioner Baker. How about Jack.

HARROUN: Yeah. When I look at or read through all the comments and I definitely believe some -- some version of Method A is probably the most palatable and workable, I do want to comment on the jobs land thing.

I get a lot of heartburn when I think that somebody saying that there's plenty of jobs land for the next 20 years and we're currently looking around and trying to find places to build and can't find it.

So just the reality from my personal experience from what we're looking for from what I hear from the industries that quality land is not available and you hear from the Port, you know, of Camas/Washougal, I think it's a very compelling testimony to me.

And the big thing about jobs land is single-family residence is apartments, they don't pay for themselves. As an individual we don't pay enough in tax base to cover the cost of the services we receive. We're reliant on businesses to fund our communities.

I think, you know, La Center is really a case study of that because just the impact of losing one of their major income generators has tremendous impacts on their community and they need that jobs lands and they need that ability to fund their community. So that's kind of my take on it. Thank you.

HALBERT: Thanks, Jack. And so, I've prepared a few comments too. I want to first thank Director Oliver and Project Manager Jose Alvarez for the work that you guys have done and the work that's going to come up, we know there's more of this to go, so...

Also, thanks to the County staff and City staff too, and I know you guys have had a lot of consultants involved in this process and a lot of hours to disseminate through a complex set of mandates that the

State's presented us, and we know we have a lot of reports and more outcomes that are going to come out of tonight, so...

And really thanks to everybody else who submitted written testimony and your public testimony and all have been really valuable. I certainly like to take all of that in, and I gain a better understanding of the decisions that we're going to be making, the recommendations, sorry, that we're going to be making.

So, I've read just recently the Columbian article by Shari Phiel on February 17th, and she did a really nice job I thought on the Comp Plan, we get asked by my friends and co-workers, you know, what is the Comp Plan and I thought she did a really nice job of an overview on the GMA process.

But one comment I have out of it, so she wrote, you know, "Back in 1990, the state Legislature passed the Growth Management Act because lawmakers were worried that unplanned, unmanaged growth posed a threat to the state's environment, economic sustainability and quality of life. Rather than leaving the plan for this growth and related decision-making to the state, legislatures focused on local control."

And I just find it ironic because here we are 30 years later and the State is more than ever dictating our growth policies, you know, through mandates like House Bill 1220 and a bill that adds another layer of complexity to this process and, you know, it's like what happened to local control, so just my commentary on that.

So as I saw the responses and written testimony and public testimony I see two major issues that came out of this, it's the allocation between Method A and Method B and the employment lands and -- and the three issues I wrote down under employment lands was construction jobs, employment and mixed use zones, and the conversion of commercial zoned land, you know, whether it's to residential, whether it's because we can't convert it because of critical lands.

I feel that tension that you guys have both said, there's -- it seems like there is a short supply in land allocation out there or land availability out there, and so really, yeah, do we have enough available land to accommodate our employment projections.

So to me I've seen an overwhelming response to have us consider Method A, you know, from what I thought was from the cities but then hearing from Bryan and Erik that maybe you guys are a little more in the middle than just going to A or Method A and all who -- but we've also heard from developers, realtors, the building community and all who continue to invest their time and their resources into Clark County and I know they do because they believe in Clark County and they want Clark County to be a place for their kids and their kids kids' to stay around and have a sustainable livable place.

So, my conclusion is that Method A does provide more flexibility for jurisdiction and to address the community housing and they'll be able to respond to the market demands better, so I mean I think I would want to recommend that we approve Method A.

And I think I'd like to propose a couple of amendments to the plan, and really I'm not even 100 percent sure what plan we're working with, I keep thinking that we're working with paper A. And, Chris, I see you stirring. Okay.

I would like to propose an amendment to require an update to the VBLM analysis to allocate land capacity for construction company jobs. I think it's important that construction companies really -- I know that, and my associates, we have just as much office staff and back-office staff as we do guys in the field. We have equipment, we have storage yards, we have shops to fabricate in and to take that all out of the VBLM just seems like a, like we're missing that piece.

I just want to credit Jamie Howsley for this paragraph, he says, these companies need both administrative spaces to support back-office departments such as customer service, sales, accounting, workshops, fabrication areas, construction meetings, training, and marketing, as well as both indoor and outdoor areas to store equipment and machinery, it takes land.

And it's true in my business and every one of the companies I associate with, we are much more than just sending carpenters to a job site. I'd like to propose that amendment.

And I'd also like to propose another amendment is that we revise the mixed-use zones and modify the VBLM to adjust downward the probability that jobs will occur in mixed use zones, but then we'll seek Mr. Snodgrass, I think I'd be open to hearing something different on that. Mr. Snodgrass is really saying, no, what they see in their model is accurate how we've allocated it, so maybe I'd withdraw that proposal, but...

HARROUN: Chair.

HALBERT: Yeah.

HARROUN: Chair.

HALBERT: Jack, please.

HARROUN: I have a **motion** that I would like to read, I'm not proposing, you know, that maybe a workshop if that's appropriate to throw out there and kind of see, I think it incorporates what you were saying and if I may I could read it and then you can --

HALBERT: Yeah, Jack. Go ahead.

HARROUN: Okay. So this would be my motion, I'm not making it right now, but like I say I **MOVE** that this Commission recommend that County Council consider adopting a modified version of Method A for configuring the population allocation to give the most flexibility for local planning in each city and a careful analysis done of Vancouver's assumption of mixed and low density residential zones to verify the feasibility of actual achieved densities for homes and jobs.

For the employment allocation and associated land capacity undergo a more detailed review beginning with reinstating land capacity for construction jobs and review the numbers of jobs planned for mixed use and have a full detailed review by economic development, commercial and industrial development community before finalizing the land inventory for all jobs.

HALBERT: Yeah. Bryan here. Jack, I like that and I'm not sure how we go about making a motion at this time.

HARROUN: I, well, I don't want to -- I'm happy to make the motion, but you were also kind of in the middle of making a motion but there wasn't a motion made and so I don't want to step on anybody's toes.

HALBERT: Yeah, Jack, I think I was just going through my point too to add to a motion but I think you captured what I was trying to do well in your motion. And so, if we -- if there's no other comments from the Planning Commission, I'd like to close the comment period.

WOGEN: I just had one more, could you read again what yours stated, I didn't catch what you were talking about for Method A. What was your verbiage on that?

HARROUN: So, I **MOVE** the Commission recommend that County consider adopting a modified version of Method A for configuring the population allocation. So, basically that it's the workability that I was reading from the cities of, you know, of it's not quite there but we can, the horse-trading we can work with it.

And then with the City of Vancouver basically saying let's verify their assumptions and because I want to respect, you know, like, hey, this is what we're achieving. And then so I can -- would you like me to read it or I can just make a motion? Is that -- did that answer your question?

WOGEN: Yeah, you answered my question.

HALBERT: Any other Planning Commission comments? Jack, I think --

HARROUN: Chair, I'd like to make a **MOTION**.

HALBERT: Please proceed.

HARROUN: I **MOVE** that this Commission recommend that County Council consider adopting a modified version of Method A for configuring the population allocation to give the most flexibility for local planning in each city and a careful analysis done of Vancouver's assumption of mixed and low density residential zones to verify the feasibility of actual achieved densities for homes and jobs.

For the employment allocation and associated land capacity, undergo a more detailed review

beginning with reinstating land capacity for construction jobs and review the numbers of jobs planned for mixed use and have a full detailed review by economic development, commercial and industrial development community before finalizing the land inventory for all jobs.

HALBERT: We have a motion. Is there a **second**?

COOK: Mr. Chair, I have just one issue with that motion. It seemed like it was a motion to do several different things and in general, it is a far better practice to take each recommendation singly so that somebody who likes three of them but hates the fourth doesn't have to vote for the fourth in supporting the other three; and that would be the way that a motion would typically be made and then once made seconded.

I think that Commissioner Harroun could do that because he has it written out and it seems to be divided into logical pieces. Does that make sense, Commissioner?

HALBERT: Yes, it does. I like that idea. So maybe we break yours down then into those four categories, the first one being the recommendation of a modified Method A and we'll take a second on that and then vote on it and then go through each one of them. Would you restate your motion then. Withdraw your first motion and restate your first Method A.

HARROUN: Sure. Forgive me. I'm just trying to figure out how to do this in a coherent manner. I appreciate the, yeah, I appreciate the thought behind that, and I'm fine with taking it, you know, each, you know, each iteration if that's certainly the will of the thing and then let's because I think we're just trying to get through the resolution here of what we recommend.

So let me try to break this into two since we have, and then we'll go from there. So, I will withdrawal my motion. I'll make a new **motion**. And I would say I would, first I **MOVE** that this Commission recommend that County Council consider adopting a modified version of Method A for configuring the population allocation to give the most flexibility for local planning in each city and a careful analysis done of Vancouver's assumption of mixed and low-density residential zones to verify the feasibility of actual achieved density for homes and jobs.

COOK: I have the same issue with that that I had before because part of it has to do with Method A and part of it has to do with Vancouver's assumption. So, if you could break those into two different motions, I would stop complaining.

WOGEN: So, Jack, can't you just shorten the first one to just say that you move that we recommend modified version of A for the housing allocation at least get that one done?

HARROUN: Yes, I can, but, yes, I will do that. I'm not sure it's appropriate, the counsel that I'm receiving right now is bothersome because I don't believe, I understand from a process standpoint, but from a legal standpoint I'm not sure. I will withdraw my motion again.

I **MOVE** that this Commission recommend that the County Council consider adopting a modified version of Method A for configuring the population allocation to give the most flexibility for local planning in each city.

HALBERT: Very good.

BAKER: This is Commissioner Baker. I second that motion.

HALBERT: So, we have a motion and a second. Any other comments on the motion? Okay. So, let's take it to a vote. Sonja.

### **ROLL CALL VOTE**

BERGTHOLD: AYE  
WOGEN: AYE  
HALBERT: AYE  
BAKER: AYE  
HARROUN: AYE

WISER: 5 to 0.

HARROUN: Motion carries.

HALBERT: The motion carries. Okay. Jack, let's go for Number 2 and I think Number 2 is really all about employment lands and maybe we could put that motion all into one because all of that seemed to be lumped together.

HARROUN: So, I'd put a careful analysis, so I would **MOVE** that a careful analysis done of Vancouver's assumption of mixed and low density residential zones to verify the feasibility of actual achieved densities for homes and jobs.

HALBERT: I think that's an excellent motion. That leaves us room for Number 3.

COOK: Ask for a second for Number 2 first and vote on that.

HALBERT: All right. Hearing a motion. Is there a second?

WOGEN: So, I have a comment or question. What I don't understand about that part is all the detail that goes in that, you say they had to make a, go verify or detail, what does that all mean?

HARROUN: So, in our testimonies that we have, like all the public testimonies, I think Vancouver is assuming greater achieved densities and greater job allocation per acre of land than the other communities are and their land allocation is based upon their achieved densities.



So, the pushback is if Vancouver isn't necessarily capturing any amount of new land that they need to capture would be the I think the pushback.

What I would like to do is just a careful analysis of it or recommending a careful analysis of it because I have tremendous respect for Bryan Snodgrass and his staff and -- but I think it's an important question to answer and take a look at and that's not saying yes or no, it's just let's take a good look at the numbers and recommend Council take a good look at the numbers.

COOK: Chair Halbert, you need to call for a second. Sorry.

HALBERT: I was giving Eldon a chance to respond here.

WOGEN: No more comments.

HALBERT: Eldon, would you make a second on that.

WOGEN: Oh, I **second**.

HALBERT: Okay. We have a motion and a second on the table. Any further discussions? Comments? Hearing none, Sonja, would you make a roll call, give us a roll call.

### **ROLL CALL VOTE**

BERGTHOLD: AYE

HALBERT: AYE

WOGEN: AYE

BAKER: I'm going

to say NAY

HARROUN: AYE

WISER: 4/1.

HALBERT: Okay. Jack, let's go through again employment allocations on buildable lands.

HARROUN: Chair, I move for the employment allocation and associated land capacity undergo a more detailed review beginning with reinstating land capacity for construction jobs and review the number of jobs planned for mixed use and have a full detailed review by economic development, commercial and industrial development community before finalizing the land -- the land inventory for all jobs.

HALBERT: Okay. We have a motion on the table. Is there a **second**?

BERGTHOLD: I'm kind of looking to Chris to see, do you have something to say about --

COOK: I'm waiting to see if there's a second.

HALBERT: As the Chair can I make a second?

COOK: Certainly.

HALBERT: Okay. I'd like to **second** that motion.

COOK: So, Mr. Chair, I have a comment. In all GMA planning there is a requirement that the public including any, anyone whether they make money from development or not, be adequately informed of proposals before the county and have an opportunity to participate in the proceedings before the county. So that is a legal requirement.

There has been, well, in the last two Comprehensive Plan updates of various parties appealed the County's decision saying that they had not had an opportunity to participate adequately.

So, I am curious about the legal significance of calling out one group in particular in the county for having notice and an opportunity to participate. By rights those opportunities belong to everyone in the county and people with all interests including of course the development and construction industries.

HALBERT: I think if I'm reading, Chris, correct, Jack, it would be good to cross off specific parties in the motion?

BAKER: I assume we need to -- we had this seconded so we more than likely need to have a vote on this, and if it fails, then maybe we can have another motion.

COOK: If someone would like to propose an amendment to what is on the floor that could be done.

HOLLEY: Who was just speaking before Chris?

BAKER: My apologies. That was Commissioner Baker.

HARROUN: So can we just ask. So, I'm trying to understand. The I guess I'm trying to understand where the tension is here and what we need to do to resolve that.

HALBERT: Sure, Jack. I'd make a recommendation or an amend, that we amend your proposal by striking the groups that need to be part of your proposal, of the motion. Could you read your motion again.

HARROUN: Yeah. So, my **motion** is for the employment allocation and associated land capacity undergo a more detailed review beginning with reinstating land capacity for construction jobs and

review the number of jobs planned for mixed use and have a full detailed review by economic development, commercial and industrial development community before finalizing the land inventory for all jobs. So, I guess from my standpoint I don't see that as any, we're just making a recommendation to County Council to look at this and then include -- and include these parties.

HALBERT: But the inclusion of the parties you have excludes others. It sounds like just those parties will be the ones that will agree that that is the correct allocation, so...

HARROUN: So then would a solution then be and any other interested and any other impacted parties?

HALBERT: It seemed to me like if you stopped before that line it would have been a good recommendation.

HARROUN: Yeah, I can make an amendment.

HALBERT: I'd like to amend your proposal to, and I'm not sure exactly where it ends there, Jack.

BERGTHOLD: Can I add one thing. Commissioner Bergthold. The words final at the end of that to me gives the connotation that it's finalizing the number whereas we're not, we're basically coming up with consensus that that number is realistic.

HARROUN: Before finalizing.

BERGTHOLD: Finalizing process is going to come where the Council votes on it. Before the --

HARROUN: Correct. So, it's saying before the vote happens, please include these people.

BERGTHOLD: Something to that extent, yeah.

HARROUN: But, yeah, that was before --

BERGTHOLD: But using the word final --

HARROUN: It wasn't final, it was finalizing. Yeah. Yeah. So, no, I get what you're saying, I think we're on the same page there, so...

BERGTHOLD: Okay. Thank you.

HALBERT: Bryan here. So, Jack, I'm just recommending that you strike by economic development, commercial and industrial development community and have the before finalizing the land inventory for all jobs follow. Read it again and see. Thanks, Jack.

HARROUN: Gotcha. So, your amendment would be for the employment allocation associated land capacity undergo a more detailed review beginning with reinstating land capacity for construction jobs and review the number of jobs planned for mixed use and have a detailed review --

HALBERT: But continue on.

HARROUN: -- before finalizing land inventory for all jobs.

HALBERT: That's correct.

COOK: Pardon me, just to clarify. That sounded like, Mr. Halbert, you were asking Mr. Harroun if he would accept that as a **friendly amendment**, and if it is accepted as a friendly amendment and you seconded the original proposal, you would have to second your own friendly amendment. Then that would be the proposal before the Commission. So, the next question is for Mr. Harroun.

HARROUN: I would accept that as a **friendly amendment**.

HALBERT: Thank you, Commissioner. Okay.

HARROUN: You need to second it.

HALBERT: I'm going to **second the friendly amendment**. Thank you. And we have a first and a second on the proposed, on the motion. Is there any other comments or discussion? Hearing none, Sonja, would you go for a vote.

### **ROLL CALL VOTE**

BERGTHOLD: I'm going to

vote           NO

HALBERT:    AYE

WOGEN:       NO

BAKER:       AYE

HARROUN:    AYE

WISER: 3/2.

HALBERT: The motion passes.

BAKER: The amendment.

HALBERT: The motion, no, it was a motion.

BERGTHOLD: The motion as an amendment.

HALBERT: Okay. Is there anything else that we need to discuss regarding the public hearing tonight?

ORJIAKO: Planning Commission members, not from me.

HALBERT: Thank you. Then this will conclude the public hearing.

### **OLD BUSINESS**

HALBERT: And we'll move on to any old business. Is there any old business that we need to discuss? Hearing none.

### **NEW BUSINESS**

#### **Election of Chair & Vice Chair**

HALBERT: We have some new business which is the election of the Chair and the Vice Chair. I'm not sure how this process goes, but our current Chair is not with us, Karl Johnson was going to be online, and it would be great if he was here. Can we recommend Karl and vote him in?

ORJIAKO: I think you can.

BAKER: This is Commissioner Baker. I would like to nominate **Karl Johnson** as Chair of the Planning Commission.

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

HALBERT: Great. Any other comments? Okay. Hearing none. We have a motion and a second.

WISER: Unanimous voice vote either way.

HALBERT: Any three unanimous?

WISER: Well, no, voice vote. I'll call.

HALBERT: AYE

BERGTHOLD: AYE

WOGEN: NO

HARROUN: AYE

BAKER: AYE

WISER: 4/1.

### **Election of Vice Chair**

HALBERT: Then we have the election of the Vice Chair. Is there a nomination from the Commissioners?

HARROUN: I would like to nominate **Bryan Halbert** for Vice Chair.

HALBERT: Accepted. Any seconds?

WOGEN: I second. This is Eldon.

HALBERT: We have a motion and a second. And any other discussions? Hearing none, let's have a vote.

### **ROLL CALL VOTE**

BAKER: AYE

HARROUN: AYE

WOGEN: AYE

BERGTHOLD: AYE

HALBERT: AYE

WISER: 5/0.

HALBERT: Motion passes or election passes. And any other comments from the Planning Commission? It's been a long night. I'm ready to go. So I think we can adjourn this meeting. Thank you all for being here.

### **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 CTVV on the following Web Page at:

***<https://www.cvtv.org/program/clark-county-planning-commission>***

Minutes Transcribed by:

Cindy Holley, Court Reporter – Rider & Associates Court Reporting

Sonja Wisner, Program Assistant – Clark County Community Planning