



MEETING SUMMARY

Clark County Buildable Lands Project Advisory Committee

Meeting #5

6/5/2020, 2:00 – 4:00 p.m.

Members Present: Jim Malinowski, Bryan Snodgrass, Ron Barca, Jamie Howsley, Rian Davis, Stephen Abramson, Jeff Swanson, Ryan Makinster, Jerry Olson, Eric Golemo, Jennifer Baker, David McDonald, Marjorie Ledell

Staff and Presenters: Jose Alvarez, Clark County Community Planning; Bob Pool, Clark County GIS; Oliver Orjiako, Clark County Community Planning; Colete Anderson, Clark County Community Planning; Chris Cook, Clark County Attorney; Becky Hewitt, ECONorthwest; Margaret Raimann, ECONorthwest; Nicole Stickney, AHBL; Wayne Carlson, AHBL

Welcome and Status Update

Jose Alvarez welcomed the committee and thanked everyone for their flexibility in participating in the virtual meeting. (This meeting was held virtually due to emergency public health policies related to COVID-19.)

Meeting 4 Summary

Jose Alvarez and ECONorthwest invited clarifications and corrections. Becky Hewitt asked for objections to approving the meeting summary. There were no objections and the summary was approved.

Meeting Process

The Project Team lead each discussion topic with a brief presentation followed by BLPAC discussion and comments. At the end of each topic, ECONorthwest asked each BLPAC member for any additional comments, to provide each member a chance to speak. This discussion is summarized in each topic section below.

Residential in Commercial

Clark County staff and ECONorthwest introduced the topic of residential development on commercial land. The BLPAC discussed the results and asked questions as summarized below.

- Eric Golemo asked for clarification on what is considered undeveloped and asked about the estimated impact on the capacity of units.
- Ron Barca asked whether there are some guidelines for minimums and maximums on these sites to understand how much capacity would be gained. What is the delta from the original designation compared to consumption?
- Jerry Olson asked how vacancy rates may factor into this.
- BLPAC members expressed difficulty in assessing each assumption individually without seeing how it may change overall capacity.
 - The Project Team stated that before the final meeting, we will bring back information about the aggregate impact of the assumptions together.



Infrastructure set asides

AHBL presented the findings of the infrastructure set asides analysis, which was followed by a BLPAC discussion, summarized below.

Presentation

- AHBL discussed the variations in stormwater manuals and the difference in adoption of those manuals by jurisdiction.
 - The analysis looked at subdivisions in different periods of time, so the numbers don't necessarily match the exact manual adoption dates. Some projects in the pipeline were designed under previous iteration of a manual.
 - New manual requirements overall indicate stormwater facilities are about 34% larger, and thus resulted in an increase of land consumption for these facilities.
- AHBL included the other considerations for infrastructure
 - Roads, which were pretty consistent over time in terms of land consumption
 - Utilities - often don't need their own set asides, number is smaller than others
 - Open space - no year to year trends, but differences in jurisdictions
 - Accounted for critical lands, did not double count
- County staff clarified off-site infrastructure needs
 - Model currently excludes publicly owned lands (parks, schools, etc) in capacity for residential development, as well as tax exempt properties (e.g. churches)

Discussion

- Eric Golemo referenced the soil classification memo previously shared with the BLPAC
 - Numbers are skewed based on where the County developed in the past, reasonable for "Green" soils. Orange and Red soil areas are the ones we're adding to UGA now. Can't always take care of this with LID. Becomes non economical to develop these sites.
 - Stated that half of open space in Ridgefield has to be outside of critical areas.
 - Referenced Engineering Advisory Board on-site infrastructure examples, which showed 36.2% of newly developed sites for infrastructure, and recommended a deduction of 32-36%. Also referenced a 36.3% recommendation from another group with more detailed sites.
 - Stated that other jurisdictions in the state use 35-40% for infrastructure deduction.
- County staff confirmed the requirements for open space development in Ridgefield, and that half of open space has to be outside of critical lands. Ridgefield is a unique circumstance, however. Other jurisdictions' open space requirements are up to developer.
- Becky Hewitt asked whether AHBL could look at the range for stormwater set asides to see what the high end looks like in terms of soil.
 - AHBL confirmed that is possible to look at.
- Jerry Olson stated that the set asides should be closer to 57%.
 - Some leftover plats were hold overs until after the recession (subject to historic stormwater).
 - RGF did a study that showed 36.6% on sites reviewed in individual study. Olson shared this study with County staff.
 - Off-site infrastructure in the study was 20% (parks, schools)
 - Counted number of churches in the phone book, calculated based on population
 - Other needed infrastructure: road widening, community facilities, etc.
- County staff stated that schools usually have 6-year plan, and identify existing properties they have planned for their needs in the future. It has been difficult to estimate beyond that in past reports.
- Bryan Snodgrass observed that the survey seems extensive, as it looked at all of long plats, not just a sample. Snodgrass asked whether it's possible to include multifamily versus single family.
 - County staff said it may be possible after cleaning up odd cases.
- Ron Barca stated interest in seeing the impact that the Ridgefield data had on the overall results, and would like to see the total (rather than increments) for other studies referenced by BLPAC members (i.e., RGF study).

Market Factor

County staff provided an update on market factor assumptions. They are working on a recommendation for never to convert and additional market factor. They provided clarification on bringing in the 15% market

factor into the model (not demand side as it is now). This needs to be explicit, explaining how the market factor is treated. This was followed by BLPAC discussion, summarized below.

- David McDonald provided a summary of his written comments.
 - DOC guidelines discuss market factors not exceeding 25%. Would like clarification on that. Stated that “never to convert” seems to work in what is defined as market factor, and the 15% seems to add in excess.
- County staff clarified the way market factor (demand side) has been used in the past is at council's discretion.
 - If brought into the model, its purpose must be demonstrated.
 - The County has not been challenged on the 15% assumption (outside of the model) in the past.
 - The County will reassess whether the never to convert could be considered as the market factor, then carefully document if deciding to include in the model.
- Bryan Snodgrass provided a summary of his written comments.
 - Need as much hard data as we can get.
 - Would be good to look at shorter period of time for when we know data/land designations haven't changed.
 - If we're going to have extra 15%, it needs to be data driven.
- Eric Golemo expressed that it is difficult to put market factor into a number. There is a disconnect between factor and what's happening in the field, and it's not an exact science.
 - What are other jurisdictions using?
 - A lot of times, never to convert areas have no funding mechanism for infrastructure.
- Jeff Swanson stated that he has worked on a few projects recently with site access issues, utility connections, etc., which impacts feasibility. He has seen developers walk away from projects for these or other reasons. How can we account for that?
- Rian Davis asked whether the Project Team can dive further into this. It seems worth discussing more in depth, and find out what methods would be reliable to get to an answer.
- Stephen Abramson stated it seems clear that there is a disconnect, and we need to figure out how factors were determined.
- Ryan Makinster agreed with the need for more data to make a decision.
- Ron Barca asked how other jurisdictions are responding.
- Jerry Olson asked about the differentiation between the two factors and the potential political reasons for not converting.

Update on other topics from the County:

County staff provided an update on topics from previous meetings, including redevelopment and employment land classifications. This discussion is summarized below

Redevelopment

County staff explained that they used a 5% factor in 2015. There was an issue of existing capacity that exceeded the population projection. There have been conversations about differences in/out of Vancouver Central City. Development on commercial land assumes no residential development, so the delta (if assuming residential on those lands) will be large.

Employment land classifications

County staff summarized discussions with CREDC. The Land for Jobs tool is tailored to shovel ready property. They are getting data about brownfields to see if that can be added to critical layer, and will continue to look at this issue, including the priority habitat biodiversity layer. On site specific issues with regard to industrial land, County staff asked for specific parcel numbers to review potential discrepancies.

Public Comment

- Carol Levanen

- The memorandum from CREDC industrial lands committee has important information to consider in industrial lands. The memo argues that many of the lands in Vancouver are port properties, mostly dependent upon river transport.
 - Look carefully at things and the purpose (e.g., high tech site needs)
- Susan Rasmussen
 - Moving forward, would be a good practice to use best practices from regional professionals that have to worked with these models on the ground. Use what they submitted into the record. CCCU has heard folks express that the numbers artificially inflate the amount of readily available land, and that there is not a plentiful supply.

Preview of Next Meeting Topics

- Next steps
 - Meeting in July on regularly scheduled meeting date.
 - Helpful to submit comments prior.
 - More time to review materials for September meeting
- Follow up on Yacolt issue
 - Since Yacolt doesn't have an assigned density target, the point is moot (no metric for reasonable measures), so there is no proposed change. Included comment from attorney from Yacolt in public comment online.
 - County staff welcome comments/further from Yacolt going forward. The purpose of the buildable lands work is to look back at what happened.