



Clark County Planning Commission

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

CLARK COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 2024 MINUTES OF PUBLIC HEARING

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

CALL TO ORDER

Planning Commission Rules of Procedure

CALL TO ORDER

WISER: We are ready to begin the hearing.

JOHNSON: Sorry, Cindy. I'd like to call this meeting to order. Good evening, Planning Commissioners, members of the public and staff members.

Before we begin this evening's hearing, I would like to introduce Mark Bergthold and Jeremy Baker, this is to my left Jeremy, and this is to my right Mark, which are two new planning members recently appointed to the City Council (sic). So welcome Jeremy and welcome Mark, nice to have you aboard and I'd like to call this hybrid public meeting to order for Thursday, February 15th, 2024.

My name is Karl Johnson, and I am the Chairman of the Clark County Planning Commission. Sonja, could we get this one to turn down. It's okay, Sonya will come fix it. It's just an echo, it's not mine. Good. There we go. Nope. There we go. We're still on. Don't worry, it's happened to me. I think it's on here. We're still on there, Sonja, that's fine.

The Planning Commission will conduct a public hearing tonight and take testimony. If any public comments were received before tonight's hearing, they 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. Keep working on it. County staff will present first and then the Planning Commission can ask questions. Next, we will invite the applicant to speak, if there is one, then the members of the public who wish to provide testimony.

When we get to the public comment portion 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 the hearing agenda, please sign up via the sign-up sheets in 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. We ask that you please do not repeat testimony that has already been provided.

At the conclusion of public testimony, staff and the applicant may respond to comments and the public portion of the hearing will then be closed. The Planning Commission will then deliberate and make recommendations to the 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 a second, please state your name for our court reporter.

Tonight, I first would like to ask, were there any conflicts of interest? Is there any Planning Commission members that have any? Seeing none, we will do a roll call and introduction of any guests. Sonja, can we get a roll call.

ROLL CALL VOTE & INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

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

Staff Present: Oliver Orjiako, Community Planning Director; Christine Cook, Prosecuting Attorney; Steve Archer, Prosecuting Attorney; Bryan Mattson, Community Development Planner III; Sonja Wisner, Program Assistant; Amy Wooten, Planner III; and Cindy Holley, Court Reporter.

GENERAL & NEW BUSINESS

A. Approval of Agenda for February 15, 2024

JOHNSON: Next, I will look for approval and a second for the agenda for February 15th, 2024. Can I have a motion, please.

HALBERT: Karl, that was February 15th?

JOHNSON: February 15th, 2024, approval for the agenda.

HALBERT: I **Move** that we approve tonight's agenda.

JOHNSON: Do I have a second?

HARROUN: Jack Harroun. I'll **Second** it.

JOHNSON: Can we get a roll call, Sonja, please.

ROLL CALL VOTE

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

WISER: 6/0.

JOHNSON: Okay. Outcome is passed.

B. Approval of Minutes for October 19, 2023

JOHNSON: Can I get a motion and a second for approval of the minutes for October 19th, 2023. That's pretty far back. Sonja, is that correct?

WISER: Yes.

JOHNSON: Okay. Thank you. Can I get a motion.

HALBERT: Mr. Chair, I **Move** that we approve the October 19th minutes as presented.

JOHNSON: Can I get a second, please.

WOGEN: This is Eldon. I **Second**.

JOHNSON: Hearing a motion and a second. Sonja, can we get a roll call, please.

ROLL CALL VOTE

HALBERT: AYE
WOGEN: AYE
HARROUN: AYE
BERGTHOLD: AYE
BAKER: ABSTENTION
JOHNSON: AYE

JOHNSON: It passes 5/1 abstention.

WISER: 5 and 1 abstention.

C. Communications from the Public

JOHNSON: Okay. Section C, any communications from the public that are not listed on our agenda. Sonja, can you please provide the instructions.

WISER: Amy, can you share the comment instructions on the overhead screen. Okay. For attendees using their computer or Webex application, if you would like to speak, please use the raised-hand icon. For attendees using the telephone, which is audio only, 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 can come to the microphone toward the front of the room. Public comments are limited to three minutes per person in order to accommodate all speakers. Again, this portion of tonight's hearing is only for items that are not listed on the agenda. So are there any people calling in, Amy?

WOOTEN: There are three attendees calling in. I don't see any hands raised.

WISER: No hands raised. Okay. Is there anyone in the audience that would like to testify on a non-hearing agenda item? Okay. With that, we'll return it back to the public hearing.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEM

Fall 2023 Biannual Code Updates: Proposed amendments to various sections of Clark County Code Title 40 (Unified Development Code) for corrections, clarifications, and minor changes.

Staff: Brent Davis, Program Manager III, Brent.davis@clark.wa.gov or (564) 397-4152

JOHNSON: Okay. So now we're moving to the public hearing that are on the agenda tonight. A reminder to the public, if you are providing public testimony in person, please sign up on the sheet in the back. If you are joining remotely, instructions will be provided to you once again at the appropriate time. With that said, tonight we'll be dealing with the Biannual Code Amendments. Staff presentation

by Bryan Mattson, Community Development. Bryan.

MATTSON: Good evening, Commissioners, staff and the general public. My name is Bryan Mattson, I'm a Land Use Planner, I'm here for Clark County Community Development. I am covering for Brent Davis whose name appears on the PowerPoint presentation tonight, and I'm going to walk you through the presentation and hopefully answer any questions that pop up.

So periodically staff batch minor amendments to the Clark County Code for Council's consideration. Some of the proposed changes include correction of scrivener's errors, updated references, clarifying of standards and proposed minor policy changes. These batches of code changes are commonly known as Biannual Code Amendments.

This presentation tonight is limited to proposed changes to Title 40 only. Amendments to other titles are proceeding directly to Council.

Just some of the notes on the process. We gather proposed updates from prior Council direction, staff, DEAB, which is Development Engineering Advisory Board, and customer suggestions. We prepare preliminary draft updates. We reviewed these updates with DEAB on 10/5/23 with a recommendation to Council. The Council work session on 10/18/23 resulted in an approval to proceed. We issued a 60-day notice to Commerce for these Title 40 updates on 10/17/23.

We prepared the legal, or we've done a legal review of final draft to the updates and the SEPA review is in process, or I'm sorry, it's not in process, it has been finalized. The DNS was finalized on 1/18/24. We're at the second from the bottom step on this list, we're at the Planning Commission work session and hearing for the Title 40 update. The Council will hear these -- the Council hearing for the proposed adoption will occur 3/26 of 2024. The SEPA comment period closed on 1/18.

Two comments have been received to date. One was supportive of changes to the Type II-A neighborhood meeting, and one was a request from Washington Department of Fish & Wildlife to add an additional amendment to 40.350.

A note about the SEPA determination: Community Development combined the SEPA review for these Title 40 amendments with concurrent biannual updates to other titles of the code. Comments that did not pertain to proposed amendments to Title 40 will be presented to Council for consideration.

This is just kind of a general list of the proposed changes, it doesn't list all of the changes because some of the changes are pretty minor in nature, a comma here, a period there. But we have a revision to address the Ecology comments on the adopted Shoreline Amendment.

We're revising -- we're proposing to revise the rural ADU size and access standards. We're proposing to remove garages from the cottage housing floor area. We're clarifying the shared recreation space requirements for multi-family housing.

Increasing the public notice radius for land use applications. Requiring a pre-application conference for major home businesses. And we're updating the developer neighborhood/community meeting requirements for the Type II-A process.

It's my understanding that you all have a copy of these code amendments where you have the section highlighted in yellow, the letters or words that are struck through are meant to be deleted and then the additional language has two lines underneath.

There's also, I'd like to point out, there's also a reminder, a rash- -- I'm sorry, a rationale or a kind of an explaining statement at the end of these, rationale, I'm sorry, at the end of these changes to kind of explain how they came about and why we're proposing the changes.

This first slide is from the Washington Department of Fish & Wildlife request. The yellow in the bottom is basically they wanted to add the bottom language so that because there are State guidelines for culverts, the sizing of culverts and basically the language is "These standards may be superseded where culverts are placed within waters subject to regulation under Revised Code of Washington 77.55, 77.57 or Washington Administrative Code 220-660." These changes are meant to align our standards with the State. Go ahead and skip this slide, it seems to be just a synopsis. So, I know that I went through that fast, but if you want to go down the list of the individual changes, we can talk about them.

JOHNSON: Yeah. So that was one question I had, and I apologize for not seeing this document, but so I have scrivener errors and minor changes, are they separated out so just from scrivener's errors to the changes specifically?

MATTSON: Some of them will say that they're scrivener errors when we, when the code language is pasted below the heading. You can see there's on Line 12, SCRIVENER'S ERRORS AND MINOR CHANGES, some of that will fall into that category.

Yes, all the scrivener stuff comes first under 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 and 9, and then the other ones, then you start a list of REFERENCE UPDATES AND CLEAN-UPS FROM OTHER CODE CHANGES.

BAKER: Now is this, this list in and of its entirety of all the --

WISER: Jeremy, can you identify yourself for the court reporter.

BAKER: Thank you. Jeremy Baker. Now, is this all of the changes?

MATTSON: Yes, sir. I thought I'd save you from reading through each page of --

BAKER: There was quite a few, I looked through them, so I just wanted to make sure that they were all represented here.

MATTSON: If you have questions about any individual one, I'm here to answer whatever questions you

may have.

JOHNSON: Gentlemen, go ahead and just jump in with questions and just make sure you state your name.

HARROUN: This is Jack Harroun. On Page 9, Number 5, the clarification for responsibility for payment of recording fees, originally the intent from my understanding of the deferred impact fees was to help reduce the cost of, the carrying cost specifically, the building, of paying impact fees prior to occupation because it could be six, nine months or a year even, is there -- and I understand the logic between of having a recorded deferred impact fee, but the expense of the recording of the fee can often supersede the cost of the savings to the developer on the impact fee.

Is there a reason why it has to actually be recorded versus just making it a condition of final building inspection?

MATTSON: No. I'm going to give you my opinion, but I'd rather refer to legal counsel. Anything that's a covenant has to be recorded, number one. I mean, if it's going to bind the property, it should be recorded, but for more legal arguments, I'd much rather refer to Steve on this, Steve Archer.

HARROUN: I guess my question is does it need to be a covenant, can it just be a condition of the -- is there a reason why it can't be just a condition of the building permit of the, of like the final inspection of the building permit versus actually -- because the intent of the Washington State Law was to reduce housing costs and the act of having to record impact, the deferral of impact fees on the actual title is, especially when you're looking at single-family, is actually pretty significant especially with the new recording fees, so it kind of, it's counter to the goal of the intent of the original law.

And so I'm just wondering why we can't as a jurisdiction just make it a condition of before you can call in your final building inspections, you have to pay your, before you can get a final occupancy, you have to pay your obviously the, your impact fees.

MATTSON: Right. And forgive me. So, you're not in favor of that is what you're saying?

HARROUN: I'm not in favor of having to have it recorded.

MATTSON: The payment of the impact fees. You know, I'd rather defer to Mr. Archer on this. I'm hoping that Mr. Archer has --

HARROUN: Yeah. And there could very well be some law that I don't understand or some nuance in the law, but...

MATTSON: Steve, would you mind?

ARCHER: Good evening.

JOHNSON: Can you get speak in the mic, Steve. Yeah. There's the second one, there you go.

ARCHER: Can you hear me now? Thank you. Good evening, Mr. Chairman, Commissioner, Commissioners. My name is Steve Archer, Deputy Prosecuting Attorney for Clark County. I advise the Department of Community Development.

As I understand your question, the requirement for a covenant is it's a policy matter that's been decided through this end of the code. I'm not aware, and I could return with an answer whether that State law mandates this or whether there's any leeway, but as covenants serve to typically bind successive owners as these do, and so that's a tool that's set.

So, whether it could be done with a different mechanism and not a -- or whether a covenant would be required, would be a policy matter that is, it would be my -- does that address your --

HARROUN: Yeah, kind of. I mean, I think if we're looking at this and it's now making the recording, you know, fees explicitly the responsibility of the developer or the builder and the intent of the rule from the State of Washington was that that those fees could be delayed until final occupancy of the structure, but then we're adding additional cost.

And I understand the protection mechanism because it will come up at closing or it will come up at, you know, and so there's always the potential that a building can get approved by some mech- -- you know, by some accident, you know, at the county level and then those fees weren't collected, but I'm just the intent of the State law is not being met in my opinion by the county code and that's what I'm trying to see if it can be corrected or if there's a mechanism to correct that.

MATTSON: Mr.- -- or, Councilor Harroun, again this is Bryan Mattson. Just, I just want to add that typically impact fees are paid at the issuance of a building permit. So, if the developer wants to defer that, then the cost should fall upon the developer to defer that is I think the point.

HARROUN: Well, the point but so we worked really hard to get the State law to, we being the building industries, you know, worked really hard to get the State law so we could defer those fees.

So because if you take like Ridgefield kind of for example where you have a 17 and \$18,000 school impact fee, you have the sewer impact fee, you know, and you have 30 or \$40,000 in impact fees potentially and then you're paying interest on that for six months, nine months to a year for something that hasn't been an impact yet and so that's where the State law came in and said, well, it should be at the time of actual occupancy and so there's kind of the history of the State law.

And then so when we're having to back end record that, we're creating an additional expense that's counter to the original goal of the law, and so that's what my, that was my question if there was a mechanism where we can still make it attached, like you can't get, you can't even call on final building until, until those fees are paid, but eliminate the cost and expense of creating a covenant, so...

ARCHER: I understand. Once again, Steve Archer. With regards to your question, I understand. What I will say is I can't comment on the policy choices that are made here and so my observation would be perhaps that the deferral, and I understand that there's a cost that's being and a choice to be made, the deferral, the covenant provides a mechanism for ensuring that those deferred fees are paid by somebody at some future time and so that would be my only comment. Thank you.

BAKER: This is Jeremy Baker. What is the actual expense for recording these fees?

MATTSON: I have to admit that I don't know what that expense is. It changes per district. Commissioner Harroun apparently has a better idea of this than I do, and I apologize, but maybe you could share what the difference is.

HARROUN: Yeah. This is Commissioner Harroun. I would have to look at the current rate but I want to say the State passed something pretty recently that was a couple hundred dollars per document, and then depending on how the documents are recorded, and I'm not, so I'm not 100 percent sure, but then there's also the expense of preparing the documents versus kind of a wrote, you know, tag on any building thing, certain things can't be called in until the other thing is passed, right, you know, you can't.

And so instead of using a very simple mechanism to ensure payment, it becomes very complicated, and it's cleared through a title company and so that's what I'm hoping that we can solve.

HALBERT: Yeah, Bryan Halbert here. Just a quick look at the Clark County's recording fees, they're about \$303 per document, and then they probably add on something per page or a document that's abnormal, but you're in that \$300 plus range.

BAKER: So that could add up pretty quick is what -- how many documents on a --

HALBERT: It's just per document and there could be multiple pages in a document. It's still less money than paying the impact fee upfront and the interest on that impact fee.

JOHNSON: Any other questions?

WOGEN: I had one.

JOHNSON: Go ahead and state your name for --

WOGEN: So, this is Eldon. So on the notification to owners of property, I know we discussed this at the workshop, and it increased from 300 to 500 for urban and 500 to 1,000 feet for rural and I think you told me that the 1,000 feet was picked because you surveyed other counties what that distance was, and the only reason I bring this up, I live in the area of five-acre lots, 1,000 feet is not very far or I'm just wondering if there should be some consideration to expanding that.

MATTSON: So that number was brought about obviously because it's a very nice round number and the significant increase in these radius', notice radiuses were the intent and the public often comment on that when they comment on different projects that they feel that they not -- there wasn't enough notice radius.

I don't know what other jurisdictions were looked at to find that 1,000 feet for rural areas, but it's certainly within the Council's, I'm sorry, the Commission's purview to recommended more or less if you choose.

WOGEN: Oliver, do you remember what the -- I think Jose presented it last week, I mean a couple of weeks ago and I was just curious of what that looked like in other counties.

FURTH: Commissioner --

ORJIAKO: This is Oliver Orjiako, Community Planning Director. Commissioner Eldon, I think it was Brent Davis that provided the, yeah, it was Brent and I can't recall what other counties we looked at, but I believe that some other county we typically look at for example Spokane County to see, which is very similar to Clark County, but I cannot tell you exactly what other counties were looked at, but as Bryan is saying here, it used to be 500, it's going up to 1,000.

If the Planning Commission believe it should be more than that, you can make that recommendation, but I believe that the 1,000 radius, depending on where your property is, you're correct you may find the 1,000 radius significant enough to do the notice.

If you are in a 10 acre or even 20-acre site, 1,000 radius may not catch a lot of property owners, but the consensus or the research was that this is reasonable given where we have been in the past.

WOGEN: All right. Thank you.

FURTH: Commissioner, can you hear me?

JOHNSON: Who's speaking?

FURTH: April Furth, Director of Community Development.

JOHNSON: Okay. Go ahead, April.

FURTH: We did do background, so we looked at Washington State which is 300 and 500 which is what the code said. We went to King County which is 500. We looked at Pierce County which is 300. Snohomish County was 500 and 1,000, they were actually the biggest, they were the biggest radius which is why we chose to mimic that.

Spokane County is 400 feet. City of Vancouver is 500 feet. City of Battle Ground is 500. And then as you can see we were 3 and 5, so that's why we chose, we actually went to the highest radius of any jurisdiction that we could find.

WOGEN: This is Eldon. That's great information. Thank you, April.

JOHNSON: Thank you. Any other questions?

HARROUN: This is Jack Harroun. Question on the 60-day notice to Commerce. So, the documents you've provided us I'm assuming so that went to Commerce 60 days ago?

MATTSON: In August or October, I believe is what the slide.

HARROUN: Whenever the -- and then so my question is if there was substantial changes that this Commission made, does that have to go back to Commerce or is it just, it's a notification to Commerce but is there if we had made like some substantial changes like at a workshop or before a hearing, does that -- are we doing the cycle backwards I guess is what I'm asking, should it go to the Planning Commission prior to going to the 60-day notice to Commerce if we're going to make recommendations?

ARCHER: I'll take that question. Steve Archer again. No, the requirement to go to Department of Commerce is statutory and that is done, it must be done initially.

HARROUN: I guess, yeah, so I, yeah, I understand that there was a statutory thing. But I guess my question is if we make changes, is that, is that allowable, like does that create a problem with the Department of Commerce or it's just it was the starting point?

ORJIAKO: This is Oliver again. No, Planning Commissioner Harroun. As Steve indicated the statute require us prior to amendment or adoption, we have to submit the proposed changes to Commerce 60 days prior to the final decision.

Now, the final decision will be made by Council, and each time we update our code, we are required to send that proposed code to give them sufficient time to review that and provide comment.

I can attest that very rarely do they submit comments back to us except in some cases, may be shoreline which Ecology has the opportunity to review and make final or critical area ordinances which they themselves even with the approval of Council, those type of changes don't go into effect until Ecology approves them as an example, but in cases like this we send it to Commerce for us to meet that 60-day review.

We don't go back to them and tell them here are the changes that the County made, but we've fulfilled that statutory requirement by the time that the Council makes the final decision, we would have met that statutory requirement. And like I said, it gives them that opportunity that we fulfilled that

requirement to send it to them 60 days prior to the final action.

But what you're reviewing it's in, how will I put it, it's a legislative process, it will go to you and it will go to the Council for final decision and we don't go back and say Commerce here's what the Council decided, but you have the opportunity now to make changes that you will feel necessary and make that recommendation to Council, they will make the final decision.

Very similar to when we do a SEPA for example, that requires us to do 60 to, in some cases you have 60 days or 30 days before the final action is made, we don't go back and change our determination under SEPA for example until that's the document that we will be working until the Council makes their final decision. All we are currently reporting is the comment that we're receiving until the Council makes their final decision.

HARROUN: Thank you.

JOHNSON: Thank you. Any other questions? Okay. With that said, I'd like to open the hearing for public testimony. Sonja.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

WISER: Amy, can you share the comment instructions on the overhead screen. For members of the audience, 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 hearing, or request to be a party of record.

If written comments were received prior to February 15th, they were submitted to the Planning Commission members and posted on the Planning Commission website. Tonight's hearing is being transcribed by a court reporter, so please spell your first and last name and speak slowly. Public comment is limited to three minutes.

So, we'll begin tonight with in person comments and begin with participants in the hearing room. Is there anybody here that would wish to speak? Okay.

So, we'll go with the Webex and the phone callers next. We'll begin with the participants that have joined remotely via computer or telephone. Please raise your virtual hand or press star 3 on your phone to let us know you would like to provide comment. Amy, do you see anybody that would like to speak?

WOOTEN: I do not.

WISER: Okay. Thank you. There is no one else wishing to speak, Karl, so we will return it back to the Planning Commission.

Return to Planning Commission

JOHNSON: Thank you. We will now close the public testimony. And there is, since there is none, staff will have no need to respond and we'll bring it back to us, gentlemen. This is the time where we'll have any deliberations. Please again make sure you state your name before you speak. Anybody who would like to speak?

HALBERT: Are you going to go down the list?

JOHNSON: I can do that. Sure. Bryan Halbert.

HALBERT: No comment.

JOHNSON: Eldon.

WOGEN: No comment.

JOHNSON: Jack.

HARROUN: No comment.

JOHNSON: Mark.

BERGTHOLD: No comment.

JOHNSON: Jeremy.

BAKER: No comment.

JOHNSON: As usual, I'd like to thank you guys for coming in tonight. You stepped in you said last minute?

MATTSON: Yes, sir.

JOHNSON: That's a good deal, Bryan, thank you so much you guys, it's unheralded and I appreciate all the work that you guys do. So , if I could, since there's no comments, I'll look for a motion. Make sure you state your name, and a second and of course state your name for that, and then as soon as we do that, we can provide a roll call.

HALBERT: All right. Karl, Bryan Halbert here, and I'd like to make a **Motion** that we approve the Fall 2023 Biannual Code Updates as presented.

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

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

ROLL CALL VOTE

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

WISER: 6/0.

JOHNSON: We have a motion that passes 6/0. And with that, that would conclude our items for our public hearing for tonight. Moving on, do we have any old business?

OLD BUSINESS

None.

JOHNSON: Any new business? That's when we talk to Oliver. Oliver.

NEW BUSINESS

ORJIAKO: Thank you. Thank you, Chair Karl. This is Oliver Orjiako again speaking, Community Planning Director. I want to take this opportunity to welcome the two new members to the Planning Commission. Thank you for your volunteering to serve, Planning Commissioner Jeremy Baker and Mark Bergthold, so congratulations. You're going to be seeing a lot of us this year because we are in the plan amendment of our 20-year growth plan.

I would also like to invite the Planning Commission to attend the lunch between the Planning Commission and Council.

For some of you that have been here long enough, we used to do that in the past, and I'm trying to bring that back again where you have opportunity to dialogue with the Council, share your thoughts, and they themselves sharing, expressing their expectations. So, that will be on the 29th. We also will use that opportunity to present former PC member Matt Swindell a farewell and thank him for his service.

And on the 29th as well, we have a special hearing, we don't use to have this hearing before, but we felt that because of the recent changes to the State law, particularly as it pertains to housing, the hearing will be on the allocation of the population and employment projection that the Council have

made decision on.

The State requires us to the changes made to House Bill 1220 which pertains to Clark County because we have a huge unincorporated area that we are managing, so House Bill 1220 pertains to us. For some of the cities, they have to deal with House Bill 1110 or 1011, I can't remember the numbers again, but the allocation will focus on population employment and housing, and we would like to use that opportunity to have the public weigh in on the allocation.

I can share with you that we have been having dialogue, conversation with our local partners since, I will say since December and it's a very complex process, but we are at a point where we have to do the allocation and then have the local jurisdiction run with that and engage their own council and citizenry on how to allocate that growth within their jurisdiction.

I must also say, it hasn't passed, but there is a bill, we are required to complete this process on or before June 30th, 2025. There is a bill in the legislature that wants to extend that to December 31st, 2025, given the 2025 adopt this gives six more months. I don't know what that will do if it passes. If it passes, we will adjust some of our schedule, but for now we are on the track to see if we can complete the process by June 30th of 2025.

Just want to let you know that that's on the table, if it could pass, if it passes, it gives us additional six months, but for whatever it's worth we will adjust that accordingly. Just want to share that with you. And again, welcoming the two new members, good to see you and that's all I have, Mr. Chair.

JOHNSON: Thank you, Oliver. I appreciate that.

COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION

JOHNSON: Are there any comments from the Planning Commissioners?

HALBERT: Bryan Halbert here. Just I'm a little confused about the March meeting schedule. I saw a notice today that there was no planning --

WISER: Right now, we don't have anything, but we will let you know if something changes.

JOHNSON: Okay. One more thing also, check on this, Oliver, that we will vote, we need a vice chair. And, again, I'm doing a lot of work out of town so it will -- I know we have two new members, but it's always nice to have somebody else that can do this, so I don't know if we can do that next meeting.

ORJIAKO: Will you be, if I may ask, will you be out next --

JOHNSON: I will make -- I won't -- the work session will be I should be online but the meeting, the --

JOHNSON: -- hearing I'll be here. I think we can do it either place, I mean it doesn't necessarily --

ORJIAKO: Yeah, I'm looking at sometime in March. Typically, we have the election as you know in January of every year by your bylaw.

JOHNSON: Yes.

ORJIAKO: But the filling the two or the three positions delayed that. So, the Council just made the selection a few weeks ago, so with that they also went, asked me because the luncheon was originally scheduled for December, no, January 25th, we had to move that to accommodate the two new members so that they can join that luncheon, so for that reason I'm thinking that your election of chair and vice chair should occur next month.

JOHNSON: So, will you just put that on the agenda so I can see it, I mean it's fine, just whenever.

WISER: So, are we going to be having a hearing in March?

ORJIAKO: It's hard to say now because I don't know really. It's hard to say. I know that we want to -- we don't have anything for a work session in March. I would like to do it in March, maybe we'll find something to put on your agenda just to get that done because I don't want it to be lingering.

JOHNSON: I think it's lingered before, but I understand all the complexities. Thank you.

ORJIAKO: I'm glad to -- I'm happy to see you, you know.

COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION

JOHNSON: Yes, glad to be back. Thank you. I miss everybody and I know it's been a time but please be patient. I just want to say I appreciate staff and especially Oliver in being patient with his chair and things that happen in life, so thank you. With that said, gentlemen, our first hearing as a new group is adjourned. Thank you.

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 CTVTV 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