



CP16 #0222



CHECKING IN ON OUR FUTURE

2016 COMPREHENSIVE
GROWTH MANAGEMENT PLAN

OPEN HOUSE

Environmental Impact Statement – Scoping

WELCOME!

Purpose of this open house

To provide you with information about the alternatives Clark County is studying to accommodate the population and employment growth expected over the next 20 years.

Share your ideas

We encourage you to share any thoughts and information or concerns with staff.

Ask questions, too. That helps us as we do our analysis.

There will also be additional opportunities for you to provide input as the process continues.

Thank you

Thank you for joining us this evening. We appreciate your time and interest in helping plan for our community's future.



Possible alternatives

1. No action alternative

The adopted 2007 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan, as amended. This would include current urban growth boundaries, planning assumptions, policies, and implementation ordinances.

2. County-initiated actions

The new planning assumptions, policy direction, changes in land use/zoning, and principles and values defined by the commissioners will be used in this alternative.

3. City-initiated actions

The cities of Battle Ground, La Center, and Ridgefield are considering expanding their urban growth areas to support job growth.

Clark County 2015-2035 Comprehensive Plan Review Scoping Open House



Oliver Orjiako, Director, Community Planning



Scoping Open Houses ~ August, 2014

Welcome!



Welcome to tonight's meeting!
Thank you for attending.



Agenda




1. Purpose of the meeting

- a. Introduce the SEPA Process
- b. Answer questions about the comp plan update
- c. Comment

2. Next steps




2016 Comprehensive Plan progress to date



State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA)

- Requires potential environmental impacts from projects and non-development projects be reviewed
- Requires preparation of environmental impact statements (EIS) for large projects
- EIS contains: description of proposal and alternatives; analyses of potential impacts; known and potential mitigation
- EIS presents options and effects; not a decision document
- Scoping meetings initiate process

General SEPA Process



Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)

Elements of the environment studied

Natural environment:

- Earth
- Water
- Fish and wildlife habitat
- Energy and natural resources

Built environment:

- Land and shoreline use
- Transportation
- Public services and utilities
- GMA conformance

2016 Comp Plan Update - SEPA Process

- Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) prepared for 2007 comprehensive plan update studied a large area (maximum study area on the handout map)
- Urban growth boundaries (UGBs) established with adoption of 2007 plan
- Challenges to 2007 plan resulted in current UGBs
- Growth Management Act (GMA) requires a 20-year land supply
- Can vacant and buildable lands in current urban growth areas accommodate population and employment, based on planning assumptions adopted by the Board?

2016 Planning Assumptions

Assumption	2016
2035 total population projection	562,207
Projected new residents	136,844
Urban/rural population growth split	90/10
Assumed annual population growth rate	1.12%
Housing type ratio	No more than 75% of one housing type
Persons per household	2.66
New jobs	91,200
Jobs to household ratio	1:1
Infrastructure deduction, residential	27.7%
Infrastructure deduction, commercial and industrial	25%
VBLM (definition of vacant)	\$13,000 residential, \$67,500 commercial and industrial
Market factor	15% residential; 15% commercial, business park, industrial

2016 Comp Plan Update-SEPA Process



- Given the planning assumptions and the amount of vacant and buildable land, there appears to be enough land to accommodate the 20-year growth projection
- Preparing a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement EIS (SEIS) based on 2007 EIS



2016 Comp Plan Update-SEPA Process



Possible SEIS alternatives:

1. No action alternative: present plan as is
2. County-initiated actions to include:
 - Public facilities zoning designation
 - Map clean ups/recent BOCC decisions (SMO)
 - Arterial map update
 - Sub-area plans
 - Rural lands
3. City requests

SEPA Process Schedule



Purpose of the Open House



Let us know what else should be considered in the environmental review process.

- **Information stations:**
 - Current comprehensive plan
 - Planning assumptions
 - Environmental constraints/built environment
 - Transportation system
 - Parks
- **Staff available to answer questions**

Food System Council

The Clark County Food System Council's mission is to increase and preserve access to safe, local and healthy food for all residents of Clark County by:

- Strengthening the connections between food, health, natural resource protection, economic development and the agricultural community.
- Researching, analyzing and reporting on information about the local food system.
- Advocating and advising on food system and food policy implementation.
- Promoting and providing education on food system issues.



Ways to provide comments

- Fill out a comment sheet.
- Submit a comment on the web:
 - www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments
- Email a comment to comp.plan@clark.wa.gov
- Submit a comment in writing:
 - Comprehensive Plan EIS Scoping
Community Planning
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666
- **Comments are due September 1, 2014.**

Questions?



www.clark.wa.gov/planning/



CHECKING IN ON OUR FUTURE



Environmental Impact Statement – Scoping OPEN HOUSE

Purpose of this open house

Clark County is revising its Comprehensive Growth Management Plan. As part of the process, the county will prepare a supplemental environmental impact statement (SEIS) in compliance with the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA). The review process will keep the public informed about environmental impacts anticipated under each of the proposed growth alternatives.

Agencies, affected tribes and the public are invited to comment on the scope of the EIS. The scope determines the range and kinds of issues studied in the EIS. You can comment on alternatives, mitigation measures, probable significant adverse impacts, or other relevant issues.

You can submit comments using the comment form or submit them in writing on the county website at www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments.html.

Comments must be received by September 1, 2014.

How it works

The open house will start with an explanation of the purpose of an environmental impact statement and description of input helpful to determine what an EIS should include. You can then walk through the room to ask questions at any of the seven stations featuring information on relevant topics.

The stations are:

- Station 1: Welcome; purpose
- Station 2: Current Comprehensive Plan zoning map
- Station 3: Planning assumptions
- Station 4: Possible alternatives
- Station 5: Environmental constraints and the built environment
- Station 6: Transportation system
- Station 7: Parks Master Plan update



Context for comprehensive planning

Since the Clark County Comprehensive Growth Management Plan was updated and adopted in 2007, conditions in the county, as well as state and federal laws, have changed, requiring corresponding changes to the plan. In addition, we now have better mapping and more accurate information about buildable lands. This additional data might change conclusions in the previous plan about the current urban growth areas' capacity to accommodate future population and jobs. As a result, in early 2014, the Board of Clark County Commissioners issued planning assumptions and policy direction for reviewing and updating the growth management plan.

Environmental Impact Statement – a general statement of impacts

SEPA requires potential impacts of proposed changes as part of a comprehensive plan update to be evaluated in an environmental impact statement. As allowed by SEPA, analyses are not detailed to specific sites, but instead give an overview of what could be expected under any alternative.

SEPA allows adoption of other documents when researching existing conditions and anticipated impacts. Because growth hasn't occurred as predicted in the 2007 EIS, the county will re-adopt that document and supplement it with additional information for the 2016 update.

Alternatives in the EIS will be considered based on requirements of the Growth Management Act (GMA), objectives of the comprehensive plan, and county planning policies.

STATIONS

STATION 1: Welcome; Purpose


To provide you with information about the alternatives Clark County is studying to accommodate the population and employment growth expected over the next 20 years.

STATION 2: Current Comprehensive Plan zoning map

This map shows the current zoning in unincorporated areas of Clark County.

2007 EIS STUDY AREA AND CURRENT URBAN GROWTH BOUNDARIES

- City Limits
- 2007 Study Area Boundary
- Adopted UGA Boundaries



STATION 3: Planning assumptions

Planning assumptions guide the amount of land needed for future growth. Assumptions, for example, predict how many people might live or work in Clark County, how densely they will live, and how much land must be set aside to avoid wetlands and other environmentally critical areas. The Board of Clark County Commissioners approved the following key assumptions:

Policy assumptions

- Base year for the plan is 2015; end year is 2035.
- Population forecast is 562,207, an increase of 1.12 percent annually.
- Jobs forecast is 91,200, an increase of more than 2 percent annually.
- Urban/rural population split is a 90:10.
- Employment density is 20 employees per commercial acre, nine employees per industrial acre.
- Add a market factor of 15 percent to acreage needed for residential lands.
- Add a market factor of 15 percent to acreage needed for industrial and commercial lands.

Consultative assumptions, county planning policies

- Housing densities of eight units per acre in the Vancouver urban growth area; six units per acre in the Battle Ground, Camas, Ridgefield and Washougal urban growth areas; and four units per acre in the La Center urban growth area.
- New housing will be no more than 75 percent of any one product type, such as detached or attached housing.
- 2.66 persons per household.

Data-driven assumptions

- For every new acre of residential land inside an existing urban growth area, 27.7 percent will be used for infrastructure. This set-aside rate includes both onsite and offsite infrastructure.
- For commercial, industrial and business park zones, 25 percent overall will be used for infrastructure.
- 10 percent of vacant residential inventory will not convert to accommodate growth over the 20-year plan.
- 30 percent of underused residential inventory will not convert to accommodate growth over the 20-year plan.
- Underused commercial and industrial parcels have a building value per acre of \$50,000 or less.
- Future development on critical lands is based on excluding the portion of land hindered by critical areas. The portion not hindered by critical areas is included in the buildable lands inventory.

Values and principles articulated by the Board of County Commissioners

The Board of Clark County Commissioners stated its values for the revised plan and lands to be included in urban growth areas. The complete text and details of the planning assumptions are available from Community Planning at www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/index.html.

STATION 4: Possible alternatives

The county population forecast for 2035 is 562,207, lower than the 2024 forecast of 584,310. Because of this lower forecast, the county has determined that most, if not all, of the expected population and jobs can be accommodated within existing urban growth boundaries.

For this scoping, the county has identified a range of options for land use changes instead of options for adding land to urban growth areas. They are:

- **No Action Alternative**, which would be the adopted 2007 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan, as amended, including current urban growth boundaries, planning assumptions, policies, and implementation ordinances.

- **County-initiated changes**, such as recent work to update application of the surface mining overlay, creation of a public facilities zone, and review of minimum parcel size for agriculture and forest lands; and areas proposed for change by property owners within existing boundaries.

New planning assumptions, policy direction, changes in land use/zoning, and principles and values defined by the commissioners would be used for this alternative.

- **Expansion of urban growth areas proposed by cities.**

The cities of Battle Ground, La Center, and Ridgefield are considering expanding their urban growth areas to support job growth.

After EIS scoping, a preferred alternative will be developed based on technical analysis, input from cities, principles and values, and results of the environmental scoping and analysis. The preferred alternative is expected to include areas roughly equivalent to current urban growth boundaries, plus lands selected from within the 2007 EIS Study Area (see map on the page 3) sufficient to meet 2016 planning assumptions and policy directions.



5



6

STATION 5: Environmental constraints and the built environment

ELEMENTS OF THE ENVIRONMENT

By adopting the 2007 EIS, the county will use much of its data and analyses as a starting point for additional study. Interested parties are invited to comment on the elements commonly included in SEPA, as well as other issues of concern. These elements are listed below.

Natural environment

1. Earth

- a. Soils

2. Water

- a. Surface waters
- b. Floods
- c. Groundwater and aquifer recharge areas
- d. Public water supplies

3. Fish and wildlife habitat

- a. Habitat, numbers, diversity of plant, animal species
- b. Wetlands
- c. Threatened and endangered species
- d. Migratory species and migration routes

4. Energy and natural resources

- a. Amount required, rate of use, efficiency
- b. Source, availability
- c. Conservation and renewable resources

Built environment

1. Land and shoreline use

- a. Relationship to existing land use plans and to estimated population
- b. Housing
- c. Economy
- d. Resource lands

2. Transportation

- a. Roadway network, including freight
- b. Transit
- c. Non-motorized modes

3. Public services and utilities

- a. Fire
- b. Police
- c. Schools
- d. Parks or other recreational facilities
- e. Libraries
- f. General government facilities
- g. Public water supplies
- h. Solid waste
- i. Sanitary sewer

4. GMA requirements

- a. State statutes
- b. County-wide planning policies
- c. Concurrency
- d. Fiscal impacts
- e. Public involvement

STATION 6: Transportation system

Transportation is a key aspect of the comprehensive plan, shaping Clark County's development patterns. Clark County's transportation network connects state highways, neighboring city streets and adjacent county roads. It connects to transportation facilities operated by other special purpose districts, such as sewer and water districts, and for-profit businesses. The public does not experience a series of separate transportation systems, but a single, unified system. This starts with coordinated planning as required by GMA. The transportation system must be affordable and minimize environmental impacts to maintain quality of life. It must serve all users and modes, despite mobility, age or income issues. A safe, efficient transportation system can work to enhance economic development in conjunction with supporting land use plans.



STATION 7: Parks Master Plan update

Clark County Parks is updating the Parks Plan. It shows current parks, open spaces and trail systems in unincorporated areas. During the next few months, we will ask for public input regarding the Parks Plan update, looking at topics such as levels of service, amenities and locations of future parks, open spaces and trails.

HOW TO HELP SHAPE THE SCOPE

We need your input about what to discuss in the supplemental environmental impact statement and potential impacts of the alternatives. Most likely, urban growth boundaries would change minimally, if at all. What concerns do you have about planning issues? Do you see areas with important physical characteristics that should be recognized or areas with built features that need special attention? Look at the list of factors for the natural and built environment. Are there special issues for the scoping area? Please identify them.

Ways to submit a comment:

- **Fill out a comment sheet and leave it with staff.**
- **Submit a comment** on the county's website at www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments.html or mail it to Comprehensive Plan EIS Scoping, Community Planning, P.O. Box 9810, Vancouver WA 98666.

Please direct questions to

Oliver Orjiako, (360) 397-2280 ext. 4112 or to comp.plan@clark.wa.gov

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION



Clark County Community Planning

Planning for Clark County's promising future

Street Address: 1300 Franklin St., Vancouver, WA 98660




Mailing Address: P.O. Box 9810, Vancouver, WA 98666


Telephone: (360) 397-2280

Email: comp.plan@clark.wa.gov

Website: www.clark.wa.gov/planning

2007 EIS STUDY AREA AND CURRENT URBAN GROWTH BOUNDARIES

-  City Limits
-  2007 Study Area Boundary
-  Adopted UGA Boundaries



2016 Comp Plan Update

- **Food Systems Council**

The Clark County Food System Council's mission is to increase and preserve access to safe, local and healthy food for all residents of Clark County by:

- Strengthening the connections between food, health, natural resource protection, economic development and the agricultural community.
- Researching, analyzing and reporting on information about the local food system.
- Advocating and advising on food system and food policy implementation.
- Promoting and providing education on food system issues.





WHAT YOU CAN DO TO SUPPORT LOCAL AGRICULTURE AND PROMOTE FOOD PRODUCTION

- ▶ Submit comments on the county website at www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments.html.
- ▶ Let your friends and neighbors know about this important issue and encourage them to get involved.
- ▶ Learn more about efforts to promote a healthy food system at www.clark.wa.gov/public-health/about/foodsystemscouncil.html
- ▶ Purchase locally grown and locally produced food as much as possible.



For more information: Please email Theresa.Cross@clark.wa.gov



Clark County Public Health

Always working for a safer and healthier community

Street Address: 1601 East 4th Plain Blvd., Vancouver, WA 98661

Mailing Address: P.O. Box 9825, Vancouver, WA 98666

Telephone: (360) 397-8000

Website: www.clark.wa.gov/public-health



CONSERVING FOOD PRODUCTION IN CLARK COUNTY

CHECKING IN ON OUR FUTURE



Why conserve food production land in Clark County?

Clark County farms support the local economy

- ▶ Local farms employ more than 4,000 people. Preserving agriculture land provides economic opportunity for new farmers and allows for existing farms to expand, keeping these jobs local.
- ▶ Supporting local farms keeps our money circulating locally.
- ▶ Locally produced food travels shorter distances, reducing transportation costs and carbon footprint while maintaining food quality.
- ▶ Privately-owned and managed agriculture land generates more local tax revenues than it costs in services.



Local food is healthy for people and for land

- ▶ Good farming practices can help preserve clean water and healthy soil.
- ▶ Encouraging the production, distribution, and procurement of food from local farms increases the availability to and consumption of locally produced foods for our community.
- ▶ Maintaining the potential to grow more of our own food helps make us resilient in the event of major emergencies.
- ▶ Local food has a lower risk of causing food-borne illnesses because it spends less time in transit, doesn't change hands as often and is more apt to be processed in small batches.



The rural character of farm land enhances the quality of life

- ▶ A high quality of life is attractive to employers wanting to locate in Clark County.
- ▶ Agricultural land provides habitat for wildlife and allows natural water filtration.
- ▶ Food grown closer to consumers uses less fossil fuels which contribute to pollution, greenhouse gases and emissions, extreme heat days, flooding, drought, deteriorating air quality, and other impacts to human health.



How can food-producing lands be conserved?

Transfer of Development Rights (TDR)

A TDR program is a voluntary, incentive-based, and market-driven approach to preserve land and steer development growth away from lands that have high value for other uses.



A TDR program is based on free-market principles and prices that would motivate landowner and developer participation. Rural landowners realize economic return through the sale of development rights to private developers who are able to build in designated unincorporated urban areas and cities.

A market in development rights allows rural landowners to receive financial compensation without having to sell or fully develop their land. TDR programs enable the transfer of development potential from one parcel of land to another—developers “buy” development rights from agricultural land owners to be used for growth in designated development zones.



Conservation Easements and Purchase of Development Rights (PDR)

A conservation easement is a deed restriction that landowners voluntarily place on part or all of their land. The easement limits development in order to protect the land's natural resources.

An agricultural conservation easement is an easement specifically designed for agricultural land. Agricultural conservation easements can be donated, usually to a non-profit land trust, or sold to a public agency or qualified conservation organization through a PDR program. Some state's PDR programs are administered by the state Department of Agriculture.

The federal Farm and Ranch Lands Protection Program provides cost-share assistance to states, cities, and land trusts to help fund the purchase of development rights. Landowners can also combine the sale and donation of an agricultural conservation easement through a bargain sale. Through a bargain sale, a landowner sells an easement at less than its fair market value, taking a charitable deduction on the donated portion of the easement.

Whether to donate or to sell an easement, or how much of a donation to make as part of a bargain sale, is often a complex decision that is influenced by a landowner's income level, tax bracket, cost basis in the property, business and/or personal objectives, and the availability of town, state, or federal funding for the purchase of development rights.

Agricultural Production Districts

Agriculture Production Districts are specific geographic areas, regardless of zoning, where farming would be actively supported by the county over the long term.


In the 2009 report released by the Clark County Agriculture Preservation Advisory Committee, a goal of maintaining or aggregating contiguous blocks of land 100-150 acres in size was identified as a desirable goal. An Agricultural Production District may encompass one, or several, of such blocks. These should be considered priority areas for use of tools such as PDR and/or TDR and cluster development concepts to maintain or aggregate larger contiguous blocks of land dedicated primarily to agricultural activities.



2016 Comprehensive Plan Update

Built Environment

Legend	
	Residential Built
	Commercial Built
	Industrial Built
	Sewer District
	Incorporated
	Urban Growth Area
	Urban Growth Area (UGA) Boundary
	Rural Center
	City Limits
	County Boundary




EIS Scoping Meetings
August 2014
 Use this to register for the meeting and with Clatsop County to see the proposed changes to the Comprehensive Plan for the County.

2016 Comprehensive Plan Update

Environmental Constraints

- Legend**
- Environmental Constraints Area
 - Incorporated
 - Urban Growth Area
 - Urban Growth Area (UGA) Boundary
 - Rural Center
 - City Limits
 - County Boundary



EIS Scoping Meetings
August 2014

The maps in this report were prepared by the Washington Department of Ecology. The maps are not to scale and are not intended to be used for any purpose other than the one stated.

Copyright © 2014, Washington Department of Ecology. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced without the prior written permission of the Washington Department of Ecology.

2016 Comprehensive Plan Update

Regional Parks System

- Legend**
- County/City Parks
 - Open Space (Conservation & Greenway Areas)
 - Other Public Lands
 - Developed Trails
 - Incorporated
 - Urban Growth Area
 - Urban Growth Area (UGA) Boundary
 - Rural Center
 - City Limits
 - County Boundary



EIS Scoping Meetings
August 2014

2016 Comprehensive Plan Update Transportation System

Legend

Arterial Classification	Pa-4cb	Incorporated
C-2	Ph-2cb	Urban Growth Area
C-2b	Ph-4cb	Urban Growth Area (UGA) Boundary
C-2cb	Ph-6c	Rural Center
Local	Ph-6cb	City Limits
M-2cb	Proposed	County Boundary
M-4b	R-2	
M-4c	Rm-2	
M-4cb	S	
Nbr	W	
Ind		



**EIS Scoping Meetings
August 2014**




Use this map to identify project locations. Check County websites for more information and to see how you can get involved in the process.

2016 Comprehensive Plan Update

Zoning

Legend

Zoning Designation	Zoning Overlay Group
Single-Family residential (SF-1, SF-2, R-10)	Other Historical - 10 (OH-10)
Single-Family residential (SF-1.5, R-15)	Historical Urban Reserve - 20 (HUR-20)
Single-Family residential (SF-1.5, R-15, R-17.5)	Historical Industrial Urban Reserve (HIUR-20)
Single-Family residential (SF-1.5, R-17.5, LDR-10)	Historical Industrial Overlay District (HIOD)
Single-Family residential (SF-4, R-4, LDR-4)	Other Historic - 10 (OH-10)
Single-Family residential (SF-4, R-4)	Urban Historic - 20 (UH-20)
Residential (R-10, R-12)	Urban Historic - 40 (UH-40)
Residential (R-14, R-16, R-18)	Urban Historic Overlay
Residential (R-22, R-24, R-26)	Surface Mining Overlay District
Residential (R-30)	Existing Historic District
Residential (R-40)	Historic District
Office residential (O-10, O-15)	Highway 99 Overlay District
Office residential (O-18, O-24)	Activity Center Overlay
Office residential (O-30, O-36)	Neighborhood Area Overlay
Office residential (O-42, O-48)	Single-Family Residential Area Overlay
Office residential (O-54, O-60)	Midwest Residential Area Overlay
Office residential (O-66, O-72, O-78, O-84)	Midwest By-Right Residential Area Overlay
Office residential (O-90, O-96, O-102)	Midwest Rural Single-Family Area
Community commercial (C-1, C-2, C-3, C-4, C-5, C-6)	Midwest Urban Overlay
General commercial (GC-1, GC-2)	Intergovernmental
Midwest use (MU)	Other Growth Area (OGA) Boundary
Midwest path (MP-1, MP-2)	Rural Center
Light industrial (LI-1, LI-2, LI-3, LI-4, LI-5, LI-6)	City Limits
Heavy industrial (HI-1, HI-2, HI-3)	County Boundary
Public facilities (PF-1, PF-2)	
University (U)	
Special (S)	
Recreation (R)	



2016 Comprehensive Plan Update

City Recommendations

- Legend**
- City Recommended UGA Expansion
 - City Recommended UGA Boundary
 - Urban Growth Area (UGA) Boundary
 - City Limits
 - Rural Center
 - Incorporated
 - Urban Growth Area
 - County Boundary



EIS Scoping Meetings
August 2014

Use this map as a guide only. It is not intended to be used as a legal document. The City of Vancouver is not responsible for any errors or omissions. For more information, contact the City of Vancouver, Planning Department.



ATTENDANCE SIGN IN for: SEPA Scoping/2016 Comp Plan-Vancouver Open House
****Please PRINT Clearly****

Date: August 19, 2014

Clark County Community Planning

PRINT NAME	MAILING ADDRESS	ZIP CODE	PRINT - E-MAIL	e-mail list?
Ikuho Masterson	imasterson@esassoc.com 1111	98107	imasterson@esassoc.com	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
SHARESE GRAHAM	ESA 5309 SHILSHOLE SEATTLE	98107	sgraham@esassoc.com	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
Sean Pasmus	spazz@tds.net	98029		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
Michelle Scott	18218 NW 28th Ave.	98042	michelle.scott@hocksd.org	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
Lisa Ross	PO Box 65182 Vancouver, WA 98665	98665	Lisa@SelectedLisaRoss.com	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
Jude Wait	POB 442 VanC	98666	judith.wait@wsu.edu	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
Alan Babuka	23105 NE 67th Ave Battle Ground, WA	98604	BabukaA@gmail.com	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO
Karen Wood	14910 NE 26th St Vancouver, WA	98682	*PARKS* kwood@pacifier.com already on it	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
REUBEN JOHNSON	4111 SE 162nd Ct. VANCOUVER, WA 90	98683	REUBEN A JOHNSON@COMCAST.NET	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
LEE L. JENSEN				<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
Sandra Toure	City of Vancouver			<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO



ATTENDANCE SIGN IN for: SEPA Scoping/2016 Comp Plan-Vancouver Open House
****Please PRINT Clearly****

Date: August 19, 2014

Clark County Community Planning

PRINT NAME	MAILING ADDRESS	ZIP CODE	PRINT - E-MAIL	e-mail list?
Anne McCormy-Ogle	3501 F St Van	98663	macogle@pacifier.com	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
Gretchen Starke	on record		gstarke@pacifier.com	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
R. Lee Dean	PO Box 2485	97208	rleedean@gmail.com	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
Kelley Burt	500 E. 19th St	98663	kellburt@gmail.com	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
Jim Karlock			JJ KARLOCK@GMAIL.COM	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
				<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
				<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
				<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
				<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
				<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
				<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
				<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO



ATTENDANCE SIGN IN for: SEPA Scoping/2016 Comp Plan Camas Open House
****Please PRINT Clearly****

Date: August 20, 2014

Clark County Community Planning

	PRINT NAME	MAILING ADDRESS	ZIP CODE	PRINT - E-MAIL	e-mail list?
1	Jan Pelkey	27124 NE Bradford Rd.	98682	bo-peep@g.com	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
2	Robert Maul	City of Camas			<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
3	Ikuno Masterson	ESA 6309 Shilshole Ave NW	98107	imasterson@esassoc.com	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
4	SHARESE GRAHAM	ESA 5309 SHILSHOLE SEATTLE	98107	sgraham@esassoc.com	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
5	JOHN LEY	444 NW FREMONT ST CAMAS	98607	PILOTJPL@AOL.COM	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
6	Warren Neth	608 Rhododendron dr. Vancouver	98661	warren.cascade@gmail.com	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
7	mellie Cantrell	27202 NE Bradford Rd van.wa	98682		<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
8	Bill Cantrell	'' ''	'' ''		<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
9	Bob Pond	9011 N.E. 312th Ave Camas WA 98607	98607	PondB@mac.com	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
10	Madeline Lyne	755 NW View Ridge St Camas WA 98607	98607	lyne272@gmail.com	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
11	Olivia Bjerke	17408 NE 72 Ave Vancouver WA 98686	98686	OliviaBjerke@gmail.com	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO



ATTENDANCE SIGN IN for: SEPA Scoping/2016 Comp Plan Camas Open House
****Please PRINT Clearly****

Date: August 20, 2014

Clark County Community Planning

	PRINT NAME	MAILING ADDRESS	ZIP CODE	PRINT - E-MAIL	e-mail list?
12	ADAM KLUKA	7021 NW FRIBBLE STRUNK ST	98607	AKLUKA@BHHSNW.COM	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
13	Greg Adessa	PO Box 470 Camas	98607		<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO
14	CAROL & NICK BOWLING	1825 N. T ST, WASHOUGAL	98671		<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
15	Elaine Pfeifer	81 malfair Rd. Washougal	98671	epfeifer@earthlink.net	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
16	Kris Gano	PO Box 551 Camas		Krisgano@comcast.net	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
17	Cheryl Klotzel	2918 SE 293rd Ave Washo	98671	csplitfire@aol.com	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
18	Susan Dymusson	CCCV		spazz@tds.net	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
19	Carol Luonen	CCCV		cccvinc@yahoo.com	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
					<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
					<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO