

**O'Donnell, Mary Beth**



**From:** Orjiako, Oliver  
**Sent:** Friday, May 01, 2015 4:41 PM  
**To:** Amanda Smeller-Woodland; Snodgrass, Bryan; Eiken, Chad; Elizabeth Decker-Consultant; Eric Eisemann-Consultant; Erin Erdman-Battle Ground; Jeff Niten-Ridgefield; Jeff Sarvis-La Center; Lee Knottnerus-Ridgefield; Mitch Kneipp-Washougal; Pete Roberts-Yacolt; Phil Bourquin-Camas; Ransom, Matt; Robert Maul-Camas; Sam Crummett-Battle Ground; Towne, Sandra; Sara Fox-Camas; Steve Stuart-Ridgefield  
**Cc:** Albrecht, Gary; Alvarez, Jose; Anderson, Colete; Euler, Gordon; Hermen, Matt; Kamp, Jacqueline; Lebowsky, Laurie; Niten, Jeff; O'Donnell, Mary Beth; Orjiako, Oliver  
**Subject:** Revised Issue\_Paper\_6\_CWPP\_draft1\_(2).docx



Dear Colleague:

Attached, please find a revised draft of Issue Paper 6 – County-wide Planning Polices. At our Joint City-County Coordination meeting today we discussed (1) what is this Issue Paper #6 about? (2) why are we doing it? (3) the benefits, and (4) how can you help?

I have made the suggested changes and would like you to review with your legal counsel and council if necessary by the end of May. We are posting the May 20 work session with the Board of County Councilors on this topic until June 10, 2015. We are also pulling the item from our PC work session scheduled for May 7, 2015. Your cooperation and timely response would be greatly appreciated. I hope there will be consensus on the framework for amendment to county-wide planning policies. If you have questions, please let me know. Thanks in advance and have a great weekend.

Best Regards,

Oliver

**Clark County Comprehensive Plan 2016 Update**  
Planning for growth 2015 – 2035  
Countywide Planning Policies – Issue Paper 6

**Purpose**

The purpose of this issue paper is to discuss the role of Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs), which coordinate comprehensive plans of jurisdictions in the same county for regional issues or issues affecting common borders (RCW 36.70A.100).

Comprehensive plans are the long-term policy documents used by each jurisdiction to plan for its future. They include strategies for land use, housing, capital facilities, utilities, transportation, economic development, and parks and recreation (as well as a rural element for counties only) (RCW 36.70A.070). Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs) establish a countywide framework for developing and adopting county and city comprehensive plans.

**Background**

In July 2013, Clark County began the process of updating its Comprehensive Growth Management Plan to meet the 2016 periodic update requirement of Chapter 36.70A.140 RCW. Several issue papers have already been prepared to allow the Board to make decisions about the update:

- Issue Paper 1 - Comprehensive Plan Overview: A summary of the county's Planning Assumptions, 2013 vacant and buildable lands model (VBLM) inventory and population and employment projections.
- Issue Paper 2 – Population and Job Projections: Background information for a discussion with the cities and the town of Yacolt on population and job planning assumptions for 2015-2035. On Jan. 21, 2014, the Board adopted the state Office of Financial Management's (OFM) medium population projection of 562,207 for the 20-year period ending 2035 (Res. 2014-01-09).
- Issue Paper 3 – Employment forecast based on input from Washington Employment Security Department (ESD). It was revised as Issue Paper 3.1 to include the 2014 VBLM information. On April 29, 2014, the Board adopted the high employment forecast of 91,200 net new jobs for the 20-year period ending 2035 (Res. 2014-04-01).
- Issue Paper 4 – Population and Job Allocation: On June 24, 2014, the Board identified the methodology for allocating growth by UGA and adopted preliminary allocations for initial review (Res. 2014-06-17). It was revised as Issue Paper 4.1 to reflect the additional capacity for population and jobs not captured by the vacant land model and presented at a BOCC Worksession on September 24, 2014. Following the 2015 assessor's population update, the issue paper was revised as Issue Paper 4.2. (Res. 2015-04-05).
- Issue Paper 5 – SEPA Scoping: On July 16, 2014, the Board discussed the environmental impact review process under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) and directed staff to proceed to scoping on development of alternatives.

- Issue Paper 5.1 provides a partial list of what has transpired from July 17, 2014 through March 11, 2015. (Res. 2015-04-06).

## Methodology

RCW 36.70A.210(1) describes the relationship between comprehensive plans and CPPs. It says that:

*a "countywide planning policy" is a written policy statement or statements used solely for establishing a countywide framework from which county and city comprehensive plans are developed and adopted pursuant to this chapter. This framework shall ensure that city and county comprehensive plans are consistent as required in RCW 36.70A.100. Nothing in this section shall be construed to alter the land use powers of the cities".*

The Washington Administrative Code (WAC) 365-196-305 states that:

*"the primary purpose of CPPs is to ensure consistency between comprehensive plans of counties and cities sharing a common border or related regional issues. Another purpose of county-wide planning policies is to facilitate the transformation of local governance in the urban growth area, typically through annexation to or incorporation of a city, so that urban governmental services are primarily provided by cities and rural and regional services are provided by counties".*

WAC 365-196-510 says that:

*"interjurisdictional consistency should be met by the adoption of comprehensive plans, and subsequent amendments, which are consistent with and carry out the relevant county-wide planning policies and, where required, the relevant multi-county planning policies. Adopted county-wide planning policies are designed to ensure that county and city comprehensive plans are consistent".*

To meet this stated goal, some of the CPPs do more than meet the Growth Management Act (GMA) mandate of ensuring consistency of comprehensive plans. The CPPs also provide to Clark County jurisdictions direction that is necessary for the coordinated implementation of GMA goals and the Community Framework Plan Policies (CFPPs). Thus, in the context of state law, administrative guidance, and the goals of the Community Framework Plan, the CPPs have been developed to accomplish the following functions:

- Meet a specific requirement to ensure consistency between County and city comprehensive plans (RCW 36.70A.100);
- Satisfy other GMA mandates;
- Maintain ongoing efforts, through the Community Framework Plan, to plan cooperatively for countywide initiatives; and
- Support local implementation of the Comprehensive Growth Management Plans that seeks to promote compact urban development in a sustainable manner.

The CPPs encourage flexibility in local interpretations to support diverse interests throughout the county.

## Framework for Amendment to County-wide Planning Policies

Countywide Planning Policies adopted pursuant to the Growth Management Act may be reviewed and amended by Clark County and approved by the municipalities in the County during a comprehensive plan update process

## Policies for Update and Ratification

The Clark Countywide Planning Policies should be dynamic and regularly monitored for applicability and effectiveness.

Proposed revisions shall be reviewed for impacts according to the State Environmental Protection Act (SEPA) and shall be consistent with the State Growth Management Act (GMA).

The County or a City may propose a policy amendment to the Countywide Planning Policies.

Ratification of amendments to the Countywide Planning Policies requires the affirmative action of the all local governments in the County following recommendation from County Board of Councilors. Demonstration of ratification shall be by execution of an inter-local agreement or the absence of a legislative action to disapprove a proposed amendment (WAC 365-196-305).

Currently, there is no specific amendment procedure in the policies to amend them, so the following is proposed:

1.1.XX An amendment to any Countywide Planning Policy may be initiated by the County or any municipality in the County.

1. The proposed amendment shall include the following:

- (a) the exact language of the proposed amendment (shown in "strike out" for deletions and "highlight" for additions); and
- (b) a brief explanation of the need for the proposed amendment, including the factors, data, or analyses that have changed since the adoption of the Countywide Planning Policies and/or the experiences with the existing Countywide Planning Policies that have prompted the proposed amendment.

**2. A proposed amendment to the Countywide Planning Policies shall be initially referred to the City-County Joint Coordination Team ~~Board of Clark County Councilors~~ for analysis and recommendation. The Board will make a recommendation that will be forwarded to all jurisdictions for legislative action within 180 ~~90~~ days.**

**3. The amended CPP will become effective, according to the schedule for amending the Comprehensive Plan, if it is ratified by all jurisdictions ~~five or more cities~~ in Clark County. A jurisdiction shall be deemed as casting an affirmative vote if it has not taken legislative action to disapprove a proposed amendment within 180 ~~90~~ days from the date of receipt from the Board of Clark County Councilors.**

**4. Amendments to Countywide Planning Policies may be included in the county's annual comprehensive plan update process or during the periodic comprehensive plan update.**

## **NEXT STEPS**

The BOCC will hold a hearing on June XX, 2015 at 10:00 a.m. to hear testimony from the public.