

O'Donnell, Mary Beth

From: Snodgrass, Bryan
Sent: Thursday, June 11, 2015 10:00 AM
To: Anderson, Colete; Amanda Smeller-Woodland; 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; Albrecht, Gary; Alvarez, Jose; Euler, Gordon; Kamp, Jacqueline; Lebowsky, Laurie; O'Donnell, Mary Beth; Orjiako, Oliver; Wisner, Sonja
Subject: RE: City/County Meeting in Washougal ~ Issue Paper 6 Countywide Planning Policies

All

FYI, attached is what we had recommended previously. As the letter notes, it would be great if there is some way for the Issue Paper to have a few sentences indicating what topics GMA directs the CWPPs cover, the fact the most of the local CWPPs are long standing, and that there is also a similarly adopted joint Community Framework Plan. We're concerned about opening up the whole CWPP issue now, and think it's important to stress the context- there's GMA direction on what these cover, there's long standing local history and agreement, etc. BRS



City/County Meeting in Washougal ~ Issue Paper 6 Countywide Planning Policies

From: Anderson, Colete
Sent: Thursday, June 11, 2015 9:13 AM
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; Albrecht, Gary; Alvarez, Jose; Anderson, Colete; Euler, Gordon; Kamp, Jacqueline; Lebowsky, Laurie; O'Donnell, Mary Beth; Orjiako, Oliver; Wisner, Sonja
Subject: City/County Meeting in Washougal ~ Issue Paper 6 Countywide Planning Policies

Greetings!

I just realized that you have not seen the latest version of Issue Paper 6 ~ my apologies!

<< File: Issue_Paper_6_CWPP_Process_June 12 version.docx >>

Bryan made a few suggestions including two 180 day time periods. We've tossed it around and agree with his comments except for the two time periods. We prefer 90 days.

Tomorrow our goal is to come to an agreement on Issue Paper 6 and resolve which CWPPs, if any, move forward to the BOCC.

We also have an opportunity to have a **BOCC WS on June 17 @ 11 am.** (this is NOT on your calendars)



Following the worksession, we're recommending that Issue Paper 6 and the CWPP amendments move to hearing with corresponding resolution before we begin the DSEIS process.

I'm not going to be able to attend the meeting ~ have fun!

<< OLE Colete Anderson
Object: Clark County Community Planning
Picture 1300 Franklin St., Vancouver, WA
(Device 360-397-2280 ext.4516
Independent www.clark.wa.gov/planning
Bitmap) >> **Like the Commission on Aging on
 Facebook!**

The Clark County Commission on Aging provides leadership and creates community engagement in addressing the needs and opportunities of aging.



May 11, 2015

Oliver Orjiako
Clark County Community Planning Director

Subject: Countywide Planning Policies

Hello Oliver

You had asked cities to respond this month to initial draft policy language in Issue Paper 6 on potential new criteria and process for amending the existing Countywide Planning Policies (CCPs) that have been jointly adopted into City and County Comprehensive Plans. We are not able to schedule our Council for review of this issue during this timeframe, but will do so later this summer. As staff we offer the below comments, and look forward to the opportunity to respond after initial review by the County Board of Councilors:

- While the existing CPPs could benefit from clearer standards on their future updates, from our perspective this may not be the most productive time to open up what could be a lengthy discussion on CPPs. We are in the middle of the countywide update process under already tight timelines, and the County Board will be reconstituted in six months.
- Deferring decisions on a new CPP process policy now would not prevent timely consideration of La Center's proposal to amend a particular CPP specific to its UGA. Such a proposal could be evaluated this year, and is arguably encouraged to do so by the GMA (RCW 36.70A.130(2)(a)) and by existing Countywide Planning Policy 1.1.11 (interjurisdictional coordination)
- If a new CPP process policy is to be adopted now, we support the proposed language in the numbered bullets of the issue paper, with some minor edits for clarity. It's appropriate that CPP changes require everyone's buy-in up-front, since state law directs that these policies are intended to facilitate interjurisdictional consistency, and contains strong provisions for resolving disputes, at least for the initial adoption of CPPs.
- We recommend the narrative of Issue Paper 6 include a sentence or two on the below items in order to give decision makers a full understanding of the local context for CPPs.

- Topics required. We suggest listing what GMA requires CPPs to address (contiguous and orderly urban development and services, siting capital facilities of countywide or statewide significance, affordable housing, joint county-city planning in UGAs, economic development and employment, and fiscal impacts), and what the current local CPPs cover (chapters on land use, housing, resource lands, rural lands, transportation , capital facilities, utilities, parks and open spaces, annexation , economic development, critical areas, community design, and historical preservation.)
- Local CPP history, which has been positive. Most of the current local CPPs were adopted in 1994, with modest changes in subsequent countywide updates. Adoption has been by consensus with little dispute.
- The existence of the Community Framework Plan. This was jointly adopted by local jurisdictions alongside the Countywide Planning Policies, and has served much of the same purpose.
- Other major County's approach. From a quick search it appears King, Pierce, Spokane and Snohomish Counties have some form of steering committee or joint interjurisdictional review for CPPs. Others may as well.

Please see the attached for suggested edit language to consider. Our thanks again for the opportunity to provide input on these important issues.

Sincerely,



Chad Eiken, AICP | Director



CITY OF VANCOUVER, WASHINGTON
Community and Economic Development Department
P: (360) 487-7882

www.cityofvancouver.us | www.cityofvancouver.us/socialmedia



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 reviewed ~~approved~~ by the municipalities in the County during a comprehensive plan update process. In 1994 Clark County and local cities adopted by consensus a wide Countywide Planning Policies and accompanying Community Framework Plan policies. These cover land use, housing, resource lands, rural lands, transportation, capital facilities, utilities, parks and open spaces, annexation, economic development, critical areas, community design, and historical preservation. Modest updates were made by consensus in each subsequent countywide planning update.

Policies for Update and Ratification

~~Although local~~ The Clark Countywide Planning Policies and Community Framework Plan policies provide a foundation for local coordination, they may ~~should~~ be dynamic and regularly periodically monitored for ongoing 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 or Community Framework Plan policies may be initiated by any local jurisdiction~~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 "underlinehighlight" 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 or Community Framework Plan policies shall be initially referred to the City-County Joint Staff Coordination Team ~~Board of Clark County Councilors~~ for analysis and recommendation to the County Board of Councilors. The Board will make a recommendation that will be forwarded to all jurisdictions for legislative action within 180 ~~90~~ days.

3. The amended CPP or CFP 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.