



proud past, promising future

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY PLANNING

---

### STAFF REPORT

**TO;** Clark County Board of Councilors  
Clark County Planning Commission

**FROM:** Oliver Orjiako, Director

**DATE:** August 27, 2015

**SUBJECT:** Materials for the September 3, 2015 Joint PC/BOCC Hearing on the Draft SEIS

---

The attached material is provided to the Board of County Councilors and Planning Commission in preparation for the September 3, 2015 Joint public hearing on the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (DSEIS) relating to the Clark County 2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan Update. The DSEIS was published August 5, 2015. The material includes the following documents:

1. A copy of the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement;
2. A copy of DSEIS comments submitted to date.

The DSEIS was developed in accordance with State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA; RCW 43.21C.120 and 43.21C.135) requirements. An EIS was prepared for the 2007 Comprehensive Plan update that covers potential impacts from development of current urban growth areas (UGAs). Because of the recession, most of the land brought into UGAs is undeveloped. Given the OFM population number the Board adopted in 2014, it was determined that enough capacity exists in current UGAs to accommodate projected growth in population and jobs out to 2035. Accordingly, the decision was made to readopt the 2007 EIS and to prepare a supplemental EIS to cover the additional changes proposed in the 2016 update.

The DSEIS provides a project description and summary of the evaluation of the four alternatives to manage growth to 2035. In the DSEIS, the alternatives are summarized and changes in impacts are documented for each alternative growth scenario. The four alternatives reviewed include:

Alternative 1 – No Action. This alternative would not change the current urban growth area boundaries, policies and regulations as adopted in 2007 and updated in 2014.

Alternative 2 – Countywide Modifications. This alternative incorporates changes in policy direction, land use, zoning, the Board of County Councilors' principles and values, acknowledges existing development trends, and resolves map inconsistencies.

Alternative 3- City UGA Expansions. The Cities of Battle Ground, La Center, Ridgefield, and Washougal are considering expanding their urban growth areas to better support employment and residential growth.

Alternative 4- Rural, Agriculture, and Forest Changes. This alternative incorporates changes in policy direction and land use/zoning proposed to correct inconsistencies between the actual lot sizes and the existing zoning in rural areas; encourage clustering options to preserve resource lands, open space, and non-residential agriculture uses, and provides additional economic opportunities in the rural areas.

Following is a chronology of events related to the 2016 update SEPA process:

## **2014**

July 16. The first mention of three possible EIS alternatives was made at a Board work session.

July 30. A 'notice of scoping' and a 'notice of re-adoption of the 2007 EIS' were published.

August 19. Board approved a contract with consultants ESA to prepare the draft SEIS. The approved contract amount was about \$100,000.

August 19, 20, 27, 28. Scoping meetings held; scoping comments were due September 1, 2014. (Note: WAC 197-11-620(1) states that scoping is optional when preparing a supplemental EIS. WAC 197-11-408(2)(a)(i) requires only a 21-day scoping comment period).

September 24. The scoping report and more detail of the three alternatives were presented at a Board work session.

October 22. Three alternatives were agreed upon by the Board at a work session.

October 29, 30. Open houses were held to explain what was in each of the alternatives. Note: WAC 197-11-440(5) requires reasonable alternatives, but does not require a specific number of alternatives.

October. ESA commenced work on the DSEIS. The issuance date was set for February 4, 2015, with a 30-day comment period (required by WAC 197-11-455(6)). A joint BOCC/Planning Commission hearing was scheduled for February 19, 2015.

## **2015**

January 21. At a Board work session, the Board asked that the DSEIS process stop, as there was interest in developing an additional alternative.

February 18. Board work session held on Alternative 4.

March 11. Board work session held Alternative 4.

March 25; April 1. Open houses held on the SEIS alternatives.

April 14. Board approved four alternatives for the draft SEIS (DSEIS). Board approves an additional \$41,000 for the analysis of Alternative 4.

August 5. DSEIS issued.

August 20. Planning Commission work session held on the DSEIS

September 3, 10. Joint Board/PC public hearing scheduled.

September 17. End of the DSEIS comment period. Planning Commission hearing scheduled to deliberate and decide on a preferred alternative to recommend to the Board.

October 20. Board hearing scheduled to deliberate and decided on a preferred alternative, which will be the subject of the final SEIS (FSEIS).

The most recent packet for the Board and the Planning Commission contains DSEIS comments received from August 5 through August 27, 2015. The comment period on the DSEIS ends September 17, 2015, so additional comments will be provided as they become available. All public comments on the 2016 Comprehensive Plan update are available online by accessing this link: <ftp://ccplanning.clark.wa.gov>.

Attachments:

- Presentation slides



Draft

---

**Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement**

**August 2015**




## Agenda

### 1. Purpose of the hearing

- a. Progress to date
- b. SEPA chronology to date
- c. DSEIS Alternatives review
- d. Next steps

### 2. Public Testimony

## Comprehensive plan progress to date



### 2014 SEPA Chronology

**July 16.** Three possible EIS alternatives presented at Board work session.

**July 30.** 'Notice of scoping' and a 'notice of re-adoption of the 2007 EIS' published.

**August 19.** Contract with consultants (ESA) approved to prepare the draft SEIS. The approved contract amount was about \$100,000.

**August 19, 20, 27, 28.** Scoping meetings; scoping comments due September 1, 2014. (Note: WAC 197-11-620(1) states that scoping is optional when preparing a supplemental EIS. WAC 197-11-408(2)(a)(i) requires only a 21-day scoping comment period).

**September 24.** Scoping report and more detail of the three alternatives were presented at a Board work session.

**October 22.** Three alternatives were agreed upon by the Board at a work session.

**October 29, 30.** Open houses held on alternatives. Note: WAC 197-11-440(5) requires reasonable alternatives, but does not require a specific number of alternatives.

**October.** ESA commenced work on the DSEIS. The issuance date was set for February 4, 2015, with a 30-day comment period. A joint BOCC/Planning Commission hearing was scheduled for February 19, 2015.

2015 SEPA Chronology

**January 21.** At a Board work session, the Board asked that the DSEIS process stop, as there was interest in developing an additional alternative.

**February 18.** Board work session held on Alternative 4.

**March 11.** Board work session held Alternative 4.

**March 25; April 1.** Open houses held on the SEIS alternatives.

**April 14.** Board approved four alternatives for the draft SEIS (DSEIS). Board approves an additional \$41,000 for the analysis of Alternative 4.

**August 5.** DSEIS issued. Available online and at libraries and city halls throughout the county. (See page FS-3 of the DSEIS for exact locations)

**August 20.** Planning Commission work session held on the DSEIS


**September 3, 10.** Joint Board/PC public hearing scheduled.

**September 17.** End of the DSEIS comment period. Planning Commission hearing to deliberate and decide on a preferred alternative to recommend to the Board.

**October 20.** Board hearing scheduled to deliberate and decided on a preferred alternative, which will be the subject of the final SEIS (FSEIS).



## Alternative 1 – No action

No Action Alternative would be the current Comprehensive Growth Management Plan, including current urban growth boundaries, planning assumptions, policies and implementation ordinances.












## Alternative 2

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



## Alternative 2

The county is proposing changes in land use/zoning that supports job growth and reflects development trends.

<p><b>Rural County</b></p> <p>Minimum parcel size changes for AG-20, FR-40 and some R-20</p> 	<p><b>Urban Reserve</b></p> <p>Removal of overlay in North Salmon Creek area to reflect current development trends</p> 	<p><b>Public Facilities</b></p> <p>Creation of a Public Facility zone to identify publicly owned facilities</p> 
<p><b>Urban Holding</b></p> <p>Removal of overlay in Fisher's swale area to reflect current development trends</p> 	<p><b>Mixed Use</b></p> <p>Matching comp plan designation to zoning</p> 	<p><b>Vancouver UGA</b></p> <p>Land use changes to support job growth in Salmon Creek and Discovery area</p> 
<p><b>Battle Ground UGA</b></p> <p>Land use changes from industrial to residential to reflect current development</p> 	<p><b>Washougal UGA</b></p> <p>Correcting zoning map inconsistency between county and city zoning</p> 	<p><b>Ridgefield UGA</b></p> <p>UGA expansion to enhance the city's recreational opportunities</p> 



## Alternative 2

### Comprehensive plan map legend consolidation

#### 1. Consolidation of comprehensive plan land use designations

- **Rural:** Consolidate multiple Rural comp plan designations (R-5, R-10, R-20) to one **Rural (R)** designation
- **Forest:** Consolidate two Forest comp plan designations (Forest Tier I and Forest Tier II) to one **Forest (F)** designation
- **Commercial:** Consolidate multiple urban commercial comp plan designations (Neighborhood, Community and General) to one **Commercial (C)** designation
- **Urban Reserve:** Combine Urban Reserve (UR) comp plan designation and overlays into one urban reserve overlay. Implemented on the zoning map by UR-10 overlay on residential and UR-20 overlay on all other zones.
- **Urban Holding:** Create an Urban Holding overlay (UH) comp plan designation. Implemented on the zoning map by UH-10 for residential and UH-20 on all other zones.

#### 2. Removal of Three Creeks Special Planning Area overlay


- Work will be completed with 2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update

## Alternative 2

### RURAL AREAS

Recommendations from the Rural Lands Task Force

- Reduce minimum lot area requirements
  - Agriculture zoning: from 20 acres to 10 acres
  - Forest zoning: For parcels zoned FR-40, from 40 acres to 20 acres
  - Rural zoning: For parcels zoned R-20, from 20 acres to 10 acres, in some areas






## Alternative 2

### BATTLE GROUND UGA

Change from industrial land to low density residential and change the R1-5 of adjacent parcels to R1-20 to recognize existing uses.

**Comp plan map:** Change from Industrial (I) to Urban Low Residential (UL)

#### Zoning map



Six parcels abutting NE 189<sup>th</sup> St to change from Single-family residential R1-5 (5,000 sq. ft. lots) to Single-family residential R1-20 (20,000 sq. ft. lots) with Urban Holding (UH-10) overlay

Change from Business Park (BP) and Urban Holding (UH-20) to Single-family residential R1-20 (20,000 sq. ft. lots) with Urban Holding (UH-10) overlay


## Alternative 2

### RIDGEFIELD UGA

5 parcel expansion of Ridgefield Urban Growth Boundary including the Tri-Mountain Golf Course

**Comprehensive Plan map:** Retaining Parks and Open Space (P/OS) designation

#### Zoning map



Retaining Parks and Open Space (P/OS) zoning and adding an Urban Holding (UH-20) overlay


## Alternative 2

### WASHOUGAL UGA

Correcting an inconsistency between county and city zoning classifications

Comprehensive plan map : No change

#### Zoning map



Change from AR-16 (Washougal zoning) to R-18 (county zoning) and adding Urban Holding overlay

Change from R1-15 (Washougal zoning) to R1-10 (county zoning)


Steigerwald refuge: Heavy Industrial to Parks and Open Space. Apply Urban Holding (UH-20) to Steigerwald and property owned by Port.

## Alternative 2


### VANCOUVER UGA

Both the Discovery - Fairgrounds and Salmon Creek sub-area plan recommendations were developed by advisory groups composed of stakeholders from the specific area including property owners and leaders of major institutions.

#### Zoning map (current)



#### Zoning map (proposed)




## Alternative 2

### URBAN RESERVE

Removal of Urban Reserve overlay in the north Salmon Creek area. This area provides a natural buffer to agriculture resource lands.

**Comp plan map:** Removal of Urban Reserve and application of Rural designation

#### Zoning map



- Removal of Urban Reserve (UR-10) zone and application of Rural (R-5) on those parcels in gray with red outline
- Removal of Urban Reserve (UR-10) overlay and retaining Agriculture zoning


## Alternative 2

### URBAN HOLDING

Removal of Urban Holding designation in the Fisher's Swale area within the Vancouver Urban Growth Boundary – these areas are already developed and are served by infrastructure

**Comprehensive plan map:** Retaining Urban Low Residential designation

#### Zoning map



- Removal of Urban Holding-10 (purple stripes) and keep the Single-Family Residential zoning of (R1-20), (R1-10) and (R1-7.5)


## Alternative 2

### MIXED USE

Application of appropriate comprehensive plan designation to match the actual zone in use instead of the mixed use

**Zoning map:** Retaining current zoning

### Proposed comprehensive plan map



Change from Mixed Use (MU) comp. plan designation to match the zoning

- Includes parcels outlined in yellow
- New comp. plan designations include:
  - Commercial
  - Industrial
  - Urban Low Residential
  - Urban Medium Residential
  - Urban High Residential

## Alternative 2

### PUBLIC FACILITIES

Creation of a Public Facilities comprehensive plan designation and zoning district. The district includes publicly owned facilities, i.e. schools, utilities and government buildings

#### Comprehensive plan map

- The comprehensive plan map applies a Public Facilities (PF) designation to land owned by some public entities.

#### Zoning map


- Changing to Public Facilities (PF) zone

## Alternative 3 – City initiated changes

The cities of Battle Ground and La Center are considering expanding their urban growth areas.


### Battle Ground UGA expansion

Proposed comp. plan designation of Mixed Use with Urban Holding overlay



### La Center UGA expansion

Proposed comp. plan designation of Commercial with Urban Holding overlay and Public Facility for school




## Alternative 3 – City initiated changes

The cities of Ridgefield and Washougal are considering expanding their urban growth areas for residential.


### Ridgefield UGA expansion

Proposed comp. plan designation of Urban Low Density Residential



### Washougal UGA expansion



Proposed comp. plan designation of Urban Low Density Residential






# Alternative 4

This alternative proposes changes to Rural and Resource lands.



# Alternative 4

This alternative proposes changes to Rural and Resource lands.



## DSEIS Summary of Impacts by Alternative

Table 1-2. Potential New Lots Allowable Under Each Alternative

Zone	Alternative 1 No Action Alternative	Alternative 2 – Countywide Modifications	Alternative 3 – City UGA Expansions	Alternative 4 – Rural, Agriculture, and Forest Expansion
Rural	5,684	5,823	5,672	9,880
Agriculture	970	1,937	952	1,958
Forest*	419	460	419	563
<b>Total</b>	<b>7,073</b>	<b>8,220</b>	<b>7,043</b>	<b>12,401</b>

Source: Clark County GIS, based on the Rural Vacant and Buildable Lands Model (VBLM) dated July 24, 2015  
 \* The Rural VBLM excludes property in the current use program for Timber and Designated Forest Land. This may underestimate the number of potential lots in Alternative 4.  
 \*\* This table does not include areas designated as Rural Center or Urban Reserve, nor does it include lots within UGAs.

## Earth Resources

Table S-2. Summary of Impacts by Alternative

Alternative 1 – No Action Alternative	Alternative 2 – Countywide Modifications	Alternative 3 – City UGA Expansion	Alternative 4 – Rural, Agriculture, and Forest Changes
No new impacts that cannot be mitigated through compliance with existing regulations.	Zoning changes could have individually small but cumulatively moderate impacts on prime soils and forested areas. Mitigation would be provided by localized protection.	Same as Alternative 1	Similar to Alternative 2, but with cumulatively greater impacts due to potentially more development.



## Water Resources

Table S-2. Summary of Impacts by Alternative

Alternative 1 – No Action Alternative	Alternative 2 – Countywide Modifications	Alternative 3 – City UGA Expansion	Alternative 4 – Rural, Agriculture, and Forest Changes
Moderate potential for impacts due to development allowed under current zoning. New stormwater regulations since 2007 could improve surface and groundwater resources.	Incremental increase in impacts to hydrology and water quality resulting from potential for more intensive development of over 34,000 acres. Individually small but cumulatively moderate impacts on aquatic resources. Potential localized impacts with UGA changes; could be mitigated during project-specific review.	Same as Alternative 1.	Similar to Alternative 2, but with cumulatively greater impacts due to potential development on approximately 65,500 acres.

## Fish and Wildlife Resources

Table S-2. Summary of Impacts by Alternative

Alternative 1 – No Action Alternative	Alternative 2 – Countywide Modifications	Alternative 3 – City UGA Expansion	Alternative 4 – Rural, Agriculture, and Forest Changes
More intensive development under current zoning could affect fish and wildlife habitats, threatened & endangered species, migratory species, and wetlands, but regulations and mitigation requirements would minimize impacts.	Incremental increase in impacts to fish and wildlife habitats, threatened & endangered species, migratory species, and wetlands resulting from potential to create 8,220 new parcels and increased density.	Potential localized impacts to fish and wildlife habitats, threatened & endangered species, migratory species, and wetlands; could be mitigated during project-specific review.	Similar to Alternative 2, but with cumulatively greater impacts due to potential creation of approximately 12,400 new lots.

## Energy and Natural Resources

Table S-2. Summary of Impacts by Alternative

Alternative 1 – No Action Alternative	Alternative 2 – Countywide Modifications	Alternative 3 – City UGA Expansion	Alternative 4 – Rural, Agriculture, and Forest Changes
Most impacts to scenic and natural resources could be mitigated through compliance with existing regulations.	Incremental increase in use of energy and natural resources resulting from potential to create 8,220 new parcels. Visual and scenic resources could also be affected with increased development. Incremental development over time would minimize impacts.	Low potential for impacts; could be mitigated during project-specific review.	Similar to Alternative 2, but with cumulatively greater impacts due to potential creation of approximately 12,400 new lots.

## Land and Shoreline Use

Table S-2. Summary of Impacts by Alternative

Alternative 1 – No Action Alternative	Alternative 2 – Countywide Modifications	Alternative 3 – City UGA Expansion	Alternative 4 – Rural, Agriculture, and Forest Changes
Localized impacts from development allowed under current zoning would be mitigated through compliance with existing regulations.	Incremental increase in impacts to land and shoreline use resulting from potential to create 8,220 new parcels which could affect opportunity for large-scale agricultural production but would increase opportunity for rural housing.	Same as Alternative 1.	Similar to Alternative 2, but with cumulatively greater impacts due to potential creation of approximately 12,400 new lots.

## Transportation

Table S-2. Summary of Impacts by Alternative


Alternative 1 – No Action Alternative	Alternative 2 – Countywide Modifications	Alternative 3 – City UGA Expansion	Alternative 4 – Rural, Agriculture, and Forest Changes
Low potential for impacts that would not be mitigated through on-going regional efforts to improve the existing transportation system, including encouraging alternative modes of travel.	Incremental increase in impacts to the transportation system resulting from distribution of higher travel demand over a larger geography compared to concentrated urban areas. Infrastructure costs could be prohibitive.	Same as Alternative 1.	Similar to Alternative 2, but with cumulatively greater impacts due to potentially more development.

## Public Facilities and Utilities

Table S-2. Summary of Impacts by Alternative

Alternative 1 – No Action Alternative	Alternative 2 – Countywide Modifications	Alternative 3 – City UGA Expansion	Alternative 4 – Rural, Agriculture, and Forest Changes
More intensive development allowed under current zoning could affect the levels of service provided in rural areas.	Incremental increase in impacts to public facilities and utilities resulting from potential to create 8,220 new parcels which distributes the need to provide services over a larger geography, compared to concentrated urban areas. Opportunities for new development may be delayed until services and facilities are available.	Low potential for impacts to infrastructure and services. No expansion of service areas would be required beyond that already planned.	Similar to Alternative 2, but with cumulatively greater impacts due to potentially more development.

## Next Steps



31

## Share your comments

Provide comments online or by email, letter or comment form. Comments must be received by 4:00 p.m. on September 17, 2015, to be considered in the environmental analysis.

Online	<a href="http://www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments/html">www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments/html</a>	
Engage Clark County	<a href="http://www.peakdemocracy.com/2963">http://www.peakdemocracy.com/2963</a>	
Email	Send to: <a href="mailto:comp.plan@clark.wa.gov">comp.plan@clark.wa.gov</a> Put "Draft SEIS Comments" in the subject line. Include your name and mailing address.	
Letter	Mail to: Clark County Community Planning Draft SEIS Comments P.O. Box 9810 Vancouver, WA 98666-9810	
Public Hearing	Sept. 3, 2015, at 6:00 p.m. 1300 Franklin Street Vancouver, WA	Sept. 10, 2015, at 6:00 p.m. 1300 Franklin Street Vancouver, WA

**Questions?**

**Thank you!**



[www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update](http://www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update)