Preferred Alternative
1. Purpose of the hearing
   a. Staff report
   b. DSEIS Alternatives discussion
## Comprehensive plan progress to date

### July-Dec. 2013
- **PRE-PLANNING**
  - GMA Overview
  - VBLM Review
  - Preliminary Scoping Timeline
  - Public Participation Plan

### January 2014—December 2015
- **DATA ANALYSIS**
  - Public Review & Comment
  - Dept. of Commerce Checklist
  - 20-year Population Range
  - Countywide Planning Policies
  - Regional Growth Trends & Allocation
  - Planning Assumptions
  - Buildable Lands Review
  - Land Use Technical Report
  - Housing Technical Report
  - Capital Facilities Technical Report
  - Transportation Technical Report
  - Environmental Technical Report

- **PLAN DEVELOPMENT**
  - Public Review & Comment
  - SEPA Analysis & Public Review
  - Urban Growth Area Review
  - Capital Facility Plan (CFP)
  - County Capital Facility & Financial Plan (CFFP)
  - VBLM Analysis
  - Land Use Transportation Analysis Zone
  - Regional Travel Demand Analysis
  - Draft Comprehensive Plan Text
  - Title 40 Changes

### Jan-May 2016
- **ADOPTION**
  - Public Review & Comment
  - Department of Commerce Review
  - Planning Commission Hearings
  - County Commissioner Hearings
  - Issue Notice of Adoption
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.
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

2.a Rural (R) Lands

- Change the comp plan map legend from three comp plan designations to one Rural (R) designation to be consistent with current comp plan-to-zoning matrix table.
Alternative 2

2.b,c,d Agriculture, Forest and Rural Lands

- 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
2.e Rural Centers

- Combine rural center commercial (CR-2) and rural commercial (CR-1) into a single comp plan designation of ‘rural commercial’.
Alternative 2

2.f Urban Reserve

- Urban reserve (UR) becomes a true overlay. Zoning defaults to underlying zone; some parcels given R-5 zoning. UR code moved to the overlay chapter of Title 40. No change in allowable land uses.
Alternative 2

2.g Commercial Lands

- Combine the three commercial zones (C-2, C-3 and GC) into a single comp plan (C) designation.
Alternative 2

2.h 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
2. Alternative 2

2.i Urban Holding

- Urban holding (UH) becomes a true overlay. Zoning defaults to underlying zone. UH code moved to the overlay chapter of Title 40. No change in allowable land uses.
2. j 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 189th 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

2.k 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

2.1-n VANCOUVER UGA

- Remove reference to the Three Creeks Special Planning Area
- 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)
2.0 VANCOUVER UGA - 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
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
2.q 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

2.r 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 3 – City initiated changes

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

3.a Battle Ground UGA expansion
Proposed comp. plan designation of Mixed Use with Urban Holding overlay

3b-c 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.

3.d Ridgefield UGA expansion
Proposed comp. plan designation of Urban Low Density Residential

3.e Washougal UGA expansion
Proposed comp. plan designation of Urban Low Density Residential
Alternative 4

This alternative proposes changes to Rural and Resource lands.

4.a Rural Lands. Eliminate R-10 and R-20 zones. Create R-1 and R-2.5 zones. Maintain R-5 zone

Alternative 4

This alternative proposes changes to Rural and Resource lands.

## DSEIS Summary of Impacts by Alternative

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

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

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

### Table S-2. Summary of Impacts by Alternative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative 1 – No Action Alternative</th>
<th>Alternative 2 – Countywide Modifications</th>
<th>Alternative 3 – City UGA Expansion</th>
<th>Alternative 4 – Rural, Agriculture, and Forest Changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moderate potential for impacts due to development allowed under current zoning. New stormwater regulations since 2007 could improve surface and groundwater resources.</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Same as Alternative 1.</td>
<td>Similar to Alternative 2, but with cumulatively greater impacts due to potential development on approximately 65,500 acres.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Fish and Wildlife Resources

### Table S-2. Summary of Impacts by Alternative

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative 1 – No Action Alternative</th>
<th>Alternative 2 – Countywide Modifications</th>
<th>Alternative 3 – City UGA Expansion</th>
<th>Alternative 4 – Rural, Agriculture, and Forest Changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most impacts to scenic and natural resources could be mitigated through compliance with existing regulations.</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Low potential for impacts; could be mitigated during project-specific review.</td>
<td>Similar to Alternative 2, but with cumulatively greater impacts due to potential creation of approximately 12,400 new lots.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Land and Shoreline Use

#### Table S-2. Summary of Impacts by Alternative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative 1 – No Action Alternative</th>
<th>Alternative 2 – Countywide Modifications</th>
<th>Alternative 3 – City UGA Expansion</th>
<th>Alternative 4 – Rural, Agriculture, and Forest Changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Localized impacts from development allowed under current zoning would be mitigated through compliance with existing regulations.</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Same as Alternative 1.</td>
<td>Similar to Alternative 2, but with cumulatively greater impacts due to potential creation of approximately 12,400 new lots.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Transportation

### Table S-2. Summary of Impacts by Alternative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative 1 – No Action Alternative</th>
<th>Alternative 2 – Countywide Modifications</th>
<th>Alternative 3 – City UGA Expansion</th>
<th>Alternative 4 – Rural, Agriculture, and Forest Changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Same as Alternative 1.</td>
<td>Similar to Alternative 2, but with cumulatively greater impacts due to potentially more development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Public Facilities and Utilities

Table S-2. Summary of Impacts by Alternative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative 1 – No Action Alternative</th>
<th>Alternative 2 – Countywide Modifications</th>
<th>Alternative 3 – City UGA Expansion</th>
<th>Alternative 4 – Rural, Agriculture, and Forest Changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More intensive development allowed under current zoning could affect the levels of service provided in rural areas.</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Low potential for impacts to infrastructure and services. No expansion of service areas would be required beyond that already planned.</td>
<td>Similar to Alternative 2, but with cumulatively greater impacts due to potentially more development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next Steps

- Comment Period ends
  PC Preferred Alternative Hearing
  September 17, 2015

- BOCC Preferred Alternative Hearing
  October 20, 2015

- Final SEIS completion
  December 2015

- 60-day Commerce notification

- Final adoption December 2015 – May 2016
  (NLT June 30, 2016)
Questions?

Thank you!

www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update