EXHIBIT B

BOCC PRINCIPLES AND VALUES

Employment lands:
1. Equalize land allocation and jobs/population ratio so cities have equitable share of jobs – diverse job base.
2. Mapping: Put job lands close to transportation so that capacity is provided to job opportunities.
3. Ground-truth where residential and jobs “make sense” – no more “wetland industrial”.
4. Focus Public Investment Areas – “hubs” of job growth that can be serviced effectively (adjust Transportation Improvement Program if necessary).
5. Maximize the potential for the county’s railroad as a job-creating asset.
6. Prioritize lands that are most likely to provide “family-wage jobs” as defined in the comprehensive plan policies.

Housing:
1. Vancouver UGB: minimize residential growth (there will be some residential growth but not dense residential growth, especially where there already exists large-lot, high-value development). Minimize doesn’t mean “don’t” but lower density of residential growth.
2. Maintain a mix of housing options (a variety of housing densities – large, medium, and small lots).
3. Identify school sites or areas where schools buildings will be necessary inside the new hubs of residential areas (need sites close to where the children will be). Avoid penalizing property owners in the process.

Community Design
1. New growth needs to blend well with existing neighborhoods (i.e., transition zones, buffering, gradual transitions in development style, type).

Rural lands
1. Minimize the conversion of productive farmland – those lands which have long-term commercial agriculture viability; or, is it being used today for commercial agriculture?

Other land use
1. Ensure good geographic distribution of commercial lands.
3. Use an integrated view in examining the proposed boundaries and plan map.
4. La Center needs greater economic diversification opportunities and multi-family land use designations.
5. Ground-truthing is extremely important for employment.
6. Lands with few if any restraints should be allocated first for employment.
7. Employment- reserve overlay for lands served by county railroad corridor.
SITE-SPECIFIC REQUESTS

There have been several site specific requests made for plan changes that would apply only to one or a few specific properties. These requests have been included in the record. Many of the requests would involve de-designation of resource lands or reduction of lot sizes in resource and rural lands. Alternatives 2 and 4 both incorporate area-wide reviews of the county’s resource and rural zones, and therefore include consideration of the issues that govern many of these requests. Because these area-wide alternatives are analyzed in the DSEIS, as well as recommendations involving the urban areas in Alternatives 2 and 3, the site specific requests have not been studied in the DSEIS. Further, the Board adopted Resolution 2014-06-16 on June 24, 2014 suspending annual reviews and docket for 2015 and 2016 unless an emergency exists. Given that resolution, the consideration of non-urban lands by Alternatives 2 and 4, and the fact that site specific requests were not specifically considered in the DSEIS, no further consideration is being given to them in this plan update.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

As previously stated, the comment period on the DSEIS ended at 4 p.m. on September 17, 2015. The Planning Commission received all comments submitted by the deadline. All comments are on the web as well: ftp://ccplanning.clark.wa.gov. The county is still taking general comments on the 2016 plan update.

PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION

The Planning Commission had extensive discussion, deliberation, and voted on each of the elements of the alternatives at a public hearing on September 17, 2015. What was voted on and what the vote was for each item are shown in Exhibit C. The minutes of the Planning Commission are attached as Exhibit D.