

# Exhibit 4 Preferred Alternative and Comp Plan Policy 2016 Comprehensive Plan Update

The Preferred Alternative starts with a foundation of Alternative 1 that is then progressively modified by the following elements with the last element taking priority and precedent over prior (lower number) elements. Related Comp Plan Update Policy is also specified as follows:

Alternative	Option Description	Planning Commission Recommendation	Preferred Alternative?
Alt. 1	NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE		
1	The 'No Action' alternative. This option re-adopts the current plan, planning assumptions and moves the planning horizon out to 2035.	Motion to Approve: AYE - 6; NAY - 0 <b>Motion Passed</b>	Yes
Alt. 2	COUNTY-INITIATED ALTERNATIVE		
	RURAL LANDS		
2.a	<b>Rural Lands</b> . Change the comp plan map legend from three comp plan designations to one Rural designation to be consistent with current comp planto-zoning matrix table.	Motion to Approve: AYE – 6; NAY – 0 <b>Motion Passed</b>	Yes, see Note 2.a
2.b	<b>Agriculture Lands</b> . Change the minimum lot size for parcels zoned AG-20 from 20 acres to 10 acres (AG-10).	Motion to Deny: AYE - 4; NAY - 2 Motion Passed	No
2.c	<b>Forest Lands.</b> Change the minimum lot size for parcels zoned FR-40 from 40 acres to 20 acres (FR-20).	Motion to Approve: AYE – 2; NAY – 4 <b>Motion Failed</b>	No
2.d	<b>Rural Lands.</b> For parcels zoned R-20, from 20 acres to 10 acres, in some areas.	No Vote Taken	No
2.e	Rural Centers. Combine rural center commercial (CR-2) and rural commercial (CR-1) into a single comp plan designation of 'rural commercial'.	Motion to Approve AYE – 5; NAY – 1 <b>Motion Passed</b>	Yes
2.f	<b>Urban Reserve.</b> 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	Motion to Approve AYE – 5; NAY – 1 <b>Motion Passed</b>	Yes



### Preferred Alternative and Comp Plan Policy 2016 Comprehensive Plan Update

	land uses.		
	URBAN LANDS		
2.g	<b>Commercial Lands.</b> Combine the three commercial zones (C-2, C-3 and GC) into a single comp plan (C) designation.	Motion to Approve AYE – 5; NAY – 1 <b>Motion Passed</b>	Yes
2.h	Public Facilities. Creation of public facilities zone.	Motion to Approve AYE – 6; NAY – 0 <b>Motion Passed</b>	Yes
2.i	<b>Urban Holding.</b> 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.	Motion to Approve AYE - 5; NAY – 1 <b>Motion Passed</b>	Yes
2.j	Battle Ground UGA. Changes comp plan and zoning designations to better reflect surrounding land uses.	Motion to Approve AYE – 6; NAY – 0 <b>Motion Passed</b>	Yes
2.k	Ridgefield UGA. Add the Tri-Mountain Golf Course to the Ridgefield UGA retaining Parks and Open Space (P/OS) zoning and adding an Urban Holding UH-20 overlay.	Motion to Approve AYE – 6; NAY – 0 <b>Motion Passed</b>	Yes
2.1	Vancouver UGA. Remove reference to the Three Creeks Special Planning Area.	Motion to Approve AYE – 6; NAY – 0 <b>Motion Passed</b>	Yes
2.m	Vancouver UGA. Approve the Discovery/Fairgrounds subarea comp plan map and zoning changes.	Motion to Approve AYE – 6; NAY – 0 <b>Motion Passed</b>	Yes
2.n	Vancouver UGA. Approve the Salmon Creek subarea comp plan map and zoning changes.	Motion to Approve AYE – 6; NAY – 0 <b>Motion Passed</b>	Yes
2.0	Vancouver UGA. Change some parcels that have a mixed use comp plan designation to a comp plan designation that matches current zoning.	Motion to Approve AYE – 6; NAY – 0 <b>Motion Passed</b>	Yes
2.p	Vancouver UGA. Remove UR adjacent to the Vancouver UGA and replace it with R-5 and AG-20	Motion to Approve AYE – 5; NAY – 1	Yes



### Preferred Alternative and Comp Plan Policy 2016 Comprehensive Plan Update

	zoning.	Motion Passed	
2.q	Vancouver UGA. Remove UH in the Fisher Swale area between Vancouver and Camas.	Motion to Approve AYE – 6; NAY – 0 Motion Passed`	Yes, provided that the conditions specified in the existing comp plan are satisfied.
2.r	Washougal UGA. Correct mapping error on parcels with city zoning inside the UGA but outside city limits.	Motion to Approve AYE – 6; NAY – 0 Motion Passed	Yes
Alt. 3	CITY-REQUESTED UGA EXPANSIONS		
3.a	<b>Battle Ground.</b> Add 80 acres, now designated R-5, to the UGA for jobs.	Motion to Approve AYE – 6; NAY - 0 Motion Passed	Yes
3.b	<b>La Center.</b> Add 17 acres, now designated R-5, for a school site.	Motion to Approve AYE – 6; NAY – 0 <b>Motion Passed</b>	Yes
3.c	<b>La Center.</b> Add 56 acres, now designated AG-20, for jobs.	Motion to Approve AYE - 3; NAY - 3 - TIE VOTE - No Recommendation	Yes, provided that if challenged, La Center will provide for the defense instead of Clark County.
3.d	Ridgefield. Add 111 acres, now designated AG-20, for residential.	Motion to Deny AYE – 5; NAY -1 Motion Passed	Yes, provided that if challenged, Ridgefield will provide for the defense instead of Clark County.
3.e	Washougal. Add 41 acres, now designated R-5, for residential.	Motion to Approve AYE – 2; NAY – 3 ABSTENTION – 1 Motion Failed	Yes
	RURAL, AGRICULTURE, AND FOREST LANDS		
Alt. 4	CHANGES		
4.a	Rural Lands. Eliminate R-10 and R-20 zones unless	Motion to Deny	See Note 4.a



#### Preferred Alternative and Comp Plan Policy 2016 Comprehensive Plan Update

	publicly owned property. Create R-1 and R-2.5	AYE – 5; NAY – 1	
	zones. Maintain R-5 zone.	Motion Passed	
4.b	Agriculture Lands. Eliminate AG-20 zone unless	Motion to Deny AYE – 4; NAY – 2	See Note 4.b
	publicly owned property. Create AG-5 and AG-10 zones.	Motion Passed	See Note 4.b
	Forest Lands. Add FR-10 and FR-20 zones to	Motion to Approve	
4.c	existing FR-40 and FR-80 zones.	AYE – 2; NAY – 4	Yes, see Note 4.c
		Motion Failed	
4.abc	Cluster Options		Yes, see Note 4.abc
	OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS		
	A <b>Motion</b> was made for the councilor's to allow	Motion to Approve	
	for a process for flexibility and opportunity for	AYE – 5; NAY 1  Motion Passed	No, see Note 4.x
	land owners who continuously owned property	WOUGH Passeu	
4.x	prior to the 1994 plan to possibly divide their		
4.X	property. The vote was 5-1 to approve. There was		
	discussion as to whether the effort, discussion of		
	the process will come to the PC work session,		
	meetings, etc.		
Policy #	Comp Plan Update Policy		
1	Exhibit B - Assumptions – Choice B		Yes, see Policy 1
2	Comp Plan Update process and FSEIS		Yes, see Policy 2

**Note 2.a:** Yes, provided that the revised Alternative 4 map is selected that, instead of proliferating significantly new 1 and 2.5 acre zoned parcels, nearly exclusively recognizes already existing 1 and 2.5 acre parcels in areas where they are the predominant parcel sizes.

**Note 4.a:** The revised Alternative 4 map is selected as the specific implementation of the policy that eliminates R-10 and R-20 zones unless publicly owned property, maintains the R-5 zone, and adds R-1 and R-2.5 zones that, instead of



# Preferred Alternative and Comp Plan Policy 2016 Comprehensive Plan Update

proliferating significantly new 1 and 2.5 acre zoned parcels, nearly exclusively recognizes already existing 1 and 2.5 acre parcels in areas where they are the predominant parcel sizes.

**Note 4.b:** The revised Alternative 4 map is selected as the specific implementation of the policy that adds AG-5 and AG-10 zones to the existing AG-20 zone.

**Note 4.c:** The revised Alternative 4 map is selected as the specific implementation of the policy that adds FR-10 and FR-20 zones to the existing FR-40 and FR-80 zones.

**Note 4.abc:** Yes. Cluster options shall be included in the Preferred Alternative for each of the rural zone categories of R, AG, and FR, as communicated by the Board throughout the Comp Plan Update process.

**Note 4.x:** No. It is not appropriate to add future general ideas / concepts to a Preferred Alternative. There is insufficient specificity for an FSEIS to analyze.

**Policy 1:** The Board selects as policy, Exhibit B and choice B of Exhibit A to be used as the specifications and criteria to be used in the FSEIS analysis. The October 8, 2015 subject matter expert letter from the Clark County Technical Advisory Committee on Septic Systems is to be included in the FSEIS to correct related out of date information published in the DSEIS.

**Policy 2:** The Board adopts the following policies and processes related to the Comp Plan:

- 2.1 The materials and information submitted for analysis by the FSEIS shall be wholly consistent with the Preferred Alternative and fully supportive of the policies selected by the Board of Clark County Councilors (Board).
- 2.2 It shall be the policy of the Board to have the option to select an alternative consultant or resource to complete the FSEIS in the event of a cost overrun or delayed delivery date.
- 2.3 The Board policy is hereby adopted to complete the FSEIS as scheduled by February 1, 2016.
- 2.4 It shall be the policy of the Board to review the FSEIS, to specify any corrections deemed necessary, and to approve the FSEIS in a public hearing before the FSEIS is considered final and submitted to state.



# Preferred Alternative and Comp Plan Policy 2016 Comprehensive Plan Update

- 2.5 Since numerous Clark County policies have changed since the existing Comp Plan was adopted, the Comp Plan shall be updated to be consistent with adopted Clark County policies. The processes necessary for the Board to specify and incorporate those policies into the Comp Plan shall be completed within the allotted time.
- 2.6 Documents not actually published by the Board or by Clark County staff shall not be posted as Comp Plan reports or plans on the Clark County website.