



November 18, 2015

Chair Steve Morasch
Vice Chair Ron Barca
Richard Bender
John Blom
Karl Johnson
Eileen Quiring
Bill Wright

SUBJECT: Preferred Alternative for FSEIS of 2016 Clark County Comprehensive Plan

Honorable County Planning Commissioners:

On behalf of the cities of Clark County, we are writing to you with grave concerns about the process this Comprehensive Plan update has taken, and the ability of our communities to adopt legally defensible Comprehensive Plans by June 30, 2016 as required by state law. The Cities have several substantive concerns about the new information which will be addressed separately. The focus of this letter is on process.

The implications of the Growth Management Act (GMA) are clear. Failure of Clark County to adopt a legally defensible Comprehensive Plan by June 30, 2016 will make Clark County non-compliant with state law therefore ineligible for numerous state grants. If Clark County adopts a legally suspect plan it runs the risk of the Growth Management Hearing Board finding the County plan invalid, or at best remanded, requiring continued time and resources on everyone's part. A noncompliant County Comprehensive Plan threatens the cities' plans because a city's plan must be consistent with the County plan. No one benefits from this outcome.

The County Planning Commission, after extensive deliberation on September 17, recommended a preferred alternative based on Alternative 3 in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Statement (SDEIS). The entire SDEIS is based on forecasts and

assumptions adopted by the County Board in April 2015, which were then carried through in the alternatives analysis, summer public comment period and September public hearings. Now, two months later, new information is being proposed that changes key assumptions that drive the EIS process and its projected impacts.

After conferring with some of our attorneys and SEPA officials at the State Department of Ecology, we do not believe the County can incorporate changes of this magnitude without revisiting the EIS process and potentially other actions taken over the past two years. This course of action would almost certainly prevent the County and the cities from meeting the June 30 completion deadline required by law. Most importantly, County legal and planning staff, when asked, have failed to affirm that the County is not putting the Comprehensive Plan at legal risk if we do not revisit SEPA. The cities have no interest in putting themselves at obvious legal risk after investing so much time and expense to be compliant with the GMA.

We believe the Commission should not recommend adoption of the new information without being comfortable with the implications. At a minimum, the Commission should insist that County staff or the Board itself provide bright clarity to the following critical questions:

- ? *Is the Board's recent update to the planning assumptions in compliance with GMA update requirements for an early and continuous public process?*

The County adopted explicit forecasts and assumptions at a public hearing and incorporated those throughout the SDEIS process, only to change several of them at a work session last week that was not open to public testimony, relied on information not developed or fully vetted by professional County planning staff, and which was provided publicly only minutes before the work session.

- ? *Is the attached adopted public participation plan still valid?*

The introduction of Alternative 4 and its recent mutations are not forecast as part of the County public participation plan and the vetting of these additions has been fraught with public notice deficiencies.

- ? *Can the County legally adopt a preferred alternative based on projected impacts far less than reported in the SDEIS without updating and reissuing the SDEIS for further comment based on the impacts now projected?*

Alternative 4, as revised again last week, is now projected to yield only half as many future lots as the SDEIS reported, not because the Alternative has been dramatically scaled back, but rather because a whole set of new assumptions are proposed about how rural land develops. Simply changing the inputs and assumptions does not lessen potential impacts on the ground.

? *Can the County legally select a preferred alternative using significantly different growth forecasts and planning assumptions than those that were adopted in the public hearing and then incorporated in the SDEIS?*

Proposed changes would introduce new set of assumptions for how rural land develops. Furthermore, increasing the countywide population forecast to 580,000 or 582,000 persons is certainly a significant change if it is used to justify or force new land use changes in the rural area, as the new information suggests.


We raise these basic questions seeking to ensure a County process that meets the GMA requirements for clarity and certainty. We respectfully request the Commission to ask County legal or planning staff to address our questions and concerns at the start of the November 19 hearing prior to the Commission delving into the many substantive details of the new information proposed.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,




City of Battle Ground




City of La Center



City of Vancouver




City of Woodland



City of Camas



City of Ridgefield



City of Washougal

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

RESOLUTION NO. 2014 -

A RESOLUTION relating to the adoption of the **Clark County Public Participation Plan and Preliminary Scoping Schedule** that will be used for the county's comprehensive land use plan 2016 periodic update pursuant to Chapter 36.70A 140 RCW.

WHEREAS, Clark County adopted a 20-Year Comprehensive Growth Management Plan through ordinances 1994-12-47 and 1994-12-53 on December 20, 1994 to meet the goals and requirements of Chapter 36.70A RCW (also known as the Growth Management Act "GMA"), and

WHEREAS, Clark County adopted an updated 20-Year Comprehensive Growth Management Plan through ordinance 2004-09-02 and 2007-09-13 to meet the goals and requirements of Chapter 36 70A RCW; and

WHEREAS, Chapter 36.70A.130 RCW requires that the county "shall take legislative action to review and, if needed, revise its comprehensive land use plan and development regulations to ensure the plan and regulations comply with the requirements of this chapter"; and

WHEREAS, Chapter 36.70A.140 RCW requires counties to conduct outreach to "establish and broadly disseminate to the public a public participation program identifying procedures providing for early and continuous public participation in the development and amendment of comprehensive land use plans and development regulations implementing such plans."; and

WHEREAS, Clark County is required to clearly identify the procedures for broad dissemination of proposals and alternatives, opportunity for written comments, public meetings after effective notice, provision for open discussion, communication programs, information services, and consideration of and response to public comments; and

WHEREAS, the Board of County Commissioners after effective notice considered the Clark County Public Participation Plan and Preliminary Scoping Schedule (Exhibit 1) at duly advertised public hearings on January 21, 2014; and

WHEREAS, the Board of County Commissioners took public testimony from interested parties, considered all the written and oral arguments and testimony, and considered all the comments presented to the Board; and

WHEREAS, the Board concluded at duly advertised public hearing and finds that adoption will further the public health, safety and welfare; now therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF CLARK COUNTY, STATE OF WASHINGTON that the Clark County Public Participation Plan and Preliminary Scoping Schedule (Exhibit 1) that will be used for the county's Comprehensive Plan 2016 periodic update pursuant to Chapter 36 70A 140 RCW is hereby approved and adopted for its stated purpose.

1 Section 1. Instructions to Clerk.

2
3 The Clerk to the Board shall

- 4
5 1. Transmit a copy of this resolution to the Washington State Department of Commerce within ten
6 days of its adoption pursuant to RCW 36.70A.106.
7
8 2 Transmit a copy of the adopted resolution to Community Planning Department Director.
9
10 3 Transmit a copy of the adopted resolution to the Cities of Battle Ground, Camas, La Center,
11 Ridgefield, Washougal, Woodland, Vancouver and Town of Yacolt.
12
13 4 Record a copy of this resolution with the Clark County Auditor.
14
15 5. Cause notice of adoption of this resolution to be published forthwith pursuant to RCW
16 36 70A.290.
17

18
19 ADOPTED this ____ day of January 2014
20

21 BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
22 FOR CLARK COUNTY, WASHINGTON


23 Attest:
24
25
26

27 _____
28 Clerk to the Board

By: _____
Tom Mielke, Chair

29
30
31
32 Approved as to Form Only.
33 Anthony F. Golik
34 Prosecuting Attorney

By: _____
David Madore, Commissioner

35
36
37 By 
38 Christine Cook
39 Deputy Prosecuting Attorney

By: _____
Steve Stuart, Commissioner

1. Clark County Comprehensive Plan 2016 Update
Public Participation Plan & Preliminary Scoping Schedule

Purpose

The Washington State Growth Management Act (GMA) requires cities and counties to conduct outreach to ensure “early and continuous public participation” in developing and amending comprehensive plans and development regulations (RCW 36.70A.140). The GMA also requires that local programs clearly identify schedules and procedures for public participation in the periodic update process (RCW 36.70:A 130(2)(a))

To ensure compliance, the Washington State Department of Commerce recommends local governments begin the periodic update process by adopting a public participation plan. It would clearly identify the scope of the proposed update, when legislative action is expected, and how the public can participate or comment. Community Planning believes this recommendation is sound, and strongly encourages the Board of County Commissioners (BOCC) to adopt a formal public participation plan.

Goals

1. Ensure broad participation by identifying key interest groups, soliciting input from the public, and ensuring no single group or interest dominates the process
2. Maintain effective communication and coordination with municipalities and service providers.
3. Provide equal opportunity for participation throughout the county; east (Camas and Washougal), south (Vancouver), northwest (Ridgefield and La Center) and north (Battle Ground and Yacolt).
4. Accommodate budgetary and staffing constraints by ensuring resources are focused on elements of the update process likely to be of greatest interest to the public.
5. Distribute information and post notices efficiently.
6. Notify the public of all meetings, hearings, workshops and legislative actions

Scope of Work

To organize the complex process of updating the Comprehensive Plan, Community Planning has divided essential elements into two phases. During Phase I Pre-Planning, the Comprehensive Plan and development regulations will be reviewed for compliance with state law. This process will identify areas of the plan that must be amended. As a preliminary step, the board and Planning Commission must establish a scope of work for the update. The preliminary scope of work and update schedule are general rather than specific because it is extremely difficult to know the full extent of the required work until Phase I is complete. Phase II will be where issues identified in Phase I are addressed. Throughout Phase I and Phase II, extensive interaction with the community will provide information to the process. To assist, Community Planning has classified work associated with the update as mandatory or strongly recommended. This will accommodate budgetary and staffing constraints. A summary is provided below.

1
2
3

Table 1 – Summary of Potential Work Items		
GMA Requirements	Mandatory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Consideration of GMA amendments ✓ Urban growth areas and population projections ✓ Critical areas regulations ✓ Mineral resource lands ✓ Internal consistency ✓ Development regulation consistency
Required by Clark County Code or Comprehensive Plan	Mandatory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Other development regulation amendments
Important Planning Considerations	Strongly Recommended	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Fully develop benchmark and monitoring system to guide future planning work ✓ Reorganization and rewrite of Comprehensive Plan to improve readability and usefulness ✓ Previously uncompleted annual review docket/work program items

4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

Phase I

Phase I will begin with a thorough review of GMA requirements and compilation of amendments since the 2007 update. The department will review the Comprehensive Plan and development regulations to determine whether revisions will be required to ensure consistency with GMA amendments.

The county also will need to analyze its Urban Growth Areas (UGAs) to ensure they are sized to accommodate 20 years of population and employment growth (based on an adopted OFM range). If, during this analysis, the county determines a UGA is either too small or too large, corrective actions will be identified. They could include altering the size of urban growth areas, changing the allowed uses and densities, or a combination of actions. Any proposed changes must be fully consistent with and supported by adopted Countywide Planning Policies (CWPPs) and capital facilities plans.

Because plans and policies of other local governments and utility providers must be consistent with the adopted Countywide Planning Policies, this step will require high-level intergovernmental coordination. To address this need, the board and Community Planning have committed to working cooperatively with all involved parties as a forum for reviewing and, if need be, revising CWPPs.

Phase II

Once the initial review and analysis are complete (Phase I), the Washington State Department of Commerce recommends local governments adopt an ordinance or resolution stating a review has been completed and identifying elements of the Comprehensive Plan or development regulations that will be updated. This step will result in a report documenting changes in Clark County since adoption of the Comprehensive Plan, areas of the plan or development regulations that must be updated or amended, and amendments or changes, which although not mandatory, the board and Planning Commission have chosen to consider

2014 Resolution

1 Phase II essentially will be a stage where issues identified in Phase I are addressed through plan or code
2 revisions. Until Phase I is complete, Community Planning cannot identify a detailed scope of work for
3 Phase II. However, the department has prepared a general outline of tasks to complete in conjunction
4 with the periodic update. The outline has been incorporated into the attached "Public Participation Plan
5 & Preliminary Scope of Work." A more detailed scope of work will be prepared for Phase II at the
6 completion of Phase I.

7 **Public Participation Program Structure**

8 To best use Clark County's limited planning resources, this plan identifies both *essential* public
9 participation strategies that *will* be employed as well as *optional* strategies which *could* be employed if
10 resources are available. The estimated completion dates for each step are indeed estimates. In some
11 cases, final action may occur before or after the target date because of constrained resources, need for
12 additional intergovernmental collaboration, or unforeseen circumstances.

13 **Techniques and Strategies**

14 The public participation methods employed by Clark County may include:

15 **Innovative Public Involvement Technology** – In addition to traditional outreach methods below, Clark
16 County will use innovative technology. The goal is to reach beyond the individuals who typically attend
17 public meetings to encourage comments from a broader audience. Technology based tools could include:

- 18 • Project grid with dates, topic/issues, upcoming PC, BOCC meetings
- 19 • Mapping/GIS applications and web-based survey
- 20 • Online surveys/Polls
- 21 • CTV – video production for TV broadcast and websites
- 22 • Community Planning's Website, commplanning@clark.wa.gov
- 23 • Electronic voting machines
- 24 • Webinars
- 25 • Social media
- 26 • The Future's Game

27 **Public workshops, Public meetings, and open houses** – Informal gatherings to solicit public feedback on
28 Clark County's planning efforts. Workshops and/or listening posts may involve presentations by staff,
29 question and answer sessions and interactive activities. Community Planning commits to hold meetings
30 at convenient times, and at locations that are accessible. Information is made available either through
31 presentations by technical staff (public meeting) or through display exhibits (open house). We will
32 present material online to create an alternative "open house" for citizens unable or unwilling to attend
33 in person.

34 **Public notification of hearings** (agendas etc.) – The public is notified of Community Planning meetings and
35 events primarily through Planning County website and e-mail communication. The Planning Commission
36 and Board packets of informational material are made available on County website. A formal public process
37 conducted before the Board of County Commissioners or Planning Commission.

38 **Clark County website** – Community Planning Department has a robust website with information about
39 active projects and activities. The online site includes a meeting calendar and electronic copies of
40 agendas, upcoming meetings, programs, and where relevant documents, schedules, announcements,
41 notices of meetings, hearings and public involvement opportunities will be posted. The website offers
42 links to archives of completed projects and studies.

- 1 **City/County coordination meetings** – Community Planning will coordinate with the cities of Battle
2 Ground, Camas, La Center, Ridgefield, Vancouver and Washougal and the town of Yacolt on countywide
3 planning issues that affect each jurisdiction. Clark County will coordinate meetings to discuss issues and
4 seek consensus with each municipality before taking final action. In addition, Clark County will work
5 directly with other municipal service providers affected by the plan.
- 6 **Technical advisory groups** – Community Planning may use technical advisory groups to solicit guidance
7 on complex technical issues requiring a high level of intergovernmental coordination. The groups will
8 include members who have specific knowledge of or interest in specialized technical topics. Technical
9 advisory groups may have members from business and interest groups, trade organizations, service
10 providers, municipalities and county departments.
- 11 **Email Distribution lists and Databases** – Community Planning will promote and maintain a list of
12 individuals and groups who have expressed an interest in the Comprehensive Plan update. The list will
13 be updated and used to disseminate announcements and notices. To join Community Planning
14 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan Update mailing list, contact the Planning Department at
15 360 397.2280 ext. 4558 or online at commplanning@clark.wa.gov The list already includes hundreds of
16 subscribers.
- 17 **Stakeholder Outreach** – Community Planning will identify and reach out to any person or groups that
18 are affected by the plan update, including those who may not be aware they are affected. Stakeholders
19 include the general public, environmental groups, school districts, public health community,
20 neighborhood and civic organizations, public agencies, and other groups.
- 21 **Neighborhood Associations** – Involve neighborhood associations and invite leaders inform neighbors via
22 social media and small gatherings
- 23 **Television and Online Videocasts** – CTV broadcasts of Planning Commission and Board hearings will be
24 replayed to reach a broader audience.
- 25 **Issue papers** – They will provide focused guidance and document the evolution of the update process.
26 Before final adoption, Community Planning will compile the issue papers into a single background report
27 and post issue papers and the report on the department's website.
- 28 **News releases** – Clark County will prepare news releases and distribute them to general news media,
29 specialized media, and neighborhood associations and other local information providers throughout
30 the update process. News releases also are available through online requests for RSS feeds and by
31 following the county on social media, such as Facebook and Twitter.
- 32 **Board of Commissioner worksessions** – Community Planning will schedule worksessions as needed to
33 brief board members and other interested parties and publicize topics and content as warranted.
- 34 **Planning Commission worksessions** – Community Planning will schedule worksessions as needed to brief
35 the Planning Commission and other interested parties.
- 36 **Notification and availability of information** - Clark County will ensure meetings, worksessions and
37 hearings are publicized as required by state law or county code Clark County will make every effort to
38 post all relevant documents on the county website. In addition, a project file will be maintained for
39 public review at Community Planning, Public Service Center, 1300 Franklin St., third floor, Vancouver.
- 40 **Preliminary Schedule** - After a preliminary review of State requirements and technical guidance,

- 1 Community Planning has identified the following specific steps for the 2016 Comprehensive Plan update.
- 2 **Public Information and Outreach** – Community Planning will work with county PIO staff to modify and
- 3 execute this plan as additional information and opportunities becomes available.

July-Dec. 2013	January 2014—December 2015		Jan-May 2016
PRE-PLANNING	DATA ANALYSIS PLAN DEVELOPMENT		ADOPTION
GMA Overview VBLM Review Preliminary Scoping Timeline Public Participation Plan	Public Review & Comment Dépt. 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	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	Public Review & Comment Department of Commerce Review Planning Commission Hearings County Commissioner Hearings Issue Notice of Adoption

4

5 **Phase I – Focus on Informing the Public**

- 6 1. Establish Preliminary Scope of Work and Public Participation Plan
 - 7 a. *Essential public participation* written plan, news release, website, work session, Planning
 - 8 Commission hearing, Board of County Commissioners hearing
 - 9 b. *Final action* Resolution adopting the Public Participation Plan and Preliminary Scope of
 - 10 Work
- 11 2. Selection of 20-year population projection range
 - 12 a. *Essential public participation*: Issue paper, city/county coordination meetings, website
 - 13 update, worksession, county and municipality review, Planning Commission hearing, Board of
 - 14 County Commissioners hearing, coordination with municipal service providers
 - 15 b. *Final action*. Resolution adopting the selected population projection
- 16 3. Countywide Planning Policies
 - 17 a. *Essential public participation*: Issue paper, city/county coordination meeting, website update,
 - 18 worksession, county and municipality review, Planning Commission hearing, Board of County
 - 19 Commissioners hearing, coordination with municipal service providers
 - 20 b. *Final action*. Resolution adopting the revised Countywide Planning Policies
- 21
 - 22 4. Regional growth trends and allocations
 - 23 a. *Essential public participation* Issue paper, website update, city/county coordination
 - 24 meeting, worksessions, coordination with municipal service providers

- 1 b. *Final action.* Resolution adopting allocation of population to each planning area and urban
- 2 growth area.
- 3 5 Buildable lands analysis
- 4 a. *Essential public participation.* Issue paper, website update, city/county coordination
- 5 meeting, worksession.
- 6 b. *Final action:* Buildable lands analysis report available to local planning jurisdictions and
- 7 service providers. The Buildable lands analysis is due June 30, 2015
- 8 6 Formal review of Comprehensive Plan and development regulations
- 9 a: *Essential public participation:* Issue paper, technical advisory group (for certain technical
- 10 elements), website update, email list, news release, public meeting in each planning area,
- 11 worksession, Planning Commission hearing.
- 12 b. *Final action:* Adopted resolution stating a formal review has occurred and identifying
- 13 pending changes or revisions to the Comprehensive Plan and development regulations, and
- 14 a detailed schedule and public participation plan for Phase II of the update.

15 **Phase II – Increase Efforts to Involve Public Before Key Decisions**

16 All public meetings will include online options for information and input for citizens not inclined to

17 attend in person.

- 18 1. Urban Growth Area modifications
- 19 a *Essential public participation:* Issue paper, technical advisory group/city/county coordination
- 20 meeting, worksession, website update, email list, news release, public meeting in each
- 21 planning area where a UGA modification is proposed, coordination with municipal service
- 22 providers
- 23 b. *Final action:* Decision on revised urban growth area boundaries, if any
- 24 2. Draft Comprehensive Plan revisions
- 25 a. *Essential public participation:* Issue paper, technical advisory group (for certain technical
- 26 elements), website update, email list, news release, public meeting in each planning area,
- 27 worksession
- 28 b. *Final action:* Completion of proposed Comprehensive Plan revisions
- 29 3. SEPA analysis and public review period
- 30 a. *Essential public participation:* Update website, email list, send notice to adopt to state
- 31 agencies
- 32 b. *Final action:* SEPA Threshold Determination issued
- 33 4. Draft development regulation revisions
- 34 a. *Essential public participation:* Issue paper, technical advisory group (for certain technical
- 35 regulations), website update, email list, news release, public meeting in each planning area,
- 36 worksession
- 37 b. *Final action.* Completion of proposed development regulations revisions
- 38 5. Final adoption
- 39 a. *Essential public participation:* Issue paper, website update, email list, news release,
- 40 worksession, Planning Commission hearing, Board of County Commissioners hearing
- 41 b. *Final action:* Formal adoption of 2016 Comprehensive Plan update