RESOLUTION NO. 2015-04-00

A RESOLUTION relating to the adoption of the alternatives for study in an environmental impact statement under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) that will be used for the county's comprehensive land use plan 2016 periodic update pursuant to Chapter 36.70A RCW.

WHEREAS, the 2016 Clark County comprehensive growth management plan review process required under RCW 36.70A.130(3) began on July 17, 2013, with a duly advertised public meeting; and

WHEREAS, the Board of County Commissioners (Board) adopted Resolution 2014-01-09 Clark County Population and Job Projections at a duly advertised public hearing on January 21, 2014, and in doing so adopted the office of financial management's medium population projection of 562,207 persons for the 20-year period ending in 2035; and

WHEREAS, the Board adopted Resolution 2014-04-01 Employment Forecast at a duly advertised public hearing on April 1 and 29, 2014, thereby adopting the employment security department's projection of 91,200 net new jobs for the 20-year period ending in 2035; and

WHEREAS, the Board adopted Resolution 2014-06-17 Population and Employment Allocation, Planning Assumptions and the 2016 Board Principles and Values at a duly public hearing on June 24,2014 to be used for the county's Comprehensive Plan 2016 periodic update pursuant to RCW 36.70A.140; and

WHEREAS, the county is required under Chapter 43.21C RCW to evaluate environmental impacts that could result from actions it approves or undertakes; and

WHEREAS, RCW 43.21C.030 states that all policies, regulations and laws of the state of Washington shall be interpreted and administered in accordance with the policies set forth in Chapter 43.21C RCW; and

WHEREAS, as part of the 2007 comprehensive plan update, the county prepared an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), issuing both a draft EIS (DEIS) and a final EIS (FEIS); and

WHEREAS, given the economic downturn that happened subsequent to the 2007 plan update, it was determined using the vacant buildable lands model that the adopted population and jobs targets can be accommodated in current urban growth areas with minimal targeted additions; and

WHEREAS, given that determination, the county on July 30, 2014 re-adopted the 2007 EIS and announced its intent to prepare a supplemental EIS for additional proposed changes, in addition to announcing scoping meetings for August 2014; and

WHEREAS, the county held scoping meetings on August 18, 20, 27, and 28, 2014; and

WHEREAS, the Board approved a contract with ESA (Seattle) on August 19, 2014 to prepare the supplemental EIS; and

WHEREAS, the Board held work sessions on SEIS alternatives on July 16, September 24, and October 22, 2014, and at the latter, the Board agreed upon three alternatives ; and

WHEREAS, the county held public open houses on the details of the three alternatives on October 29 and 30, 2014; and

WHEREAS, the Board requested at a work session on January 21, 2015, that work be halted on the supplemental EIS until a fourth alternative could be developed; and

WHEREAS, the Board reviewed Issue Paper 5.0 SEPA Scoping (Exhibit 1) at a worksession on July 16, 2014, and reviewed Issue Paper 5.1 SEPA Alternatives (Exhibit 2) at a worksession on March 11, 2015; and

WHEREAS, a fourth alternative was developed and the county held additional open houses on the alternatives on March 25 and April 1, 2015; and

WHEREAS, the Board considered revised Issue Papers 5.0 SEPA Scoping and 5.1 SEPA Alternatives at a duly advertised public hearing on April 14, 2015; and

WHEREAS, the Board 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 finds that adoption will further the public health, safety and welfare; now therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS OF CLARK COUNTY, STATE OF WASHINGTON, as follows:

Section 1. The Board hereby adopts the Clark County Alternatives for study under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) as shown below. This information developed in SEPA analysis of the Clark County Alternatives will be used for the county's 20-year Comprehensive Growth Management Plan 2016 periodic update pursuant to RCW 36.70A.140.

Alternative 1: No Action Alternative. This alternative is the adopted Comprehensive Plan as amended in July 2014, with the current urban growth boundaries, planning assumptions, policies and implementation ordinances.

Alternative 2: Rural and Urban Changes. The new planning assumptions, policy direction, changes in land use/zoning and principles and values defined by the Board were used in this alternative. This option supports job and population growth.

- FR-40/AG-20 to FR-20/AG-10, and R-20 to R-10, where appropriate

- Washougal UGA comp plan to zone consistency
- Expand Ridgefield UGA to include the Tri-Mountain Golf Course
- Single Rural Lands comp plan designation
- Single Rural Commercial comp plan designation
- Urban reserve (UR) changing urban reserve to a true overlay, and applying underlying rural zoning where needed
- Urban holding (UH) changing urban holding to a true overlay, recognizing the underlying zoning applied when the land was brought into a (UGA)
- Public facilities zone creation
- Single Commercial comp plan designation
- Removal of Three Creeks Special Planning Area
- Removal of UH in the Fisher Swale area of the Vancouver UGA
- Mixed Use comp plan to zone consistency
- Subarea comp plan and zone changes
- Arterial Atlas updates (includes Bicycles)

Alternative 3: Battle Ground, La Center, Ridgefield and Washougal.

- Battle Ground's request for 80 acres (currently zoned R-5) for employment
- La Center's request for 56.55 acres (currently zoned AG-20) for employment, and for an additional 17 acres (currently zoned R-5) for a new school site
- Washougal's request for 40.6 acres (currently zoned R-5) for residential
- Ridgefield's request for 107.47 acres (currently zoned AG-20) for residential

Alternative 4: Rural options.

- Forest zones: Include 20- and 10-acre minimum lot size areas where appropriate (considering the existing rural nature and predominant lot sizes)
- Agriculture zones: Include 5- and 10-acre minimum lot size areas where appropriate (considering the existing rural nature and predominant lot sizes), and eliminate the 20-acre minimum lot size
- Rural zones: Create 1, 2.5, and 5 acre minimum lot size areas where appropriate (considering the already developed lots, the existing rural nature, and predominant lot sizes), and eliminate the 10- and 20-acre minimum lot sizes
- Clustering Options to aggregate and preserve 70% of R, AG, and FR land in open space for agriculture, forest, or other non-residential uses.

* * * * *

Section 2. Effective Date. This resolution shall take effect immediately upon its adoption.

Section 3. Instructions to Clerk.

The Clerk to the Board shall:

1. Transmit a copy of the adopted resolution to Community Planning Department Director.

2. Transmit a copy of the adopted resolution to the Cities of Battle Ground, Camas, La Center, Ridgefield, Washougal, Woodland, Vancouver and Town of Yacolt.

ADOPTED this 14th day of April 2015.

BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
FOR CLARK COUNTY, WASHINGTON

Attest:

Rebecca Tilton
Clerk to the Board

By: _____
David Madore, Chair

Approved as to Form Only:
Anthony F. Golik
Prosecuting Attorney

By: _____
Jeanne E. Stewart, Councilor

By: Christine Cook
Christine Cook
Deputy Prosecuting Attorney

By: _____
Tom Mielke, Councilor

Exhibits

Exhibit 1, Issue Paper 5.0
Exhibit 2, Issue Paper 5.1

Exhibit 1

Clark County Comprehensive Plan 2016 Update

Planning for growth 2015 – 2035

SEPA Scoping – Issue Paper 5

Purpose

This memorandum provides a basic framework and starting point from which the county and its cities will launch the environmental impact review process under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA). This process will be used to inform the public about three proposed growth alternatives, advertise the county's intent to prepare a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS), and provide an opportunity to comment on the scope of impacts to be examined in the SEIS.

Background

In July 2013, Clark County began updating its Comprehensive Growth Management Plan to meet the 2016 periodic update requirement of RCW 36.70A.140. Community Planning prepared the following issue papers to help the Board of County Commissioners make decisions about the update:

- Issue Paper 1 - Comprehensive Plan Overview: A summary of the county's Planning Assumptions, 2013 vacant and buildable lands model (VBLM) inventory and population and employment projections.
- Issue Paper 2 – Population and Job Projections: Background information for a discussion with the cities and the town of Yacolt on population and job planning assumptions for 2015-2035. On Jan. 21, 2014, the Board adopted the state Office of Financial Management's (OFM) medium population projection of 562,207 for the 20-year period ending 2035 (Res. 2014-01-09).
- Issue Paper 3 – Employment forecast based on input from Washington Employment Security Department (ESD). It was revised as Issue Paper 3.1 to include the 2014 VBLM information. On April 29, 2014, the Board adopted the high employment forecast of 91,200 net new jobs for the 20-year period ending 2035 (Res. 2014-04-01).
- Issue Paper 4 – Population and Job Allocation: On June 24, 2014, the Board identified the methodology for allocating growth by UGA and adopted preliminary allocations for initial review (Res. 2014-06-17).

This issue paper, Issue Paper 5, will discuss the environmental impact review process under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) and seek Board direction on development of alternatives.

SEPA Process

Enacted in 1984, the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) requires local governments to evaluate environmental impacts that could result from actions they approve or undertake. The most common evaluation is to discuss potential impacts of a proposed development on various resources and qualities of the environment listed on the SEPA checklist. There also are non-project actions that are reviewed, such as adoption of code language or a new plan or policy. The completed checklist is shared with federal, state and local agencies, Indian tribes, neighborhood organizations and interested parties.

Large development projects, such as an asphalt plant, and certain non-development projects, such as expansion of an urban growth area, require a more in-depth SEPA review, including, 1) identification and analysis of potential project-related impacts, and 2) consideration of possible alternatives to the proposed action. An environmental impact statement (EIS) is prepared, discussing any potential impacts. The county prepared an EIS in 2007, issuing both a draft EIS (DEIS) and a final EIS (FEIS). Comments on alternatives presented in the draft were used to determine a preferred alternative that was the focus of analysis in the FEIS.

For the 2016 update, the county is proposing to add to the 2007 environmental analysis, as needed, by preparing a supplemental EIS (SEIS). Under SEPA, analysis of a plan's impacts is not required to be site-specific, but rather give an overview of impacts that could be expected under the alternatives.

The EIS process under SEPA begins with a scoping process. That is when the county seeks public input and Board direction to define issues related to the comprehensive plan update that will be addressed in the draft SEIS. The preferred alternative studied in the final SEIS and eventually adopted by the Board will reflect local jurisdictions' input, Board directives, guiding principles and values and countywide planning policies. The SEIS and comprehensive planning process will end with adoption of an updated comprehensive growth management plan for Clark County.

Methodology

Since Clark County's 2007 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update, conditions in the county, as well as state and federal laws, have changed, requiring corresponding changes to the plan. The Board has adopted planning assumptions and principles and values that provide policy direction for reviewing and updating the county's growth management plan by June 2016.

As stated above, preparation of an EIS must include alternatives, including a 'no action' alternative that maintains the status quo. Possible alternatives for review in the EIS are listed below.

Alternative 1: No Action Alternative. This alternative is the adopted Comprehensive Plan as amended in July 2014, with the current urban growth boundaries, planning assumptions, policies and implementation ordinances.

Alternative 2: County-Initiated Actions.

a) Urban growth areas adopted in July 2014.
b) Rural Land amendments to the Zoning Map, such as AG-20 to AG-10, FR-40 to FR-20 and R-20 to R-10, where needed.
c) Washougal UGA amendments to the Zoning Map to reflect county zoning and application of Urban Holding.
d) Vancouver UGA amendments to the Zoning Map to remove the Three Creeks Overlay.
e) Removal of Urban Holding in the Vancouver UGA area known as Fisher's Swale.
f) New Public Facility zone.
g) Eliminate Comprehensive Plan Chapter 1 Table 1.6, Mixed Use footnote and subsequent Comprehensive Plan and Zoning changes.
h) Streamline commercial zones from three to two.

i) Zoning Map changes to include property owner site-specific requests, particularly within the Salmon Creek and Discovery planning areas.
j) Zoning Map cleanup of Urban Reserve application consistency, UR-10, UR-20 and UR-40; Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Map cleanup of Urban Holding application consistency.
k) New Arterial Atlas Map for bicycles.
l) At the request of property owners, sites that meet Board directives and other criteria. The new planning assumptions, policy direction, principles and values defined by the commissioners will be used in this alternative.

Alternative 3: City-Requested Actions.

a) Urban growth areas adopted in July 2014.
b) Expansion areas proposed by cities in July 2014.

After the scoping process, land use alternatives will be developed based on technical analysis, input from cities, the Board's principles and values and results of the environmental scoping and analysis. From the DSEIS, a preferred alternative will emerge, providing a 20-year land supply and meeting the 2014 planning assumptions and policy directions.

NEXT STEPS

During four open houses in August, the public is invited to comment on the scope of impacts to be examined in the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement. All open houses will be 7 - 8:30 p.m. Here are the open house dates and locations:

Tuesday, Aug. 19	Fort Vancouver Community Library, 901 C St., Vancouver
Wednesday, Aug. 20	Lacamas Lake Lodge, 227 N.E. Lake Rd., Camas
Wednesday, Aug. 27	Ridgefield Community Center, 210 N. Main Ave., Ridgefield
Thursday, Aug. 28	Battle Ground Community Center, 9123 E. Main St., Battle Ground

Exhibit 2

Clark County Comprehensive Plan 2016 Update

Planning for growth 2015 – 2035

SEPA Alternatives – Issue Paper 5.1

Purpose

This memorandum provides a summary of events that have transpired since the Board of County Commissioners, now known as Board of Clark County Councilors (Board), initially discussed the environmental impact review process under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) on July 16, 2014.

Background

In July 2013, Clark County began the process of updating its Comprehensive Growth Management Plan to meet the 2016 periodic update requirement of Chapter 36.70A.140 RCW. Several issue papers have already been prepared to allow the Board to make decisions about the update:

- Issue Paper 1 - Comprehensive Plan Overview: A summary of the county's Planning Assumptions, 2013 vacant and buildable lands model (VBLM) inventory and population and employment projections.
- Issue Paper 2 – Population and Job Projections: Background information for a discussion with the cities and the town of Yacolt on population and job planning assumptions for 2015-2035. On Jan. 21, 2014, the Board adopted the state Office of Financial Management's (OFM) medium population projection of 562,207 for the 20-year period ending 2035 (Res. 2014-01-09).
- Issue Paper 3 – Employment forecast based on input from Washington Employment Security Department (ESD). It was revised as Issue Paper 3.1 to include the 2014 VBLM information. On April 29, 2014, the Board adopted the high employment forecast of 91,200 net new jobs for the 20-year period ending 2035 (Res. 2014-04-01).
- Issue Paper 4 – Population and Job Allocation: On June 24, 2014, the Board identified the methodology for allocating growth by UGA and adopted preliminary allocations for initial review (Res. 2014-06-17). It was revised as Issue Paper 4.1 to reflect the additional capacity for population and jobs not captured by the vacant land model and presented at a BOCC Worksession on September 24, 2014. Following the 2015 assessor's population update, the issue paper was revised as Issue Paper 4.2.
- Issue Paper 5 – SEPA Scoping: On July 16, 2014, the Board discussed the environmental impact review process under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) and directed staff to proceed to scoping on development of alternatives.
- Issue Paper 5.1 provides a partial list of what has transpired from July 17, 2014 through March 11, 2015.

On July 16, 2014, the Board held a worksession on Issue Paper 5 - SEPA Scoping and instructed staff to inform the public about three proposed growth alternatives, advertise the county's intent to prepare a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS), and provide an opportunity to comment on the scope of impacts to be examined in the SEIS. Highlighted below is a brief summary of events since July 16.

- July 17 Planning Commission review of Issue Paper 5

- July 29 — Press release 6946 – Open Houses to gather public input on scope of growth plan update
- July 30 — Legal Notice – Intent to re-adopt 2007 EIS printed in Columbian
- July 29, 30 — Legal Notice – SEPA threshold and scoping printed in Reflector, Columbian and Camas Washougal Post Record
- Aug 5 — Camas/Washougal Post Record article - Camas hosts growth plan update workshop
- Aug 8 — City/County Coordination Meeting
- Aug 10, 12, 13, 15 — Open House advertisement – printed in Columbian, Reflector and Camas Washougal Post Record
- Aug 13 — Reflector article – Open House to gather public input on scope of growth plan update
- Aug 17 — Clark County Focus
- Aug 18, 20, 27, 28 — Open Houses – SEPA scoping
- Sep 12 — City/County Coordination Meeting
- Sep 18 — Planning Commission – SEPA scoping update
- Sep 24 — BOCC Worksession – SEPA scoping update
- Oct 10 — City/County Coordination Meeting
- Oct 13 — Neighborhood Associations of Clark County presentation on growth plan update by staff
- Oct 13 — Press release 6992 – County prepares more information on growth plan alternatives
- Oct 14, 15, 17, 19 — Open House advertisements – printed in Columbian, Reflector and Camas Washougal Post Record
- Oct 14, 15 — Public Notice – Alternatives printed in Columbian, Reflector and Camas Washougal Post Record
- Oct 15 — Press Release 6994 – Planners to brief commissioners on maps of growth plan proposals
- Oct 16 — Planning Commission- review of alternatives
- Oct 17 — Postcard mailer to property owners (quantity 9,625), notice of open houses
- Oct 22 — BOCC Worksession – three alternatives
- Oct 29, 30 — Open Houses - three alternatives
- Nov 6 — Planning Commission - update on open houses
- Nov 14 — City/County Coordination Meeting
- Jan 21, 2015 — BOCC Worksession – progress to date on 2016 Comprehensive Plan update, key decisions, SEPA review and update, issues review and update. Stop Work Order Issued to contractor drafting SEIS

The county received 209 comments from July 16, 2014 through January 21, 2015 on the comprehensive plan in general, SEPA scoping and process, the proposed three alternatives and planning assumptions.

- Feb 18 — BOCC Worksession – review of proposed 4th alternative, City of Ridgefield and City of La Center request for UGA expansion
- Mar 11 — BOCC Worksession –review of alternative 3.1 (Ridgefield, La Center, Washougal and Battle Ground requests for UGA expansion) and the proposed alternative 4 guiding principles, goals and options to be analyzed

Methodology

Since Clark County's 2007 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update, conditions in the county, as well as state and federal laws, have changed, requiring corresponding changes to the plan. The Board has adopted planning assumptions and principles and values that provide policy direction for reviewing and updating the county's growth management plan by June 2016.

As stated in Issue Paper 5, preparation of an EIS must include alternatives, including a 'no action' alternative that maintains the status quo. Alternatives that were reviewed by the Board on **October 22** to be included in a supplemental EIS are as follows:

Alternative 1: No Action Alternative. This alternative is the adopted Comprehensive Plan as amended in July 2014, with the current urban growth boundaries, planning assumptions, policies and implementation ordinances. SEPA requires the inclusion of a no-action alternative.

Alternative 2: Rural and Urban Changes. The new planning assumptions, policy direction, changes in land use/zoning and principles and values defined by the Board were used in this alternative. This option supports job and population growth.

- FR-40/AG-20 to FR-20/AG-10, and R-20 to R-10, where appropriate
- Washougal UGA comp plan to zone consistency
- Expand Ridgefield UGA to include the Tri-Mountain Golf Course
- Single Rural Lands comp plan designation
- Single Rural Commercial comp plan designation
- Urban reserve (UR) changing urban reserve to a true overlay, and applying underlying rural zoning where needed
- Urban holding (UH) changing urban holding to a true overlay, recognizing the underlying zoning applied when the land was brought into a (UGA).
- Public facilities zone creation
- Single Commercial comp plan designation
- Removal of Three Creeks Special Planning Area
- Removal of UH in the Fisher Swale area of the Vancouver UGA
- Mixed Use comp plan to zone consistency
- Subarea comp plan and zone changes
- Arterial Atlas updates (includes Bicycles)

Alternative 3: Battle Ground and La Center. The cities of Battle Ground and La Center are considering expanding their urban growth areas to support job growth.

- Battle Ground's request for 80 acres (currently zoned R-5) for employment
- La Center's request for 56.55 acres (currently zoned AG-20) for employment

On **February 18, 2015** Alternative 4 was presented by Board staff.

Alternative 4: Rural options. The preliminary focus is on parcels smaller than 9.5 acres in forestry and agricultural zoning districts.

- Recognize existing parcelization for parcels <9.5 acres
- AG -20 to Rural
  - 682 parcels / 2864 acres

- 554 developed, 128 undeveloped
- 68 in current use, 10%

- FR-40 to Rural
  - 844 parcels / 3673 acres
  - 680 developed, 164 undeveloped
  - 68 in current use, 8%

On **March 11,** the Board reviewed updated Alternatives 3.1, approved the creation of a new Alternative 4 based on the following, and discussed creating a new countywide planning policy that sets reasonable timeframes for review and possible action on Urban Reserve and Urban Holding areas.

Alternative 3.1. Battle Ground, La Center, Ridgefield and Washougal. The county received new requests to expand urban growth areas by La Center (school site), Ridgefield (large lot residential) and Washougal (large lot residential).

- Battle Ground's request for 80 acres (currently zoned R-5) for employment
- La Center's request for 56.55 acres (currently zoned AG-20) for employment
- A new La Center request for an additional 17 acres (currently zoned R-5) for a new school site
- A new Washougal request for 40.6 acres (currently zoned R-5) for residential
- A new Ridgefield request for 107.47 acres (currently zoned AG-20) for residential

Alternative 4: Rural options. (Councilor Madore's proposal)

Guiding Principles and Goals:

1. No de-designation of Resource Lands (AG or FR).
2. Correct fundamental discrepancies between the actual predominant lot sizes and the existing zoning map.
3. Respect the actual rural character in each local area to provide better compatibility and consistency with adjacent properties.
4. Add clustering options to better aggregate parcels and preserve resource land and open space for agricultural, forestry, and non-residential use.
5. Allow a wider range of affordable lot size choices to fill obvious market gaps and provide a better balance.
6. Add flexibility needed to convert fallow land to more manageable economically viable agricultural and forest land.

Options to be analyzed:

- Forest zones: Include 20 and 10 acre minimum lot size areas where appropriate (considering the existing rural nature and predominant lot sizes)
- Agriculture zones: Include 5 acre minimum lot size areas where appropriate (considering the existing rural nature and predominant lot sizes)
- Rural zones: Include 1, 2.5, and 5 acre minimum lot size areas where appropriate (considering the already developed lots, the existing rural nature, and predominant lot sizes)
- Clustering Options to aggregate and preserve 70% of R, AG, and FR land into open space for agriculture, forest, or other non-residential uses.

NEXT STEPS

During two open houses, the public is invited to comment on the scope of impacts to be examined under SEPA. Both open houses will be 5:30 - 7:00 p.m.

- March 25, Ridgefield High School
- April 1, Hockinson High School

The BOCC will hold a hearing on April 14, 2015 at 10:00 a.m. to hear testimony from the public and then affirm which alternatives will be studied under SEPA.