Summary of DEIS Comments - ALPHABETICAL by Commentor

Commentor:	Summary of Comment:	Response
Addis, Kevin	Concern for environmental impact and request for survey information from impacted residents and infrastructure revenue funding information.	1.) The GMA requires that the county plan for the projected number of people expected to be living in Clark County in 20 years. The county is working through a planning process to try to determine the best way to manage this growth. 2.) Information is included in both the DEIS and FEIS on the potential impacts to habitat and scenic values and a host of other things of environmental importance. A buffer along the Washougal River could certainly be included. 3.) We are not sure what survey information you are referring to. With regard to costs and revenues, a capital facilities plan will be prepared before the comprehensive plan is adopted showing costs for new facilities for growth and the projected revenues to pay for them.
Agar, Peter & Tamara	Opposition to Alternatives #2 & #3 for Battle Ground region.	Comments noted.
Agenda: BOCC Hearing 09/20/2006	Agenda for BOCC Hearing to solicit agency comments on DEIS.	Hearing Agenda - no comments required.
Alm, Don & Jennie	Opposition to Alternative 3, specifically west end of Salmon Creek, with concern for septic cystems and storm runoff. Request to be excluded from proposed UGB.	This is a Site Specific Request to be excluded from the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.
Bergeron, Wayne	Opposition to being included in the Battle Ground UGB. 274419-000, 274588-000, 274571-000, 195275-000, 195287-000 & 195252-000.	This is a Site Specific Request to be excluded from the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.
Bodell, Polly	Request to expand UGB to include V-1 area with R1-20 to 1 acre large-lot zoning and supporting commentary. Request to identify UR-10 designation and where it will be applied.	This is a Site Specific Request to be included in the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.
Bottemiller, Steve & Carol	Approval of Alternative #3, Vancouver NW.	Comments noted.
Bourquin, Phil	1) Camas Residential Development, 2) Prime industrial lands, 3) City of Camas proposed rebalanced map, with attached data and maps.	Comments noted.
Brown, Arthur	Need to finish this process, it makes sense for this area to be developed. Parcel # 117020-000.	Comments noted.

Commentor:	Summary of Comment:	Response
Brown, Milton O.	Request to include 89 acres into Vancouver UGB. Parcels # 183079-000.0, 183081-000.0, 183086-000.0, 183090-000.0, 183080-000.0, 183082-000.0, 183087-000.0, 183091-000.0, 183061-000.0, 183088-000.0, 183083-000.0, 183084-000.0, 183089-000.0 & 183085-000.0.	This is a Site Specific Request to be included in the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.
Brown, Milton O.	Request to include 110 Acres in Vancouver UGB. Parcels # 213065, 213068, 213072, 213070, 213074, 213080, 213066, 213069, 213076, 213079, 213067, 213071, 213073, 213075, 213077, 213082, 213078, & 213081.	This is a Site Specific Request to be included in the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.
Buck, Joe & Teri Lyn	Opposition to Alternatives #2 & #3 for Battle Ground region.	Comments noted.
Calnan, John and Anita	Opposition to inclusion into the boundary. Comment that area is major staging and wintering ground for migratory fowl. Land use zoning changes would result in los of uses and they do not want that to happen. 209720-000	This is a Site Specific Request to be excluded from the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.
Camas, City of	1) Camas residential development, 2) Prime industrial lands, 3) City of Camas proposed rebalanced map, plus attached spreadsheets.	Comments noted.
Carman, Lynn	1) Lack hazards (super fund sites, all EPA sites & Camp Bonneville), 2) poor planning to provide concurrency services, 3) sprawl.	Comments noted.
Christensen, Paul	Request to include 171727-000, 172341-000, 171727-000, 171704-000, 172557-000, 172553-000, 172559-000, 173178-000, 172557-000, 173213-000, 173212-000, 173193-000, & 173158-000 into Camas' UGB.	This is a Site Specific Request to be included in the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.
Cisney, Merle E.	Request to include their 30 acres north of Lacamas Lake in the Camas UGA.	This is a Site Specific Request to be included in the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.
Cisney, Robert & Debra	Requesting inclusion of their 10 acres north of Lacamas Lake in the Camas UGA.	This is a Site Specific Request to be included in the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.
Clark County News Release	"County extends comment period on growth planning". Deadline for public comment on DEIS extended to October 2.	News Release Record - no comments required.
Clark, Arlen	Comment regarding coyotes not being mentioned in DEIS.	1.) Coyotes are not a species on either the federal or state endangered/threatened species lists.

Commentor:	Summary of Comment:	Response
Close III, Daniel V.	Opposition to Alternatives #2 & #3 for Battle Ground region.	Comments noted.
Cobb, Roland & Connie	Request to be excluded, or if must be included, to limit lot size to 1 acre or larger. Parcel #19880-005.	This is a Site Specific Request to be excluded from the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.
Connelly, Eric	Comments/concerns re: infrastructure deficiencies and capital facilities deficiencies.	Comments noted.
Connelly, Eric	Concerns on Infrastructure deficiencies, Financial/traffic. "Citizens will suffer too much, decline of livability will be too great, and impact on our natural resources will be too great to proceed at this time."	Comments noted.
Coop, John	Request to include his property in UGA and change zoning under Alternative 3 from R-10 to Commercial Light Industrial.	This is a Site Specific Request to be included in the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.
Coop, John	*COPY-DUPLICATE* Support for Alternative #3 as it pertains to parcels #179152-000 and 179191-000.	This is a Site Specific Request to be included in the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.
Crawford, Tom & Marianne	Opposition to Green Mountain and Northshore Land regions of Lacamas Lake being "swallowed up by large developers for the use of businesses and homes".	Comments noted.

Commentor:	Summary of Comment:	Response
Creager, Kurt	Comments that DEIS does not address the demand for affordable housing, particularly extremely and very low-income residents.	1.) Housing affordability is discussed beginning on page 153 of the DEIS, although no projections of affordability over the 20-year planning period were done. Table 49 shows the number of county households that can afford rents within specific ranges, and compares the ranges to the HUD fair market rent, which is higher than what over 20,000 existing households can afford. SEPA does not require an EIS for a GMA document to quantify the impacts of future growth on affordability. The RCW citation refers to the adequacy of comprehensive plan elements under the GMA, and does not refer to the adequacy of housing analysis in a DEIS. The FEIS can address how the County and its cities comply with state and federal regulations pertaining to allowing for government-assisted housing, manufactured housing, group homes and foster care facilities. 2.) It is true that policies for affordable do not guarantee availability of affordable housing. The demand for affordable housing may need to be met through additional county and city policies and incentives. This can be reflected in the "additional mitigation" section of the land use section of the FEIS. 3.) Alternative 2 or a modification of this alternative that has become the Preferred Alternative would allow a large amount of single-family development to occur outside of Vancouver and is unlikely to improve the availability of affordable housing. The DEIS reflects current county policy to address affordability of housing through policies and implementing regulations. This discussion can be expanded in the FEIS.
Creager, Kurt	*COPY-DUPLICATE* Comments that DEIS does not address the demand for affordable housing, particularly extremely and very low-income residents.	Comments noted.
Currier, Dave	Addition to previous comment with reference to page #'s in the DEIS.	Comments noted.
Currier, Dave	*COPY-DUPLICATE* Concerns & objections to changes in growth boundaries, specifically on south side of NE 28th Street.	Comments noted.
Currier, Dave	Concerns & objections to changes in growth boundaries, specifically on south side of NE 28th Street.	Comments noted.
Currier, Dave & Kay	More density = lower values over time. We prefer urban reserve. Think before you leap!	Comments noted.
Curry, Barbara	Opposed to continued spending of taxpayers' money on the Growth Management Project and does not want to be included in UGB.	Comments noted.
Davis, L.	Thanks for offering this information.	Comments noted.

Commentor:	Summary of Comment:	Response
Dennis, Paul; Mayor	Comments specific to density and housing mix goals.	Comments noted.
Dennis, Paul; Mayor	Comments re: new road plans and intent to preserve Ledbetter Mansion.	Comments noted.
DeTemple, Charles & Frank	Request that their property be excluded from the newly proposed Camas Urban Growth Area.	This is a Site Specific Request to be excluded from the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.
Douglass, Steve	Marc Boldt should recuse himself from voting on issues that will benefit his brother.	Comments noted.
Douglass, Steve	Will Boldt Dairy be treated the same as other property? Infrastructure concerns for construction and funding. Concern that there is little talk of creation of new jobs.	Comments noted.
Doutrich, Dawn & Steigelman, Michael	Support of Alternative #1 (no change) with 6 suggestions/comments provided.	Comments noted.
Dowd, Charles & Vicki	Request to be included in Camas UGB. Parcel 175266 and 175270.	This is a Site Specific Request to be included in the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.

Commentor:	Summary of Comment:	Response
Durgan, Robert T.	DEIS Comments and Critical Lands Report	1.) Your comments are noted. The DEIS is based on the direction of the Board which is to accommodate a higher growth number. 2.) The key development assumptions used to develop the alternatives were chosen by the Board through a public process. All the assumptions (e.g., infrastructure factor, growth rate, development on critical lands, employment and housing densities) reflect policy decisions by the Board. 3.) The Board provided direction for the development of the alternatives to include a variety of densities (e.g., employment densities, tired density for each of the cities). See the Clark County Buildable Lands Report (August 2002) per the requirements of RCW 36.70A.215 which was based on actual development. 4.) Overrides that were not documented have been excluded from this analysis. As noted in Table 60, page 188 the actual job densities achieved from 1995 to 2000 exceeded the 9 and 20 jobs per acre target, so the Board's job density assumption is not unreasonable. The public sector job estimate is based on Washington State Employment Security Department. data on public sector job growth as a percentage of total covered employment. Public sector jobs are likely to be located on existing exempt lands as well as non-exempt lands such as new school sites not currently owned by a school district. 5.) See response #2. 6.) Your comments are noted. 7.) Table 87 expresses Alternative 1 as the full buildout of the existing Urban Growth Area in terms of existing dwelling units and acres. Alternative 2 contains the proposed Urban Growth Areas. 8.) The capital facilities plan data in the DEIS for the Evergreen School District (pages 230 and 232) says that under Alternative 1 the District would need to construct six elementary schools, one middle school and one high school, for a total of eight new schools in addition to those that are planned in the next six years. Under Alternative 2, the District would need to construct seven elementary schools, one middle school and one high school, for a total of nine new schools in addition to those that are planned in the next six years. There also would be approximately 1,300 students attending classes in portables, a slight increase in the number of unhoused students projected under Alternative 1. Under Alternative 3, the District would need to construct seven elementary schools, one middle school and one high school, for a total of nine new schools - the same number projected under Alternative 2. There would be approximately 73 additional students attending classes in portables under Alternative 3 in comparison to Alternative 2. The District needs to construct one additional elementary school to accommodate projected growth under Alternatives 2 and 3 because the county estimated that there would be approximately 716 additional single family homes built in that portion of the Vancouver Urban Growth Area that is in the Evergreen School District under Alternatives 2 and 3 (fewer housing units are forecast under Alternative 1). The District's anticipated increase in student enrollment is a result of the additional housing, with the biggest increase projected at the elementary school level. Similarly, the slight increase in the number of students that would be attending classes in portables under Alternative 3 is a result of the estimated 112 additional housing units in the Camas Urban Growth Area (sub area 1)

that is in the Evergreen School District.
9.) The discussion of policy issues on page 213 was not intended to be a comparative cost benefit analysis of the various transportation investment options. Reference is made to transportation planning projects currently underway to address some of the major issues related to cross river and transit capacity. The purpose of the DEIS is to evaluate growth alternatives, not to prioritize regional transportation investments on interstate corridors. Estimates of future transportation funding from the state are very conservative. Projections based on past history are problematic now that the legislature has assumed a greater role in determining where funding is allocated. We agree that the Board is likely to increase impact fees to generate much of the revenue shortfall; however they have not yet taken that action. The impact fee estimates in the revenue model are based on current TIF rates and the growth in daily trips projected for the plan horizon year.
10.) Your comment is noted.
11.) Jerry Olson expresses two concerns about the Vacant Buildable Lands Model (VBLM) yield calculations:
1. He states that according to the model a large number of people that will be living on environmentally constrained land.
2. He questions whether the Infrastructure deduction used for Residential land includes enough land for schools and parks.
With regard to the first concern, for the 1994 and 2004 Comprehensive plan process it was assumed that parcels with more than 50% environmental constraints would not develop. During the data driven assumptions analysis it was determined there were flaws in the environmental constraints analysis. There were many examples of these lands developing during the past ten years. For the current process the environmental constraints methodology was changed so that environmentally constrained lands were treated as aggregate area independent of the parcel configuration. The new methodology provided a much better method of evaluating the rate of development during the past 10 years. It was determined that vacant and underutilized land with environmental constraints converts to other classifications at half the rate of non constrained land. The BOCC agreed that 50% of the constrained lands would be converted to other classifications during the course of the comprehensive plan.
Mr. Olson's assumption that lower job and population densities will occur on constrained lands vs. non – constrained lands is probably true. The density of housing units and jobs per acre has not been reviewed with respect to constrained vs. non-constrained lands.
During the VBLM analysis it was determined that constrained lands have higher percentage of infrastructure than do non-constrained lands. This is because the constrained lands are converted preferentially to parks and open space. This supports Mr. Olson's assumption. The analysis also showed that using different infrastructure deductions for constrained vs. non-constrained had a minimal effect on the final yield.
Mr. Olson's report uses an aggregate housing units and jobs densities numbers. Housing units and jobs densities vary depending on comprehensive plan

Commentor:	Summary of Comment:	Response
		designation. To fully evaluate Mr. Olson's assumption it would be necessary to take a much closer look at what housing and employment densities were achieved on constrained and non-constrained lands during the past 10 years. These numbers could then be used to adjust the density forecasts for the current comprehensive plan. Since housing and employment density was not considered a data driven assumption this has not been fully evaluated for this comprehensive planning process. With regard to the second concern, the infrastructure deductions are data driven assumptions based on the development trends that have occurred during the past ten years. Mr. Olson's analysis suggests that all of the parks and school lands required for the expected growth during the life of the comprehensive plan will be converted from vacant and underutilized residential land. During the past 10 years this has not been the case. New school property has been acquired outside the existing UGB. Parks lands have been created primarily from industrial, commercial, and residential constrained land. Park lands have also been acquired outside the UGB. The VBLM analysis has not compared how much park land was purchased during the study period against how much park land was needed to meet planning goals. Recent efforts by the Battle Ground School District to site a new elementary school highlight the challenge facing schools trying to purchase residential vacant land.
Erickson, Mark	I would like to be included in the new zoning designation (higher density) when the plan is adopted.	This is a Site Specific Request to be included in the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.
Esser, Kevin	I need someone to explain to me why the top of Green Mountain is designated as "employment/business". Clearly not suited for this. Please give me a call at 360-834-7007 night, 503-745-8307 day.	Comments noted.
Forbes, Ed & Carole	Request for Alternative #3 to include a 7 acre parcel at corner of 50th Ave & 179th Street, Parcel # 193327-000.	This is a Site Specific Request to be included in the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.
Forbes, Edward	In favor of Alternative #3.	Comments noted.
Francis, Bob	The only alternative to accommodate growth is to allow building in areas outside of the present boundaries of the urban area.	Comments noted.
French, Angela	Request to be included in the UGB and to let Washougal grow.	This is a Site Specific Request to be included in the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.

Commentor:	Summary of Comment:	Response
Friends of Clark County	68-page commentary.	1.) The estimates for transportation costs do not include local and neighborhood street improvements, because these roads are built by developers as a condition of development approval. The second comment regarding transportation infrastructure does not relate to the DEIS, but to the development approval process. Staff is aware that many road segments have not yet been built to the design standards of the functional classification adopted in the Arterial Atlas. The concurrency and traffic safety analysis required prior to development approval should be adequate to address the stated concern. 2.) The purpose of the DEIS is to disclose information about environmental impacts. 3.) Your comments are noted. The DEIS is based on the direction of the Board which is to accommodate a higher growth number. Any change in policy of how the county grows in the future is at the discretion of the Board. 4.) The observed job densities for new construction between 1995 and 2000 were 9.9 jobs per gross acre for industrial uses and 22 jobs per gross acre for commercial uses. These actual densities are comparable to the 9 and 20 jobs per net acre assumed in the DEIS per Board direction. 5.) See response #3. The FEIS and other related documents such as capital facilities plans will address how to pay for anticipated growth.
Garrett, Timothy	Please adopt #1 Alternative. Remember we have already 4000 homes on the market with no one purchasing them.	Comments noted.
George, Dan	SSR to include 196185-000 Collier, 196185-005 George, 196197-010 & 196185-010 Hart, 196186-000 Nelson, 196242-000 Poage in V4 South of Salmon Creek.	This is a Site Specific Request to be included in the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.
Germann, Larry	Request to include 153962-000 & 154009-000 located at 16209 NE 99th St, in UGB.	This is a Site Specific Request to be included in the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.
Gervais, Alan	30-day comment period is insufficient.	Comments noted.
Gillaspie, David	Need to notify homeowners by mail on proposals. Not everyone takes the local newspaper.	Comments noted.
Gilroy, David	Concern for habitat and environment with references to EIS Scoping Comments index.	Comments noted.
Gruher, Jim & Monica	*COPY-DUPLICATE* 1) Traffic, 2) Utilities, 3) Not orderly, 4) Decrease in quality of life. (This is a duplicate copy of letter sent also to Commissioner's office.)	Comments noted.
Gruher, Jim & Monica	1) Traffic, 2) Utilities, 3) Not orderly, 4) Decrease in quality of life.	Comments noted.

Commentor:	Summary of Comment:	Response
Habersetzer, Donna	Requesting inclusion of parcel # 154006-000 owned by Roth Investments, LLC, into the UGB.	This is a Site Specific Request to be included in the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.
Haddon, Lance	30-day comment period insufficient.	Comments noted.
Hammack, Duncan	Request to rezone 257370-000 @ 701 NW 379th Street, La Center WA from FR-40 to RA density, and that the current mining overlay be lifted.	This is a Site Specific Request to be included in the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.
Hardy, Dave	Opposition to expansion into the Fern Prairie area in Camas.	Comments noted.

Commentor:	Summary of Comment:	Response
Hayes, Jennifer	Alt #1 does not adequately evaluate the potential for accommodating new population within existing UGA boundaries usines Low Impact Development and open space corridor planning.	1.) The comments about the potential of LID and open space corridor planning to mitigate the impacts of development are well taken. Low Impact Development (LID) is an approach to stormwater management that mimics nature's processes through small, cost-effective landscape features located at the lot level instead of conveying and managing / treating stormwater in large, costly end-of-pipe facilities located at the bottom of drainage areas. Almost all components of the urban environment have the potential to serve features of LID, not only open space, but also rooftops, streetscapes, parking lots, sidewalks, and medians. LID is a versatile approach that can be applied equally well to new development, urban retrofits, and redevelopment / revitalization projects. Consequently, implementation of LID means higher-density development can have fewer net impacts from stormwater runoff than either non-LID higher-density or single-family development. Green infrastructure strategies can also be part of LID, providing a way to achieve desired densities while limiting the use of land and maintaining critical ecosystem services. Adopting green infrastructure practices into land use and site planning can result in keeping habitat protections or stormwater management as part of other recreational or scenic amenities of a site. As a system, green infrastructure is an integrated network of streets, forests, greenways, and bikeways that are designed to enhance their ecological function. An example of green infrastructure would be street trees which evapotranspirate stormwater, absorb pollutants, and provide cover for pedestrians. Another site strategy for high-density development is combining open space requirements with a vegetated infiltration basin for stormwater flow control and volume reduction. The FEIS section on impacts and mitigation from high density development will be expanded to reflect this. 2.) If the No Action Alternative were adopted unchanged as the Preferred Alternative, analysis shows there would be insufficient land under the existing zoning designations to accommodate projected residential growth. That alternative alone would not meet the requirements of the GMA. Upzoning within the existing UGAs is an option for keeping the existing UGAs and also accommodating future growth. The BOCC decided to draft the No Action Alternative with the assumption that some upzoning would be required, but no specifics as to how or where that would be done were included. The BOCC assumed that further analysis of upzoning options could occur in the development of a Preferred Alternative and be analyzed in the FEIS. However, the Preferred Alternative includes an expansion of the UGAs and no changes to existing zoning are proposed under the Preferred Alternative. Pressure for development on rural areas could be offset by increased development options from upzoning in the urban areas; however, without specifics of upzoning implemented as part of Alternative 1, the potential for development pressure on rural areas should be disclosed, particularly if the market demand for single-family detached housing exceeds supply in urban areas because of conversion of low-density residential zones to multi-family zones. 3.) Paragraphs 2-4 on page 20 discuss upzoning as part of Alternative 1. Additional information will be added to the revised DEIS. 4.) The areas mentioned as lacking open space corridors (Vancouver, Camas and Washougal) already lack open space corridors. One of the Board's principles and

Commentor:	Summary of Comment:	Response
		values is to maintain open space that already exists, particularly between Ridgefield and La Center. 5.) When land is annexed into a city, that city's regulations apply. All Clark County cities have critical areas ordinances that are assumed to be GMA-compliant. 6.) Support for use of transfer of development rights, open space corridor planning, cluster development and other innovative strategies for reducing impacts from growth are noted.
Hayes, Molly	1) Information of potential changes/proposals need to be made, not just in paper, by mail, also for meetings! 2) #3 plan appears to have more open/green space which we must keep/have/protect.	Comments noted.
Henry, Lisa Nichols	Comments regarding Battle Ground school districts problems and quality of life near St. Johns Road, comments on lack of zoning protections for property values.	Comments noted.
Hobson, Hali; Realtor	Request to have properties included in UGB/Camas annexation with attached signatures from residents.	This is a Site Specific Request to be included in the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.
Hogan, Pat	Take Carty Lake area out of Ridgefield boundary!	This is a Site Specific Request to be excluded from the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.
Holtmann, John J.	Support for Alternative #3 and commentary that there appears to be an overall shortage of good light and heavy industrial land within Clark County's UGB.	Comments noted.

Commentor:	Summary of Comment:	Response
Horenstein, Stephen & Howsley, James	1) Population projection, 2) Transportation, 3) VBLM, 4) Legal adequacy under SEPA, 5) Additional Mitigation, plus 5 more specific comments.	1.) Your comments are noted. The DEIS is based on the direction of the Board which is to accommodate a higher growth number. Any change in policy of how the county grows in the future is at the discretion of the Board. 2.) Estimates of future transportation funding from the state are very conservative. Projections based on past history are problematic now that the legislature has assumed a greater role in determining where funding is allocated. We agree that the Board is likely to increase impact fees to generate much of the revenue shortfall; however they have not yet taken that action. The impact fee estimates in the revenue model are based on current TIF rates and the growth in daily trips projected for the plan horizon year. More discussion of the potential for additional state and TIF revenue will be included in the final document. 3.) At the time of preparing the DEIS, the county relied on the most current data and on policy directions from the Board which included the base year of 2004. Information on plated lots or pending subdivisions are outside the scope of the DEIS. 4.) The nature of Alternative 3 as the geographic flexibility alternative made it impossible to adequately compare it to Alternative 2. It was decided that the best course of action was to discuss each Alternative 3 subarea individually so that an assessment could be made if the Board chooses to include any of them along with Alternative 2 lands in the preferred alternative. 5.) The reviewer is correct in that it is assumed that develop regulations are in place that will adequately protect, for example, critical areas. The information on mitigation is presented precisely for this reason--to let readers know that there are policies, programs and regulations in place to mitigate the expected impacts of growth. 6.) Your comment on Camas' growth and required upzoning to accommodate future population is noted. Data from 2004 to 2006 were not provided for all jurisdictions by way of comparison. 7.) The county has engaged a consultant to prepare an analysis of designated agricultural land proposed for inclusion in Alternatives 2 and 3. The Board will consider that report and any subsequent information to make findings on whether those specific properties should be included or excluded from urban growth boundaries. These comments, however, are not adequate to conclude that AG-20 lands should be included or excluded from urban growth boundary expansions. 8.) This information will be added to the revised DEIS. 9.) This information will be added to the revised DEIS. 10.) La Center junction is not characterized by urban development by any stretch. It makes sense for La Center to have the connection to I-5. Provision of true urban services, such as water and sewer, however, is a whole different issue, and these are presently a long way from the junction.
Howsley, James	Inclusion of parcels 177904-000, 177884-000, 177885-000, 177891-000, 175259-0000, 175258-000, 175727-000, 175726-000, 175772-000, 175733-000, 1755724-0-00, 175747-000, 175752-000, 175713-000, 175717-000, 175717-000,& 175712-000 in Camas' UGB. (Lacamas North Shore properties).	This is a Site Specific Request to be included in the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.

Commentor:	Summary of Comment:	Response
Howsley, James	Request to include 214427-000 known as "Mt. View Dairy", currently zoned AG and owned by William Rohrer.	This is a Site Specific Request to be included in the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.
Howsley, James	Request to include 181466-000, 181548-000, 181580-000 known as "Zilke Property", currently zoned AG PF UR owned by Wilfred & H. Marjorie Zilke; and 181581-000 known as "Milbrandt parcel", currently zoned UR owned by Birchwood Farms LLC.	This is a Site Specific Request to be included in the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.
Howsley, James	Request to include 216450-000, 216452-000, 216477-000 & 216690-000 known as "Kennedy Property", currently zoned R-10 PF AG and owned by William Kennedy.	This is a Site Specific Request to be included in the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.
Hukla, James	30-day comment period is insuffient.	Comments noted.

Commentor:	Summary of Comment:	Response
Irish, Jim; Mayor	66 specific line-item comments to DEIS.	1-5.) See responses #1-5 for DEIS 82, also a letter from the City of La Center. 6.) Alternative 3 contains 19 subareas that could be used to add land to Alternative 2. It would be more correct to say that Alternative 3 is not a stand-alone alternative, because adding the 19 subareas to Alternative 2 would result in a much larger than needed expansion area to accommodate 20 years of projected growth. The ability to serve Alternative 3 subareas is discussed in the Public Facilities and Utilities section of the DEIS. 7.) The purpose of providing information on mitigation is to let readers know that there are policies and regulations in place to address most if not all impacts from development. 8.) If L2 goes to urban reserve, then the traffic impact would certainly be less than stated. L2 as analyzed in the DEIS included both single family and multi-family residential in the area of 11th Avenue and NW Spencer Rd. 9.) This information will be added to the revised DEIS. 10.) This information will be added to the revised DEIS. 11.) See response #1, DEIS 82. 12.) The rest of the principle/value includes 'that can be serviced effectively'. La Center has acknowledged its desire to, but the difficulties of, serving the junction. 13.) The total acreage for the new La Center UGA in Alternative 2 in the DEIS is 1,213 acres. Where calculations of land area were based on overlays, the acreage can be slightly higher, either due to rounding or minor errors in mapping. This shows up in Table 26, Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas, as 1,218 acres because the mapping layer includes surface waters. The actual land area added in the UGA is correct to the best of the County's calculation, at 1,213 acres. The authors could not find a reference to 1,220 acres in the DEIS. 14.) Figure 4 is correct based on the information that was presented and analyzed in the DEIS. 15.) One of the Board's principles and values was to try to identify areas in the county that should not be made urban because of their environmental value(s) or the presence of severe environmental constraints. 16.) Critical areas are removed from the buildable inventory but it is not always possible to state with certainty that there won't be some impact to all gross acres. The purpose of providing the information on development regulations and mitigation is to let readers know that there are policies and regulations in place to address most if not all impacts from development. 17.) This information will be added to the revised DEIS. 18.) As originally proposed, L2 contained multi-family residential. 19.) This information will be added to the revised DEIS. 20.) This information will be added to the revised DEIS. 21.) This information will be added to the revised DEIS. 22.) The mitigation section is included to state that soils with severe limitations can still be built developed. 23.) The error in the characterization of the zones in the DEIS has been corrected. 24.) The stream miles as shown in Table 17 are correct based on data provided by County GIS.

Commentor:	Summary of Comment:	Response
		25.) The data in Table 20 were generated by county GIS staff based on what is actually observed in land developments. 26.) The DEIS has been revised to reflect lower impacts from Parks/Open Space zoning. 27.) To the extent that Parks/Open Space zoning will preserve land from development, the addition of L1 and L2 subareas would not the same potential for adverse impacts as under other urban zones. However, as long as the subareas are within the UGA, they are potentially subject to requests for rezones, whereas they would have greater protection against conversion outside the UGA. Unless there are deed restrictions or special overlays targeted to protecting those areas, the claim that floodways and floodplains will have enhanced protections by adding the subareas to the UGA rather than leaving them outside the UGA is not accurate. 28.) The data in Table 24 were generated by county GIS staff based on what is actually observed in land developments. 29.) There are no impacts to McCormick Creek by the Alternative 3 subareas. The data for Allen Creek is correct in Table 24. 30.) This information will be added to the revised DEIS. 31.) Your comments are noted. The revised DEIS and FEIS reflect the observation that Parks/Open Space zoning will have less impact on priority habitat than is indicated by the Table 33. Alternative 2 does not add any Parks/Open Space zones to the UGA, so the reference to Table 32 does not apply. 32.) Your comment is noted. This will be reflected in the FEIS. 33.) As originally proposed, L2 contained multi-family residential. 34.) The data is correct for the land uses presented in the DEIS for L1. 35.) Under section "f" on page 187, a sentence noting La Center's lack of industrial land has been added. 36-37.) According to Clark County GIS, Alternative 2 would add 507 acres of employment land, and Alternative 3 would add 325 acres of industrial land (no distinction of light industrial). 38.) This information will be added to the revised DEIS. 39.) This information will be added to the revised DEIS. 40.) This information will be added to the revised DEIS. 41.) This information will be added to the revised DEIS.

Commentor:	Summary of Comment:	Response
Irish, Jim; Mayor	Comments re: L1 and L2 subareas.	The comments from the city were in favor of Alternative 3, with a couple of exceptions. The city commented on the characterization of how well the alternatives met the Board's principles and values. The characterizations were made from a county-wide perspective, not from a La Center perspective. 1.) As proposed in the DEIS, the characterization of L1 and L2 is correct. La Center's revised proposal submitted as a comment on the DEIS would show that this principle/value was met. 2.) As proposed in the DEIS, neither L1 nor L2 contained any commercial land. Alternative 2 does include commercial land on the east side of I-5 along La Center Road. 3.) Again, Alternative 2 meets this principle/value, but L1 in and of itself does not. 4.) Compared to other proposed expansion areas, those proposed for the La Center UGA are heavily constrained. 5.) Again, compared to other proposed expansion areas, those proposed for the La Center UGA are heavily constrained.
Irish, Jim; Mayor	Follow up response to issues raised in public hearing on 9/20/06	Comments noted.
Jacobsen, Dennis & Joella	Request for parcel #184843-000 @ 3117 NW 151st Street in V1 to be included in UGB and UR-10 to be lifted.	This is a Site Specific Request to be included in the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.
Johnson, Terry & Beth	Opposition to Alternatives #2 & #3 for Battle Ground region.	Comments noted.
Johnson, Todd	Request for CJ Dens properties to be included in Camas UGB. Parcel # 177905-000, 177906-000, 178172-000, & 178236-000.	This is a Site Specific Request to be included in the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.
Johnson, Todd	*COPY-DUPLICATE* Request for CJ Dens properties to be included in Camas UGB. Parcel # 177905-000, 177906-000, 178172-000, & 178236-000.	This is a Site Specific Request to be included in the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.
Johnston, Lynn	Request for inclusion of their 9 parcels totaling 260 acres in the Camas UGA.	This is a Site Specific Request to be included in the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.

Commentor:	Summary of Comment:	Response
Kabel, Doug	Against expansion of UGB beyond the 2004 UGB. Concerns re: schools, Northshore of Lacamas Lake development, transportation, historical preservation, values/principles assumptions.	1.) Your comment is noted. The purpose of a DEIS is to disclose information about environmental impacts. 2.) The inclusion of the north shore of Lacamas Lake was requested by the City of Camas. If included as proposed in the preferred alternative, most of the area along the lake will be residential (including residential as mixed use) or parkland. The Board is aware that this is one of largest proposed urban growth boundary expansions in this comprehensive plan update cycle. 3.) The transportation cost estimates on page 10 represent only the County's likely expenditures for transportation capital facilities. They do not address any of the impacts from subareas in Alternative 3. Prior to final adoption of an urban growth boundary, the cities and County will need to demonstrate that they have realistic, financially constrained transportation capital facilities plans. 4.) Your comment is noted.
Kabel, Laura	Against Alternative #3. Comments re: schools, transportation, scenic resources, historic preservation.	1.) Camas School District has provided information regarding what capital facilities will be needed to respond to each of the alternatives. 2.) Prior to final adoption of an urban growth boundary, the cities and County will need to demonstrate that they have realistic, financially constrained transportation capital facilities plans. 3.) Your comment is noted. The Preferred Alternative studied in the FEIS includes much of the area proposed under Alternative 3 along the north side of Lacamas Lake.

Commentor:	Summary of Comment:	Response
Karpinski, John S.	Comments re: inadequate infrastructure, guaranteed jobs, and costs of growth. 2006 growth plan costs table, with attached memo to BOCC and Rich Lowry that the growth plan alternatives do not meet legal standards with supporting WAC's.	1.) As an option the Board could adopt some kind of phased development requirement with the adoption of the 2006 comprehensive plan, similar to what was done with urban holding in the 1994 comprehensive plan. 2.) Your comments are noted. See response #1. 3.) The county understands the need to calculate the costs of growth. The DEIS process is to make a reasonable attempt to estimate what these costs might be. A capital facilities plan will be prepared once the geography of a preferred alternative is defined that will not only better define costs of growth but will also include revenue sources expected to pay for them. 4.) The SEPA rules address required EIS alternatives analysis in WAC 197-11-440(5) (generally) and WAC 197-11-442 (non-project proposals). Generally, an EIS must include a reasonable level of analysis of a reasonable number and range of reasonable alternatives. The limitation to reasonably detailed analysis and a reasonable number and range of alternative is an application of the "rule of reason" which governs the adequacy of an EIS. Under the rule of reason an EIS is not required to include a compendium of every conceivable effect or alternative, but need include only information which is truly beneficial to the decision making process. "Reasonable alternatives" are specifically defined by the SEPA rules as actions capable of attaining or approximating the proposal's objectives "but at a lower environmental cost or decreased level of environmental degradation" (WAC 197-11-786). Here the stated objective is to accommodate a 2% growth rate given the other assumption contained in the Scoping Notice. Presenting a range of geographic areas, with comparative environmental analysis, which reasonably could be substituted for areas within Alternative 2 and still achieve the county's objective better informs the decision making process than a set of superficially distinct geographic options. In neither 1994 nor 2004 did the board of county commissioners ultimately adopt one of the "stand alone" alternatives which were presented in EIS analysis. The current formulation of Alternative 3 recognizes the dynamic and evolving nature of comprehensive plan development and adoption. The appropriateness of Alternative 3 is underscored by the SEPA rule dealing with non-project actions. Impacts and alternatives are to be discussed at a level of detail appropriate to the level of abstraction of the proposal. Particularly for non-project proposals SEPA accords agencies with wide latitude in preparing and EIS as long as the impacts and alternatives are discussed at a level of detail commensurate with the scope of the non-project proposal.
Karpinski, John S.	30-day comment period is not sufficient.	Comments noted.
Keithley, Jim	Request to change population assumptions from 2% to 2.26% to match maximum assumptions allowed by the Office of Financial Management.	1.) The Board chooses the 20-year growth rate from low, medium or high population numbers provided by the state. The 2.0% growth rate (2.2% for the first six years) was chosen by the Board as the most likely scenario, and represents the upper end of the medium range.

Commentor:	Summary of Comment:	Response
Kennedy, Wanita	Because of environmental issues it is hard to make a living Dairy farming in Clark County. A stream goes through our property.	Comments noted.
Knapp, Chester & Lisa	Support of the existing proposed map and expansion.	Comments noted.
Kohler, Monique	Vote NO on Alternative #3.	Comments noted.
Kujava, Rodger & Barbara	Opposition to Alternatives #2 & #3 for Battle Ground region.	Comments noted.

Commentor:	Summary of Comment:	Response
Kunec, Michelle	Summary comments and edits to the DEIS.	1.) Information on the Conservation Futures program will be added to the revised DEIS. 2.) The DEIS discusses capital expenses as required by the Growth Management Act, but does not discuss operating costs. The Board of County Commissioners addresses operating and maintenance costs through the budget process. 3.) The potential costs of correcting the original deficit created by the Urban Growth Area have been discussed in the DEIS, see table 85 which depicts the number of new acres necessary to meet each jurisdictional standard. Also see page 236, lines 28 through 30 of the DEIS which discusses cost of acquisition both in rural areas and urban areas. 4.) The document states no new park facilities are planned for the expansion areas because that is currently accurate. We understand that park and recreation plans will be updated to reflect the need for parks within the expansion area. However, staff can only rely on currently adopted plans at the time of publication, not future plans that might be adopted in the drafted form or could change prior to adoption. 5.) The boundaries of the Greater Clark Parks District (GCPD) will remain at the current geographic location until a new vote is held and the taxing authority is expanded, with voter approval, to match the new Urban Growth Boundary. 6.) See response #4. Staff is aware of a new plan going through the process, but we are also aware that the new parks and recreation plan will probably not be adopted this year. 7.) See response #1. 8.) See response #4. We are aware the numbers are likely out of date, however we must rely on the adopted information or information that has been recently published. 9.) See response #2. 10.) This information will be corrected in the revised DEIS. 11.) This information will be corrected in the revised DEIS. 12.) This information will be corrected in the revised DEIS. 13.) See response #4. 14.) This information will be corrected in the revised DEIS. 15.) This information will be corrected in the revised DEIS. 16.) This information will be corrected in the revised DEIS. 17.) This information will be corrected in the revised DEIS. 18.) See response #4 above. 19.) This information will be corrected in the revised DEIS. 20.) This information will be corrected in the revised DEIS. 21.) When a preferred alternative is selected these numbers will more accurately reflect the park acreage needs. Table 85 bases need on UGA capacity in Alternatives 1 and 2.
Lampe, David	*COPY-DUPLICATE* Request to include parcels # 28533-000, 228538-000, 228547-000, 228550-000 & 228552-000 into BG UGB, and designation change to Mixed Use/Employment Battle Ground. GIS packet attached.	This is a Site Specific Request to be included in the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.

Commentor:	Summary of Comment:	Response
Lampe, David	Request to include parcels # 28533-000, 228538-000, 228547-000, 228550-000 & 228552-000 into BG UGB, and designation change to Mixed Use/Employment Battle Ground. GIS packet attached.	This is a Site Specific Request to be included in the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.
Langsdorf, Michael G.	Request to include Walker Farm in the GMA for Ridgefield as shown on Alternative #2.	This is a Site Specific Request to be included in the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.
Lathim, Byron	Request to be included in UGB as per Alternative #3, with attached petition of 11 signatures representing 9 addresses.	This is a Site Specific Request to be included in the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.
Lauerman, Kirk	Nice maps, very nicely done!	Comments noted.

Commentor:	Summary of Comment:	Response
Levanen, Carol	Concern that county is trying to prevent residential activity in the rural areas of Clark County.	1.) RCW 36.70A.070 lists the GMA requirements for comprehensive plan, one of which is a rural element. The rural element includes consideration of a) local circumstances; b) rural development; c) measures governing rural development; and d) rural centers (limited areas of more intensive rural development). The GMA was enacted so that fully-planning counties plan for both urban and rural areas. 2.) The consideration of scenic resources is a requirement of the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), not the GMA, although one element of 'measures governing rural development includes 'assuring visual compatibility of rural development with surrounding rural area' (RCW 36.70A.070(5)(c)(ii)). A discussion of scenic resources is included in the DEIS, as required by SEPA. 3.) As stated in #1 above, GMA requires the preparation of a rural element. The rural element, as defined, includes "lands that are not designated for urban growth, agriculture, forest of mineral resources." This includes rural lands as well as resource lands. The GMA planning goals (at RCW 36.70A.020) include sprawl reduction and efficient urban growth which are designed to protect rural lands. The rural development element includes 'measures governing rural development' which includes 'containing or otherwise controlling rural development (RCW 36.70A.070(5)(c)(i)). Premature urban development is that that would occur in the absence of planned public services/facilities and that allows the inappropriate conversion of undeveloped land into sprawling, low-density development in rural areas (RCW 36.70A.070(5)(c)(iii)). 4.) The purpose of an EIS is to disclose information about environmental impacts. The information about soils is provided to inform readers about soil types and characteristics. The information does not purport to allow or prohibit any type of development. Decisions about development are made on a parcel-specific basis, and most if not all of environmental constraints, including slope, soil type and stability, erosion hazard or landslide potential can be mitigated for. 5.) Information included in the DEIS figures is at a macro-scale, to give the reader a sense of the general nature of a particular resource county-wide. There is much more detailed information available on a site-specific basis. SEPA requires that the 'lead agency shall discuss impacts and alternatives in the level of detail appropriate to the scope of the non-project proposal and to the level of planning for the proposal (WAC 197-11-442(2)).
Levanen, Carol	Concern for pollution in rivers and streams.	Comments noted.
Levanen, Carol	Continued concern re: land use restrictions and prevention of new rural housing in the rural lands outside the UGA's.	1.) The proposal to expand urban growth boundaries in no way limits the use of rural lands for any type of activity other than to convert them over 20 years from rural uses to urban uses. The information presented in the DEIS is to disclose in general terms the characteristics of the environment and the impacts of projected growth in both urban and rural Clark County. Information on mitigation is provided so that readers understand that there are programs and regulations in place to address the impacts of growth. With regard to soils, they are classified in a number of ways, very few of which speak to any prohibition of use. The obvious examples are addressed in the flood hazard ordinance and the geohazard ordinance.

Commentor:	Summary of Comment:	Response
Lewis, Gordon	Request to include Schmidt property of 47 acres of land new WSU to be included in UGB as mixed use with apartment/conco/attached/single-family zoning. No parcel # reference, but map attached.	This is a Site Specific Request to be included in the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.
Libby, Darrel	Opposition to extension of UGB in his area.	This is a Site Specific Request to be excluded from the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.
MacRae, Rosalee	Request for preservation of Pittock/Leadbetter house and Lacamas Lake area with comments re: traffic concerns as well.	Comments noted.

Commentor:	Summary of Comment:	Response
Madsen, Steven	1) Schools, 2) Transportation, 3) Environment, 4) Land Use, 5) Jobs.	1.) The purpose of the table on page 8 is to show to what degree each alternative meets the targets which result from the Board assumptions. Footnote #4 refers to Page 5 of the DEIS Summary, but we have not been able to locate the numbers and conclusions cited. The DEIS does not estimate the need for 6423 additional acres of residential lands and 2669 acres of job producing lands for Alternative 2. The Alternative 2 map is what it is; the acres identified for residential and employment uses are listed in Table 53, page 158. The methodology used to compute the capacity of the land supply for each alternative is the Vacant Buildable Lands Model and the Board assumptions on density, infrastructure, never-to-convert, which are listed on pages 2 -3 of the DEIS Summary. 2.) The DEIS is a disclosure document developed as a guide to help decision-makers. The Board recognizes that growth will occur and articulated its beliefs in a series of planning assumptions for projected growth. Using these assumptions he DEIS looks at alternative geographies for accommodating projected growth. There is no requirement to state that any alternative is more likely that any other. 3.) Your comments are noted. The purpose of the DEIS is to disclose information about environmental impacts. 4.) There are several errors in the summary of transportation impacts on pages 3-4. Under the Alternative 1 summary, line 38 should read: "It is expected that under this alternative the result would be a lower number of congested lane miles," etc. Also the proposed projects to mitigate this alternative would cost between $98.5M and $124.5M. Under the Alternative 2, page 4, the sentence on Line 21-22 beginning with "An additional mitigation project..." should be deleted, because the cost of this additional project is already included in the estimated mitigation cost in the previous sentence. This information will be corrected in the revised DEIS. 5.) Alternative 1 assumes no UGB expansion and Alternative 2 would expand boundaries by 10, 800 acres. The assumption of GMA is that this 20-year land supply will be used for 'urban' uses. It is correctly noted that much of the proposed expansion land is already 'urban' in nature so that changing the land use won't result in much difference in appearance. However, converted or not, there will be substantial cost in serving the new expansion areas. 6.) It is well documented that higher densities result in at least marginally higher transit use. The DEIS does not assert that the increase in transit use in Alternative 1 would fully address or mitigate the additional congestion caused by the projected level of growth. It is very unlikely that transportation funding will keep up with the impacts of growth under any of the alternatives. 7.) The purpose of the section cited was to compare the job growth potential of the alternatives, not to disparage the residential construction industry which is an important employment sector in Clark County. Language referring to residential construction jobs as "short-term" and "cyclical" will be deleted in the final document.
Manes, Denise	Requesting inclusion of parcel # 154006-000 owned by Roth Investments, LLC, into the UGB.	This is a Site Specific Request to be included in the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.

Commentor:	Summary of Comment:	Response
Mansell, Mark	Additional information for DEIS regarding La Center Schools	1.) This information will be added to the revised DEIS.
MAP: City of Ridgefield	MAP - Ridgefield Urban Growth Area - Alternative 2 & 3: Area requested to be included in the final UGA.	Map - no comments required.
Marini, Pam	30-day comment period is more than enough time for people to comment on UGB changes.	Comments noted.
Marthaller, Elmer & Patricia	Shopping needed in 179th & north to 194th. Need to finish 189 St road to relieve traffic on 179th Street intersection.	Comments noted.
Maruca, Jeffery	Opposition to proposed growth plan.	Comments noted.
Mason, David & Alexis	Request to be included in Camas UGA. Parcel #175735-000.	This is a Site Specific Request to be included in the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.

Commentor:	Summary of Comment:	Response
McDonald, Chuck	11 specific Clark Regional Wastewater Comments.	1.) Prior correspondence with Clark Regional Wastewater District (CRWD) indicated that "the I-5 corridor, while functional for transportation issues, presents concerns and high costs to serve with sewer." However, CRWD, in updating its General Sewer Plan, has determined that they would not anticipate (in general) higher costs to serve this area as compared to other areas. 2.) In January 2005, the United States Environmental Protection Agency developed a Guide for Evaluating collection system's management, operation, and maintenance program (CMOM) at Sanitary Sewer Collection Systems. Collection system owners or operators can or continue to review their own systems by following the checklist in Chapter 3 to reduce the occurrence of sewer overflows and improve or maintain compliance. 3.) This is a general comment for the County. The City of Vancouver and Clark Regional Wastewater District have enough capacity for future growth, however, this statement is true for Battle Ground, Camas, La Center, Ridgefield, and Washougal. 4.) Prior correspondence with CRWD indicated that "the I-5 corridor, while functional for transportation issues, presents concerns and high costs to serve with sewer." However, CRWD, in updating its General Sewer Plan, has determined that they would not anticipate (in general) higher costs to serve this area as compared to other areas. 5.) Maintenance costs on STEP systems could be more expensive for residents compared to traditional gravity service. 6.) Your comment is noted. 7.) Inevitably, population and employment growth would result in increased generation of waste water. Unavoidable adverse impacts are related to the expenditure of resources to serve that growth. However, demand will result in the necessary expenditures and developers review the individual impacts for each effected property. This is not considered a significant impact providing the economy stays at current growth rates or better and development continues to pay a fair portion of the costs. 8.) The comment in question will modify the bottom paragraph, page 307 and this information will be included in the revised DEIS.
McDonald, Chuck	*COPY-DUPLICATE* 11 specific Clark Regional Wastewater Comments.	
McFatridge, Ian	Support for Alternative #3.	1.) The GMA talks about spaces between cities, and this is one of the Board's principles and values. This is why Alternative 2 was proposed with a separation between La Center and Ridgefield, even though the separation includes a portion of I-5.
McGuffin, Shane	Request to be included in Camas' UGB. (North Lacamas Lake area.) Parcels # 173457-000 175712-000.	This is a Site Specific Request to be included in the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.
McMullen, Scott	Request for inclusion of 199635-006 in Vancouver UGB with attached maps.	This is a Site Specific Request to be included in the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.

Commentor:	Summary of Comment:	Response
Mesa-Johnson, Delcine	Request to correct information in DEIS regarding Hockinson's facilities.	1.) This information will be added to the revised DEIS.
Mezes, Judy	Requesting inclusion of parcel # 154006-000 owned by Roth Investments, LLC, into the UGB.	This is a Site Specific Request to be included in the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.
Middagh, K.	Nice open house! Please include both sides of 28th St. into the proposed UGB.	Comments noted.
Middagh, Kevin	30-day comment period is insufficient.	Comments noted.
Mill Creek HOA	Comments re: impact to Mill Creek, wetlands & habitat, as well as traffic concerns due to sight-distance issues. Note: there is no signature or person to return comment to, but there is a CD attached.	Comments noted.
Miller, Marty & Nancy	Removal of 226949-000 from Alternative #3 plan.	This is a Site Specific Request to be excluded from the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.
Mills, John	Requesting inclusion in the Camas UGA of Lacamas Northshore Coalition. Comment that every acre of land that is added to UGB be part of a master plan.	This is a Site Specific Request to be included in the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.
Mills, John	Support of converting Lacamas Northshore (subarea C1) to urban uses.	This is a Site Specific Request to be included in the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.
Mills, John	Request to include 95-acre property on Lacamas Lake's NE shore into Camas UGA.	This is a Site Specific Request to be included in the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.
Mills, Sherry	Question any urban reserve areas for future & support alternative set forth by Mayor of Camas bringing in land northeast of Lacamas Lake but south of Green Mtn. area.	Comments noted.
Moon, Austin L.	Objection to expansion of BG UGA, south of 179th Street.	Comments noted.
Newell, Philip	Please exclude northern BG from the city's future plans. 37 signatures on attached document.	This is a Site Specific Request to be excluded from the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.
Noall, Judy	Concerns on expanding the Camas UGB re: traffic and historic preservation.	Comments noted.
Nokes, Kathy	Concern with development of Washougal River area and protection of the environment. 130316-000.	This is a Site Specific Request to be excluded from the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.
Nordahl, Lorraine	30-day comment period is insufficient.	Comments noted.

Commentor:	Summary of Comment:	Response
Not Signed	No farmers here to farm land anymore; if it were still economic there would be more farmers.	Comments noted.
O'Dell, Robert "Casey"	Please include my address in proposed UGB. It is included in Option #3. If my property is not included, I request option #1 (no change).	This is a Site Specific Request to be included in the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.

Commentor:	Summary of Comment:	Response
Ostrowski, John; C-TRAN	28 specific comments on DEIS.	1.) Your comment is noted. 2.) GMA requires that transportation facilities and services be addressed separately from other public facilities and utilities. The potential impacts of each Alternative 3 sub-area on transit service were addressed on pages 209-210. None of the potential sub-areas were found likely to have a significant affect on transit service that would justify inclusion in this summary of impacts table. 3.) At the time of DEIS issuance, there were still a very broad array of bridge crossing and transit service options under consideration. The FEIS will include the most current information available. 4.) The emphasis on Park-and-Ride facilities was intended to identify "big ticket" capital facilities costs that might vary by alternative. Clarifying language will be included in the FEIS. 5.) Clarifying language will be included in the FEIS. 6.) Clarifying language will be included in the FEIS. 7.) Clarifying language will be included in the FEIS. 8.) Clarifying language will be included in the FEIS. 9.) Your comment is noted. The insufficient peak hour bridge capacity affects the efficiency of transit service as well. 10.) See response #2. The DEIS was not intended to be a complete capital facilities plan for all service providers, but rather a comparison of impacts between the alternatives. C-TRAN needs to provide County staff with information on facility needs and funding so that this data can be included in the Capital Facilities Plan. 11.) Clarifying language will be included in the FEIS. 12.) See response #3. 13.) See response #10. 14.) Your comment is noted. 15.) Your comment is noted. 16.) Clarifying language will be included in the FEIS. 17.) Your comment is noted. 18.) See response #8. 19.) ITS is listed in Table 69 as a mitigation to be used on several corridors; however some additional discussion of TDM/TSM measures will be added to the FEIS. 20.) Your comment is noted. 21.) The DEIS was not intended to be a complete capital facilities plan for all service providers, but rather a comparison of impacts between the alternatives. C-TRAN needs to provide County staff with information on facility needs and funding so that this data can be included in the Capital Facilities Plan. 22.) See response #11. 23.) Clarifying language will be included in the FEIS. 24.) Clarifying language will be included in the FEIS. 25.) Clarifying language will be included in the FEIS. 26.) Clarifying language will be included in the FEIS. 27.) Clarifying language will be included in the FEIS. 28.) Clarifying language will be included in the FEIS.

Commentor:	Summary of Comment:	Response
Owens, Ernest	Support for Alternative 3 UGB.	Comments noted.
Owens, Ernest L.	*COPY-DUPLICATE* Support of Alternative 3 Growth Boundary.	Comments noted.
Padgett, William	Support for Alternative #1, maintaining existing UGB.	Comments noted.
Palshis, Mike	Concern on traffic congestion, quality of life, and strain on schools.	Comments noted.
Panfilio, Carol	Need to stabilize our county's infrastructure before moving forward with continued uncompromising growth.	Comments noted.
Parker, Jeff	Request to include property in UGB with residential zoning.	This is a Site Specific Request to be included in the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.
Parker, Kim	30-day comment period is insufficient.	Comments noted.
Parsons, Charles	Request to be included in UGB and zoned R6 Residential. 196163-000, 196164-000, 196224-000, 196351-000, & 196317-000.	This is a Site Specific Request to be included in the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.
Parsons, Charles	*COPY-DUPLICATE FROM BOCC* SSR for 18+ acres to be included in UGB. Parcel numbers: 196163-000, 196164-000, 196224-000, 196351-000, & 196317-000.	This is a Site Specific Request to be included in the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.
Pearl, Randall	Alternative #1 should not have been declared null & void just to meet the political whims of the BOCC.	Comments noted.
Pearl, Randall	Comments re: effects of Alternative 2 & 3 on Salmon Creek watershed and opposition to commercial/mixed-use hub at 50th Ave & 139th Street.	
Pearl, Randall	Comments re: endangered species and effects of impervious surfaces and resource lands. Request to prohibit development involving impermeable surfaces in flood hazard zones unless required for a water-related use.	1.) The Board is aware of ESA requirements, and the county's ESA office is continuing its efforts to develop a MRCI limit that will pass muster with NOAA Fisheries. It is expected that there will be impacts from development. However, one of the premises of decision-making of this magnitude is that federal, state and local regulations to protect functions and values are in place and will be used to mitigate impacts from development. 2.) The Board is also aware that some of the land proposed to be brought into UGAs is resource land. The GMA does not prohibit this; rather it requires that the county show its reasoning as to why resource land is being converted to urban land. This is the balancing provision that is required by the GMA—that counties balance the 13 GMA goals. 3.) One of the Board's principles and values is to not create 'industrial wetlands'. This issue will receive further attention as the Board develops the preferred alternative for discussion in the FEIS.

Commentor:	Summary of Comment:	Response
Petition	31 signatures to exclude Green Mountain/Lacamas Northshore area from Camas UGB.	This is a Site Specific Request to be excluded from the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.
Phillips, Bart	6 comments: 1) Assuring an Adequate Industrial Land Inventory, 2) Eliminating Urban Reserve, 3) Market Factor, 4) Critical Lands, 5) BP Zoning Designation, 6) Other comments.	1. Your comments are noted. The DEIS is based on the direction of the Board which is to accommodate a higher growth number. Refer to the county direction on assumptions. 2. See response #1.
Phillips, Bart	Support for Alternative #3.	Comments noted.
Phillips, David; AAL	Request for inclusion of parcels into UGB. Parcel #: 212546-000 owned by PN Investments.	This is a Site Specific Request to be included in the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.
Pleasant Valley Rural Ranch HOA	Mill Creek Sub-area planning comments. 54% of the property owners do not want the UGB extended to their area.	This is a Site Specific Request to be excluded from the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.
Plescia, Tony; VP, Vancouver Land Development Co.	Request to include parcels 193549, 193550, 193625, 193551 into the UGB.	This is a Site Specific Request to be included in the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.

Commentor:	Summary of Comment:	Response
Pollard, Royce; Mayor	Statement that EIS does not meet a number of basic legal requirements. Detail of 7 SEPA requirements not adequately considered in the Countywide DEIS.	1.) The transportation analysis in the DEIS does not limit its consideration of the proposal's impacts to only those within county jurisdiction. Table 68 lists capacity project needs county-wide, and Table 69 lists mitigation measures that were identified in State and city transportation plans and other documents. Only one project (NE 13th/Goodwin Road) was listed to be added to a city transportation system plan (TSP). 2.) A detailed analysis of maintenance costs is not a SEPA requirement. In any case, the differences between the alternatives are not likely to be significant. Maintenance and operations costs were deducted from the estimates of county revenues available for transportation capital facilities. 3.) As an option the Board could adopt some kind of phased development requirement with the adoption of the 2006 comprehensive plan, similar to what was done with urban holding in the 1994 comprehensive plan. Such phasing could be used from the county perspective for transportation and schools. The concept of phased development is mentioned numerous places in the DEIS as a potential mitigation option, primarily in the section on public facilities and utilities (Section X). 4.) The Board made an assumption that the county will grow faster than was assumed in 2004, based on revised OFM population projection figures. What happens in the 'no action' scenario is that there is a greater population at the end of 20 years. The result of the 'no action' alternative is that, with a greater population, there will be higher densities in urban areas and more folks living in rural areas than the assumed 10% split. 5.) A comparison of the alternatives to base year conditions is not required by SEPA, nor is it essential to making a reasoned choice between alternatives. The data, however, will be in the revised DEIS. 6.) The DEIS looks at the potential impacts of expanding urban growth boundaries to accommodate 20 years of growth, the time horizon set by the GMA. Future actions relating to the comprehensive plan will be based on new assumptions, establishment of new baselines and environmental analysis through a new SEPA process. 7.) Code amendments are procedural in nature and subject to Board discretion and action.
Prall, Jay & Kathy	Exclude their property and surrounding rural property from the UGB.	This is a Site Specific Request to be excluded from the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.

Commentor:	Summary of Comment:	Response
Price, Ron	7 specific points of comment on the DEIS.	1.) This is one of the Board's principles and values, and is implemented through the application of site-specific zoning regulations at the time of development. 2.) Improvements to NE 50th Avenue are included in the proposed mitigation projects identified in Table 70. NE 50th Avenue is classified as a minor arterial road way (M-2cb) from Salmon Creek Avenue to NE 179th Street. 3.) Your comments are noted. At the current time, the county has not adopted a new land use plan. There are no plans to change plan policies that addresses long term livability and balance communities or neighborhoods. See Goal 2.3: "Land use patterns and individual developments should be locationally and functionally integrated to reduce sprawl, promote pedestrian and transit use, and limit the need for automobile trips, and to foster neighborhood and community identity." 4.) See response #3. 5.) The Board provided direction for the development of the Alternatives through a public process and a preferred land use plan will reflect policy decisions by the Board. 6.) This is one of the Board's principles and values, and is implemented through the application of site-specific zoning regulations at the time of development. 7.) Your comments are noted. The DEIS presented a summary of adverse impacts on streams associated with impervious surfaces. The Technical Document expands on the description of those impacts, including cumulative impacts. The DEIS and its Technical Document makes the same point as the authors, which is that the greater the proportion of a watershed that is covered in impervious surface, the greater the risk to the health of streams in that watershed. Low density residential typically has a lower proportion of land covered by impervious surface. Evaluating the impacts of different types of growth on future stream health is complicated. The DEIS is required to present a planning level assessment of potential impacts at a level of analysis and in language that is understandable to the general public. The analysis is not intended to present a comprehensive evaluation, but to illustrate the potential differences between impacts from the alternatives. Coverage by impervious surface is one available and measurable parameter that can be used to make estimates about future impacts and enable comparisons between alternatives. 8.) Your comment is noted. It should be noted that the SEPA guideline cited in the comment letter is not intended to offer mitigation for planning-level impacts on groundwater. It is an example of how to show that a project's compliance with existing plan designations may be considered adequate mitigation for a specific type of impact. Land uses that have lower impacts from impervious surface coverage include open space, parks, and campus industrial or institutional to low-density residential. Any of those could be used to offset the greater amount of impervious surface created by commercial, industrial and multi-family uses, recognizing that there are many other factors that go into decisions to locate specific uses. 9.) The Board is aware that some of the land proposed to be brought into UGAs is resource land. The GMA does not prohibit this; rather it requires that the county show its reasoning as to why resource land is being converted to urban land. This is the balancing provision that is required by the GMA—that counties balance the 13 GMA goals. 10.) The DEIS did include discussion of measures to mitigate potential environmental

Commentor:	Summary of Comment:	Response
		impacts. 11.) Your comments are noted. The Board took this into consideration and decided for the Preferred Alternative to remove the large commercial and mixed use areas on the east side of NE 50th Avenue with the exception of a small neighborhood commercial parcel. Additional commercial and medium density residential land may be located along NE 72nd Avenue. 12.) Widening projects to complete NE 50th Avenue will be needed in the 20-year plan period regardless of which zoning designations are applied on the east side of NE 50th Avenue. The timing of development vis-à-vis road improvement projects is an important consideration which cannot be known for certain at this point in time.
Printz, Randy	Request to include Parcels known as "Fifth Plain Creek" located in Area 5 of the Vancouver UGA - NE.	This is a Site Specific Request to be included in the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.
Printz, Randy	Request to include Parcel # 198794-000, 198805-000, 198806-000 & 198876-000 located in Area 4 of the City of Vancouver's UGA - NW.	This is a Site Specific Request to be included in the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.
Printz, Randy	Request to include Parcel # 192606-000 located in Area 3 of Battle Ground's UGA.	This is a Site Specific Request to be included in the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.
Printz, Randy	Request to include Parcel # 154032-000 located in Area 6 of Vancouver's UGA - NE.	This is a Site Specific Request to be included in the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.

Commentor:	Summary of Comment:	Response
Printz, Randy	Specific comments on Transportation, Schools, Zoning, Environment, and "One Sided Roads".	1.) The purpose of this EIS is to make comparisons between possible growth scenarios. Given that the growth assumptions are the same for all three alternatives in the DEIS, only generalized comparisons can be made, which is all the SEPA requires for a non-project action. Nowhere in the DEIS is efficiency equated with level of service. Level of service for roads and schools will be unacceptable in the next 20 years whether the UGBs expand or not. Perhaps the term 'more efficient' isn't entirely accurate, but making better use of current infrastructure would have to occur under a no boundary movement alternative. For schools this means more portables, since we currently have no standard level of service measure. The higher use of alternative modes is not an assumption. It is an output from the regional transportation model. It is a generally recognized planning principle that a more compact urban form and the resulting densities make alternative modes of transportation more attractive. This will not offset congestion and failing levels of service on county roads anticipated with projected growth. 2.) The commenter correctly notes the contradiction about 'higher number of congested lane miles'. This should have read 'lower number of lane miles', and is corrected in the revised DEIS. 3.) The county is not responsible for the levels of service the city of Vancouver chooses to adopt for its road system. Given the planning assumptions and projected patterns of growth, RTC's model shows no significant difference in the levels of congestion and the need for transportation projects over 20 years between Alternatives 1 and 2. 4.) See response to comment #1. There will be a more complete documentation of costs in the Capital Facilities Plan prepared as part of the comprehensive plan update. 5.) The BOCC defined the 'no action' alternative (Alternative 1) as a 'no boundary expansion' alternative. The conclusion in the DEIS was that there was not enough vacant and buildable land within UGAs to accommodate the projected growth. This is evident in the DEIS. In attempt to fine tune what the Alternative 1 impacts might be, cities were allocated a share of the 20-year projected growth and asked how they would accommodate the increase without a UGB expansion. This analysis is presented in the FEIS. As expected some cities said they could accommodate their share (e.g. La Center) and others said it could not be done (e.g. Yacolt which has no sewer system). The concept of having to upzone and densify to accommodate growth without expanding the UGBs is implicit in the DEIS if not explicit, because there simply is no other way to do it. 6.) The referred to conversion of ML properties to BP had a small impact on the overall county-wide employment numbers because not all jobs occur in ML or BP lands. 7.) The commenter is correct in noting that higher densities in Alternative 1 will have a negative impact on the environment within UGBs. The choice between alternatives is to marginally increase negative impacts on urban habitats, wetland and open space in existing UGAs, or to potentially accelerate environmental impacts to an additional 17 square miles of the county. Surrogate measures of such impacts are acres of impervious surface and miles of streams impacted, information about which is presented in the DEIS. It cannot be stated with certainty whether or not a few habitat and wetlands will be more greatly degraded or lots of habitat and wetlands will potentially be degraded by proposed urbanization. In either case current critical areas ordinances are assumed as mitigation. 8.) Enough land is included (Alternative 2 in the DEIS; the preferred alternative in the FEIS) to accommodate the OFM

Commentor:	Summary of Comment:	Response
		population projection. SEPA requires an analysis of a no-action alternative which Alternative 1 in both documents represents. 9.) Again, Alternative 1 was chosen as a 'no action' alternative and the analysis presented is an assessment of what would have to happen to accommodate the projected growth. The purpose of the EIS is to disclose what might happen or have to happen based on a set of given assumptions (in this case the BOCC's planning assumptions). It is also assumed as mitigation that current zoning codes are in place, which address the beveling issue. 10.) DEISs are not cost documents; they are intended to discuss potential environmental effects. Costs for capital facilities will be outlined in the Capital Facilities Plan that will accompany the update in the comprehensive plan.
Printz, Randy	Request to include Parcel # 258635-000 & 209692-000 located in Area 1 of the La Center UGA.	This is a Site Specific Request to be included in the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.
Printz, Randy	Request to include Parcel # 200539-000 located in Area 5 of Vancouver's UGA- NE.	This is a Site Specific Request to be included in the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.
Printz, Randy	Request to include Parcel # 181675-000, 181755-000, 181672-000 & 181686-000 located in Area 4 of the Vancouver UGA - NW.	This is a Site Specific Request to be included in the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.
Printz, Randy	Request to include Parcel # 129825 located in Area 7 in City of Washougal's UGA.	This is a Site Specific Request to be included in the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.
Printz, Randy	Request to include Parcel # 196347-000, 196205-000, 196176-000 & 196346-000 located in Area V4 Vancouver UGA - NW.	This is a Site Specific Request to be included in the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.
Printz, Randy	Request to include Parcel # 211007-000 & 210987-000 located in Area 5 of La Center's UGA.	This is a Site Specific Request to be included in the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.
Rancourt, Jaehee	30-day comment period is insufficient.	Comments noted.
Reisbick, Sydney	Comments re: short time to digest a huge document and high taxes/traffic. Suggestion for moratorium on houses until the school bonds pass.	Comments noted.
Residents of Country View Estates	Petition to the BOCC to place Camas UGB no further north than 28th Street. 4 reasons given, 8 resident signatures.	This is a Site Specific Request to be excluded from the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.
Rhods, Everett & Juanita	Request to be included in Camas UGB. Parcels # 172549-000, 172560-000, & 172547-000.	This is a Site Specific Request to be included in the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.

Commentor:	Summary of Comment:	Response
Ridgefield, City of	Support of Alternative 2 as proposed, w/exception that "employment" adjacent to I-5 in southern most portion of Ridgefield's Alt #3 is requested to be included in the final UGA. Maps attached.	1.) The Board formulates a preferred alternative from the alternatives discussed in the DEIS that is discussed in the FEIS. It may or may not include all of Alternative #2 and portions of Alternative #3. The Board will eventually adopt a final UGB that falls within all alternatives, including the Preferred Alternative. 2.) The County recognizes and appreciates the effort of both Ridgefield and LaCenter in coming up with a compromise of proposed UGB's. Since Alternative #3 has far more land than is needed for accommodating the 20-year land supply need, longer term needs of the two communities may be addressed in map form or plan policy form and may be beyond the 20-year planning horizon. 3.) The Board formulates a preferred alternative from the alternatives discussed in the DEIS that is discussed in the FEIS. It may or may not include all of Alternative #2 and portions of Alternative #3. The Board will eventually adopt a final UGB that falls within all alternatives, including the Preferred Alternative. As for the westerly extension of the future I-5/219th Street interchange, the County has been processing an arterial plan map amendment to facilitate this future possible project. This arterial plan map amendment will likely be one of the many components to the adopting resolution that the Board approves with the Comprehensive Plan update. 4.) Competing issues will be 'off-set' by other competing issues. The adopted Comprehensive Plan will take into account the needs for residential, employment, critical areas, capital facilities and many other things to provide a balanced approach to accommodating 20 years of growth.
Roff, R.	Quit trying to turn Ridgefield into Portland or Vancouver. Stop building houses and start building bridges across the Columbia.	Comments noted.
Rose, Jo	Request to include property in Camas UGB. (54.5 Acres @ 215 Leadbetter Road, Parcel # 175774-000)	This is a Site Specific Request to be included in the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.
Rosenberg, Heidi	*COPY-DUPLICATE* General Comments, Technical Comments, and GMA Policy Matrix/DEIS Alternative	Comments noted.

Commentor:	Summary of Comment:	Response
Rosenberg, Heidi	General Comments, Technical Comments, and GMA Policy Matrix/DEIS Alternative	1.) Your comments are noted. It is important to note that the purpose of a draft environmental impact statement is to disclose information about environmental impacts. 2.) Alternative 1 in the adopted comprehensive plan from 2004. It was studied as a "no-action" alternative. The draft environmental impact statement acknowledged that alternative 1 would not accommodate new growth assumptions without significant land use changes. 3.) The Board of County Commissioners (BOCC) planning assumptions and direction on growth (example: Principles and Values statements) were developed to accommodate additional growth. The key planning assumptions were discussed in a public forum throughout the planning process. 4.) Your comments are noted. The BOCC in their final selection of the preferred plan will adhere to their stated principles and values. 5.) This information will be added to the revised DEIS. 6.) This information will be added to the revised DEIS. 7.) This information will be added to the revised DEIS. 8.) This information will be added to the revised DEIS. 9.) This report (Land Use Element, p.51, line 18) will be reevaluated to ensure the information used is the best available. 10.) See response #9. 11.) See response #1. 12.) See response #3. 13.) See response #1.
Rosmaryn, John	*COPY-DUPLICATE* Vancouver should not be allowed to annex additional property until it really becomes a "big city". The school districts are unequally supported. Need to focus commercial and social center and plan light & heavy industry.	Comments noted.
Rosmaryn, John	Vancouver should not be allowed to annex additional property until it really becomes a "big city". The school districts are unequally supported. Need to focus commercial and social center and plan light & heavy industry.	1.) The Board will be considering where to put industrial property, exactly for the reasons you mention in your e-mail.
Roth, James	Requesting inclusion of parcel # 154006-000 owned by Roth Investments, LLC, into the UGB.	This is a Site Specific Request to be included in the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.
Roth, Mike	Requesting inclusion of parcel # 154006-000 owned by Roth Investments, LLC, into the UGB.	This is a Site Specific Request to be included in the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.
Roth, Todd	Requesting inclusion of parcel # 154006-000 owned by Roth Investments, LLC, into the UGB.	This is a Site Specific Request to be included in the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.

Commentor:	Summary of Comment:	Response
Rouhier, Darin	Primary staffing need forecast; impact on the Clark County Sheriff's Office.	1.) This information will be added to the revised DEIS. 2.) This information will be added to the revised DEIS. 3.) This information will be added to the revised DEIS.
Rylander, Dick	Inclusion of large parcel of land south of 179th Street should NOT be allowed. 6 reasons why are stated.	This is a Site Specific Request to be excluded from the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.
Rylander, Dick	11 separate specific comments with request for commissioners to "say no to this land grab".	1.) The 30-day comment period was extended by the Board of County Commissioners to 38 days in order to address this concern. 2.-7.) The Bergeron property was included in the area to be studied under Alternative 2 at the request of the City of Battle Ground. Consent of the property owners is not required for land to be included in a DEIS analysis. The industrial land use was proposed by the City. Compatibility of this land use with adjacent properties is a reasonable consideration. 8.) The level of congestion projected for the SR-503 corridor is primarily due to grow in Battle Ground and north County. It is just as reasonable to conclude that development of this site for industrial uses would provide jobs for Battle Ground residents and reduce the demand for peak hour travel on SR-503 to Vancouver, Portland and other employment destinations to the south. The suitability of lands west of Battle Ground for industrial purposes is not relevant. The City has not proposed to expand west of NE 94th Ave. along SR-500. 9.) The 20-year need for employment land countywide has been evaluated. The City has requested this land be added in order to provide for future employment in Battle Ground. 10.) Wetland impacts have been analyzed in the DEIS. Critical areas within the proposed expansion area are excluded from the inventory of vacant and buildable land and protected by wetlands ordinance from inappropriate development. 11.) The DEIS includes an assessment of the environmental impacts of an expansion of the growth boundary including the subject site.
Saculles, Enya	Requesting to allow to subdivide Ridgefield property.	This is a Site Specific Request to be included in the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.
Salas, Barbara	Request to be included in UGB.	This is a Site Specific Request to be included in the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.
Sanches, Joe & Jean	Request to be excluded from the expanded UGB.	This is a Site Specific Request to be excluded from the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.
Sanders, Dale	Support of Alternative #3 and Duluth area being zoned Commercial/Business Park.	Comments noted.
Sanders, Dale	Please change my zoning to highway commercial so that I can legally have semi-trucks.	This is a Site Specific Request to be included in the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.
Sandry, Krislynn	In favor of Alternative #2 to expand the current UGB.	Comments noted.

Commentor:	Summary of Comment:	Response
Sandry, Willie	In favor of Alt #2 and timeline of adopting any changes by Dec. 29, 2006.	Comments noted.
Sandry, Willie & Krislynn	Request to include 123200-000 and 123231-000 in proposed UGB. In favor of Alternative #2.	This is a Site Specific Request to be included in the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.
Scheel, Christine	Opposition to Alternatives #2 & #3 for Battle Ground region.	Comments noted.
Schorr, Jennifer	Comments A. Proposed UGB under both alternatives would lead to significant negative impacts on riparian habitat; B. County relies on inadequate local regulations for protection of riparian habitat and does not sufficiently consider impacts to riparian areas as a whole.	1.) Alternative 2 adds 110 acres of designated priority habitat out of a total expansion of 10,850 acres, 1% of the total. Alternative 2 adds 190 acres of non-riparian habitat conservation area to an existing total of 2,256 acres (an addition of 8.4%), and adds 1,322 acres of riparian habitat conservation area to an existing total of 7,322 acres (an addition of 18%) over 20 years. The total addition shown in Table 32 is 1,621 acres, a 10% increase over the current total of 16,955 acres. So, there is potential for impacts to the county's fish and wildlife resources from increased development as a result of boundary expansion. All jurisdictions including the county have recently updated their critical areas ordinances as required by GMA. These ordinances by law have to be based on best available information on how to protect critical areas such as fish and wildlife habitat, and are assumed to be in place as mitigation measures. 2.) Critical areas ordinances are the first and foremost tool for protection of critical habitat, but not the only tool. The county's ESA office is pursuing a strategy for getting a 4(d) limit under the Endangered Species Act. Public Works has been working on a watershed planning strategy as well. The county has both habitat banking and wetlands banking as options, and will be working to update both its shoreline master program and its stormwater management efforts in the near future. The county recently hired a manager for its conservation futures program, which in part will see lands acquired and managed for fish and wildlife habitat. 3.) The purpose of the DEIS is to disclose information on potential environmental affects and how those affects can be mitigated or avoided given the policies and laws currently in effect. It is not a document that examines the effectiveness of county regulatory efforts.
Schwarz, Bridget	30-day comment period is insufficient.	Comments noted.
Seekins, Ryan	Request for Parcel #198348-000 to be included in the UGA and to be comp planned for Urban Low Density Residential.	This is a Site Specific Request to be included in the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.
Sheadel, Vonnie	Request to extend the 30-day comment period.	Comments noted.
Sheadel, Vonnie	Concerns: 1) Schools, 2) Wildlife Refuge north of Ridgefield, 3) Support for Alt #3 in area east of I-5 and north of 179th Street.	Comments noted.

Commentor:	Summary of Comment:	Response
Shirey, Steve	Opposition to inclusion of Walker farm of 100+ acres within Ridgefield UGA. Parcels lay east of NE 10th Avenue between NE 279th and NE 259th.	This is a Site Specific Request to be excluded from the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.
Sign-In Sheet: Battle Ground	Battle Ground City Hall Open House Sign-in Sheet from 9/11/2006	Sign in Sheet - no comments required.
Sign-In Sheet: Camas	Camas Fire Station Open House Sign-in Sheet from 9/12/2006	Sign in sheet - no comments required.
Sign-In Sheet: PSC Hearing 9/20/06	Sign in sheet for 6:30 PM Hearing session with the general public.	Sign in sheet - no comments required.
Sign-In Sheet: PSC Hearing 9/20/06	Sign in sheet for 2:00 PM Hearing session with the Cities and Capital Facilities providers.	Sign in sheet - no comments required.
Sign-In Sheet: Ridgefield	Ridgefield Community Center Open House Sign-in Sheet from 9/13/2006	Sign in sheet - no comments required.
Small, Gloria	Vote NO on UGB Alternative #3.	Comments noted.
Smart, R.L.	30-day comment period is insufficient.	Comments noted.

Commentor:	Summary of Comment:	Response
Snodgrass, Bryan	5 page table of comments.	1.) See response #2, DEIS 83. 2.) See response #3, DEIS 83. 3.) A breakout by jurisdiction was not provided, because there has not been an allocation of households and jobs per se. It would certainly be possible to list the capacity by jurisdiction for household and job growth based on land supply. 4.) See response #6, DEIS 83. 5.) See response #7, DEIS 83. 6.) See response #1, DEIS 83. 7.) See response #5, DEIS 83. 8.) This is an incorrect statement. There are three areas which have failing LOS in Alternative 2, that are not failing in Alternative 1 (refer to Table 68). Only one of these areas is in County jurisdiction (NE 142nd Ave) for which a cost estimate is provided. The other two are in areas that would be under city jurisdiction at the time of development (Timmen Rd / La Center and NE 239th St/Ridgefield) and which would likely be constructed as frontage improvements by adjacent development based on the city comments received. There are also two corridors that are failing in Alternative 1, but not in Alternative 2. For lack of any response from the City of Vancouver, the two additional failing areas within their jurisdiction (Burton Rd and the 162nd/164th Ave corridor) were assumed to be constrained corridors that would be managed without significant capacity improvements other than ITS. This approach appears to be consistent with the City's adopted TSP. Comparisons with the 2003 DEIS are not valid for several reasons, the most significant being that road widening was assumed to be the necessary approach to LOS deficiencies in 2003, regardless of the built environment or other corridor constraints. The City subsequently has adopted a Transportation System Plan which makes it clear that mobility is not paramount and that some corridors must be considered built out to their design classification. The 2006 DEIS does not presume that road widening will occur in conflict with local plans and policies. Therefore comparing cost estimates between the two DEIS documents is not meaningful. 9.) A discussion of the Columbia River Crossing is included in the DEIS on pages 203-04. 10.) Most of the discrepancies noted between the transportation analyses of the two alternatives are due to the way "overrides" were accounted for in the course of this analysis. The Alternative 1 transportation analysis included all of the changes to VBLM results proposed by local jurisdictions. Hence there are 19,000 more jobs in Alternative 1 than in Alternative 2, which only included those overrides which had been adequately documented. As a comparison between Figures 34 & 35 makes clear, there is very little difference between the impacts of the two alternatives, regardless of the differences in household and job numbers assumed. If anything, the extra jobs in Alternative 1 make it appear to perform better as a result of more local "attractors" and fewer cross-river commute trips. [A subsequent transportation model run that used identical household and job numbers allocated to the Alt. 1 & Alt. 2 boundaries revealed that there were no differences in failing LOS corridors from those shown in Figs 34 & 35.] The VBLM and TAZ tables were provided to the City as requested and are not of

Commentor:	Summary of Comment:	Response
		general interest to the public. 11.) See response #1, DEIS 83. 12.) See response #4, DEIS 83. 13.) See response #10 and #20, and response #2, DEIS 83. 14.) General government facilities includes in essence city halls, and based on the information submitted at the time of the DEIS, such facilities were seen as adequate. Other facilities needed for public safety, libraries, schools and parks are addressed separately in Table 3. 15.) Whether or not the alternatives meet the Board's principles and values is based on the best judgment by county staff. Admittedly, it was difficult in some cases to make an adequate assessment given the information available. 16.) Your comment is noted. The summary discussion on page 3 contains an error on Line 38, which should indicate that Alternative 1 would result in lower negative impacts to the performance of the transportation system. 17.) Critical areas regulations will apply under all the alternatives. It is likely as the DEIS points out that critical areas in Alternative 1 will have greater impacts because of the likely increased densities; the trade-off is fewer impacts to critical areas outside of current UGAs. The county recognizes the validity of the science relating to canopy cover and impervious surface but has not yet formulated a specific approach to achieving these outcomes 18.) Rural lands are not 'threatened' by any of the alternatives. The point made is that if Alternative 1 is adopted, it is likely that the urban/rural split would change from 90/10 to something in the 80's/teen's, depending on how much upzoning there is in UGAs to accommodate projected growth. 19.) Your comment is noted. 20.) Your comment is noted. School cost information will be more accurate in the revised DEIS and FEIS, as the difference between Alternatives 1 and 2 is a lot less than $286 million.
Spencer, John	Request to remove property from proposed UGA. 142595-000, 142651-000, 142594-000, 130540-000, and 142611-000.	This is a Site Specific Request to be excluded from the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.
Spencer, John	*COPY-DUPLICATE* Remove property from UGB. Parcels #142595-000, 142651-000, 142594-000, 130540-000, 142611-000.	This is a Site Specific Request to be excluded from the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.
Spencer, John	Request to remove parcel #130540-000 and 142611-000 from Options 2 and 3 of proposed revision to Washougal's growth area.	This is a Site Specific Request to be excluded from the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.
Spencer, Sally	Remove property from UGB. Parcels #142611-000, 130540-000, 142595-000, 142651-000, 142594-000.	This is a Site Specific Request to be excluded from the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.

Commentor:	Summary of Comment:	Response
Starke, Gretchen	10 specific comments to the DEIS document, as well as expression of time beting too short and structure of DEIS not allowing for true comparision due to "mix-and-match" of the 3 alternatives.	1.) Alternative 2 is based on the approximate amount of land needed to accommodate 20 years of projected growth. Alternative 3 was crafted as a way to potentially mitigate for impacts identified in Alternative 2. In essence, Alternative 3 overstates the impacts, because it appears as though we are potentially adding 19 areas from Alternative 3 without taking away land from Alternative 2. This is not the case. The Board in crafting the preferred alternative is expected to include lands from both Alternatives 2 and 3, but only enough to meet the 20 year need. 2.) Federal, state and local regulations are assumed to be in place as mitigation for impacts of planned growth. All the cities as well as the county have critical area ordinances in place as required by the GMA. The purpose of the EIS is to disclose potential impacts of future growth on a broad scale; it is not a document prepared to assess and comment on the environmental quality of the county. 3.) Table 30 have been updated in the revised DEIS. Comments on the habitat categories and level of detail on existing conditions are noted. The DEIS lists priority habitats found in Clark County by type and specific location as identified by WDFW. Brief descriptions and the importance of each habitat type are offered, succinctly describing the principal features of the environment (priority habitats) that would be impacted by the alternatives. Other sources of habitat information may be available but SEPA allows the lead agency to decide the level of detail required for analysis. As a document assessing the impacts of proposed growth over a 20-year period, the analysis must be at a general level and focuses on the habitat protections required by the GMA, and state and federal agencies. Assessing the exact degree and nature of impacts that would result from each of the alternatives is beyond the level of detail appropriate for a non-project, planning level EIS. 4.) The title for Table 32 notes that the number refer to acres of land. "Species" refers to the amount of land containing an identified priority species. Therefore, the headings on Table 32 are related to the categories established by the county's mapping of priority habitats and simply the named categories related to GIS-based mapping. Data on Alternative 3 subareas is presented in Table 33. At present, Clark County does not have the resources to map, monitor, or evaluate species and habitats as you suggest. 5.) Your comment is noted. This paragraph intends to demonstrate that some subareas have higher percentages of the land identified as priority habitat and that removing land with a higher proportion and adding land with a lower proportion would tend to reduce potential impacts. "Respective" subareas means subareas in Alternative 2 that are adjacent to subareas in Alternative 3. 6.) Identification of endangered species in Clark County is based on whether any part of the county was once identified as part of a species' range, regardless of whether the species is known to be currently present. 7.) Your comment is noted. 8.) Your comment is noted. 9.) Your comment is noted. 10.) Table 85, shown on page 237 of the DEIS, shows the increase in necessary park acreage to serve the anticipated population increase. Significant distinctions between Alternatives 1 and 2 are shown because the analysis was performed on the basis of

Commentor:	Summary of Comment:	Response
		UGA capacity shown in the alternatives, when a preferred alternative is selected we will have more accurate assessment. Table 85 also shows the current standard and current situation for each service provider.
Steinhauer, Jeanette	30-day comment period is insufficient.	Comments noted.
Steinhauer, Jeanette	CommisSioner Boldt must recuse himself from decisions, input & voting concerning area #5 on map-figure A.	Comments noted.
Steinhauer, Jeanette M.	The Draft EIS is full on inconsistancies and does not meet the Principles & Values that the commissioners adopted September 2005.	Comments noted.
Steinhauer, Louie	Concern for environmental impact on 5th Plain Creek area, flooding where 5th Plain Creek & Lacamas Creek meet. Traffic concern 182 Ave & 4th Plain.	Comments noted.
Stephens, Carleen	Please remove property from proposed BG boundary. Parcel #227225-000.	This is a Site Specific Request to be excluded from the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.
Stern, Kay	Disapproval of being included in La Center urban boundary with concerns re: water lines, sewer districts, and changes in school boundaries.	This is a Site Specific Request to be excluded from the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.
Stevens, Kellie	Support for Alternative #3	Comments noted.
Stoker, Broce	Consider revisions to school boundary lines in conjunction with UGB.	Comments noted.
Streeter, Karen	Concerned about wetland/stormwater impacts in Curtain Creek basin and why no expansion east of Washougal.	Comments noted.
Stuart, Charles R.	Request to be excluded from UGB, or if they must be included zoning of R1-20 to preserve rural nature of area.	This is a Site Specific Request to be excluded from the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.
Sundem, George	Request to include Tax Lot #25 Sec 21.at NW 149th St. & 21st Avenue into the UGB.	This is a Site Specific Request to be included in the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.
Swapp, Brent	Request to exclude 120 acres in Alternative 3 L2 of La Center proposal.	This is a Site Specific Request to be excluded from the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.
Taplin, Dan	Would like to see BG's plan moved 1/4 mile west of existing proposed plan, 1/4 mile west of 92 Avenue.	Comments noted.

Commentor:	Summary of Comment:	Response
Taplin, Dan	Request to move the 92 Avenue boundary west approximately 1/4 mile with several reasons why and list of 14 property owners in agreement.	This is a Site Specific Request to be included in the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.
Templeton, Todd	30-day comment period is insufficient. Opposed to expanding UGB based on landowner petitions.	1.) The Board extended the comment period from September 25 to October 2, 2006. 2.) The city of Camas has modified their proposed map to bring in land all along the north side of Lacamas Lake, making the expansion more concentric, consistent with growing "from the center out". The City and the county are required by law to consider citizen and landowner comments when expanding urban growth boundaries. If the City has not met its public participation criteria in determining where to draw its recommended boundaries, that case needs to be made to the City. The City has indicated, and will need to prove through an adopted Capital Facilities Plan, that it can provide for adequate facilities for Transportation, Fire, Police, water and public sewer. The County will need to review the adequacy of the City CFP as a part of the plan adoption. 3.) The city has proposed a continuous urban growth boundary along the north side of Lacamas Lake.
Thurber, Gail	Opposition to Alternative #2 & #3 high-density and industrial zoning in Washougal.	Comments noted.
Tiemann, Andy	Requesting inclusion in Camas UGA for parcels #: 173184-000, 173181-000, 173174-000, 173198-000, & 173172-000. (Note: rec'd 3 copies via e-mail, 1 via fax, and 1 via regular mail.)	This is a Site Specific Request to be included in the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.
Toscano, Joseph & Christine	Support for Alternative #1, do not go forward with Alternatives #2 or #3.	Comments noted.

Commentor:	Summary of Comment:	Response
Trohimovich, Tim	Comment: Inadequate public participation opportunities and failure to include a true "no action" alternative.	1.) The county announced its intent to review and update the 2004 comprehensive plan in early 2005. The DEIS contains the list of activities the county has undertaken to keep the public informed of the process. There was a county-wide mailer sent to all households in the spring of 2006 that presented information about the comp plan update and how the public could participate in the update process. All information and maps, including the DEIS itself have been continually posted/updated on the county's website. The county also held a series of open houses in September and held a hearing (not required by SEPA) on the DEIS. The county had a booth at the county fair in August, and participated in the Friends of Clark County forum on growth management and the Fairgrounds Neighborhood activity day in September. There has been extensive news coverage in The Columbian and most if not all Board work sessions (in addition to hearings) have been carried live by CVTV. We disagree that there has not been 'any meaningful opportunity to comment on the proposed growth assumptions', or on any other aspect of the comprehensive plan update. 2.) The Board made an assumption that the county will grow faster than was assumed in 2004, based on revised OFM population projection figures. What happens in the 'no action' scenario is that there is a greater population at the end of 20 years. The result of the 'no action' alternative is that with a greater population, there will be higher densities in urban areas and more folks living in rural areas than the assumed 10% split. 3.) On pages 175-181, the DEIS Technical Document discusses both resource-designated lands and lands with agriculture and forest soils. Table 57 compares the acreages of agriculture and forest resource lands added to UGAs, using the Agriculture, Agriculture-Wildlife, Forest Tier I and Forest Tier II land use designations (see footnote to the table). Those acreages are reflected in the summary table of impacts as well.
Turik, Clifford	Absolutely opposed to any inclusion of my home and area into the UGB.	Comments noted.
Turik, Clifford	Opposition to being included in UGB and 30-day comment period being insufficient.	This is a Site Specific Request to be excluded from the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.
Urbas, Joe	30-day comment period is insufficient.	Comments noted.

Commentor:	Summary of Comment:	Response
Vartanian, George	5 general and 24 specific comments and questions.	1.) A capital facilities plan is required and will be prepared to ensure that the costs of growth can be paid for over the next 20 years. 2.) There is no way of knowing how much property values will increase as density increases. 3.) What prompts an increase in urban growth areas is the GMA requirement that they contain a land supply (housing and jobs) adequate to accommodate 20 years of growth. Essentially the questions in the DEIS are: Do we grow up (Alternative 1) or out (Alternatives 2 and 3), and to what extent? 4.) The household and job target numbers cited are correct. The proposed plan is intended to increase the jobs to population ratio countywide. The new jobs are not expected to be taken exclusively by new households. 5.) With current zoning, UGAs can only accommodate 119,000 people of the expected 173,000 over the next 20 years. The 54,000 people are the number that the current UGAs cannot accommodate in the next 20 years without changes in zoning. 6.) Public schools comment for Battle Ground has been corrected in the revised DEIS. 7.) The jobs/acre numbers are averages over the entire acreage given for the comp plan designation. 8.) Soil stability is an important consideration in looking at buildable land, but it is just one of several considerations. Many areas with weak soils and higher erosion potential can be built on with proper engineering. 9.) The sentence has been corrected in the revised DEIS. 10.) The gross acres on line 12 has been corrected to 5,540 in the revised DEIS. 11.) As noted in Table 66 on page 202, the transit share and non-motorized mode share would both be marginally higher under Alternative 1. There are other differences between Alternatives 1 and 2 identified in the transportation performance measures on this table. The context of the statement on page 47 is that overall the levels and locations of congestion on the transportation network are very similar between Alternatives 1 and 2. 12.) Each of the three tables needs to be read separately. There are soils that are not good for foundations, soils that are not good for septic systems, soils that are prime forest soils and soils that are prime agricultural soils. A soil at any location may have one or more of these characteristics. 13.) Yes—they were removed from the endangered species list a few years back. 14.) See response #11. 15.) The percentages reflect changes from 1990-2000, not 1990 to 2004, as stated. The numbers in the revised DEIS are corrected. 16.) The 37,543 acres in Table 53 represent the amount of acreage in the Urban Low comp plan designation. Per the comp plan, there are several zones that are allowed in urban low density, from R1-20 to R1-5. Zoning will be assigned to expansion areas once the preferred alternative is defined. What the expansion areas are actually zoned for will depend on Board assumptions and the decision about how much land to include. 17.) Unfortunately, Clark County does not have any study or know of any as to how much housing cost increase for every X% of density increase. A statement will be added to the FEIS indicating that such data is not available, and the county may proceed in the absence of information if the information is unknown. 18.) How much land is added to UGAs and what it is used for is entirely up to the Board. The analysis presented in the DEIS is based on assumptions that came from the Board in 2005. 19.) Table 59 first lists top employers by sector, and then identifies the top employer within different sectors. It should not be read as a guide to total employment, but more as an indication of the most active employment sectors in the Clark County economy. 20.) The information provided in

Commentor:	Summary of Comment:	Response
		the DEIS is snapshot of land inventory showing land converted to 'built' between 2000-2005. The data did not examine average employees per acre during the same period. The Clark County Buildable Lands Report completed in August 2002 per the requirements of RCW 36.70A. 215 provided such information. (See page 12 of the report). 21.) See response #20. 22.) The key development assumptions used to develop the alternatives were chosen by the BOCC through a public process. All the assumptions (e.g., infrastructure factor, growth rate, development on critical lands, employment and housing densities) reflect policy decisions by the BOCC. The report cited in the DEIS will be reviewed and appropriate correction made if warranted. 23.) The Board originally set a goal of one job for each 1.75 people. At a work session held on Oct. 4, 2005, the Board's direction was to eliminate the market factors for employment lands and calculate a new jobs-to-population target based on the job capacity of Alternative 2 at buildout. The additional job capacity includes private sector employment, approved overrides and rural job potential. 24.) An asterisk note should have been included that clarified that total person trips includes all trips with at least one trip end in Clark County. The correction will be made in the revised DEIS. 25.) Proposed mitigation measures and the estimated cost of proposed County mitigation projects are listed in Tables 69 and 70. It should be noted that these measures collectively cannot improve all lane miles in the transportation system to LOS D or better.
Vilhauer, Sam	Alternative #2 is flawed because of omission of tract of land between the north side of Ridgefield's UGB and south side of La Center's on west side of I-5. Support for Alternative #3.	1.) The GMA talks about spaces between cities, and this is one of the Board's principles and values. This is why Alternative 2 was proposed with a separation between La Center and Ridgefield, even though the separation includes a portion of I-5.
Voshell, Anne Marie	Opposition to expanding the city limits.	Comments noted.
Walgren, Scott & Molly	Request to be included in UGB. Parcel #181441-000.	This is a Site Specific Request to be included in the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.
Warren, Joe; Mayor	Request to designate certain urban reserve areas adjoining the UGB. Map is attached.	This is a Site Specific Request to be included in the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.
Wastler, Don	Comments in support of staying with the current plan and enforcing it.	Comments noted.
Wastler, Don	Concern that there are no longer 5 acre parcels and that the developers own Clark County.	Comments noted.
Weakley, Gregg & Charlotte	Request to be included in Camas' UGA. Parcel #113205-000.	This is a Site Specific Request to be included in the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.
Weber, Tony	Comments in opposition to inclusion in the UGB. Member of the St. Helens View Homeowner Association.	This is a Site Specific Request to be excluded from the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.

Commentor:	Summary of Comment:	Response
White, David	Request for inclusion of the area east of the current Ridgefield UGA in the revised UGA.	This is a Site Specific Request to be included in the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.
Whitmire, Lisa	Requesting inclusion of parcel # 154006-000 owned by Roth Investments, LLC, into the UGB.	This is a Site Specific Request to be included in the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.
Williams, Darrel & Kamee	Request that the "industrial reserve" overlay be removed from their property whether alternative #1, #2, or #3 is adopted.	This is a Site Specific Request to be included in the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.
Williams, Robert	Eagle Crest HOA would like to remain under County jurisdiction and request that the second option be adopted by BOCC.	This is a Site Specific Request to be excluded from the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.
Winkler, Angela	Concerns re: traffic & noise, fencing around their property, their property's zoning and whether they would be Ridgefield or La Center residents.	1.) The County has no design proposals for improvements to Timmen Road. Monitoring for speed and truck weight is a law enforcement issue, not directly related to this DEIS. 2.) Requirements for landscaping, screening, and fencing to protect private property are imposed at the time of development application. 3.) The Board formulates a preferred alternative from the alternatives discussed in the DEIS that is discussed in the FEIS. It may or may not include your parcel along Timmen Road. If the property is brought into the La Center urban growth boundary, it could at a future date be annexed into the city of La Center. Any development that borders your property will need to be mitigated to the extent possible so that it doesn't affect the use of your property.
Winkler, Walter & Angela	Concerns regarding development near 31801 NW Timmen Road, Ridgefield and whether they would be Ridgefield or La Center residents.	Comments noted.
Winters, Ray	Move growth boundary 1/4 mile west to utilize the utilities on 92nd Ave from 239 St to 219 St.	Comments noted.
Wood, Karen	Support for Alternative #1 (no change), with comments of concern regarding #2 & #3.	Comments noted.
Wright, Sherian	12 numbered comments with request to BOCC to choose Alternative 1. Statement that the City of Washougal needs to work within its existing budget without further burdening its residents.	Comments noted.
Yancey, Ann	30 day comment period is insufficient.	Comments noted.
Yancey, Ann	Dismayed at development plans for Lacamas Lake area and in opposition to development other than minimum lot size of 5 acres.	Comments noted.

Commentor:	Summary of Comment:	Response
Yates, Matthew	Concerns re: traffic, Campen Creek/Gibbons Creek watershed and that expansion of Washougal will not automatically solve its problems.	1.) The transportation comments in the DEIS for areas W1 and W2 support your comment that both areas have poor accessibility for the proposed uses. 2.) The DEIS has been corrected to show the impacts on Campen and unnamed creeks in the Washougal Alternative 2 and 3 subareas. These acreages were erroneously omitted from Table 22.
Youde, James & Judith	Request to have their 9 acres of land in "urban reserve" included in the UGB with urban low-density residential designation.	This is a Site Specific Request to be included in the UGB. Noted for record; no response required.