

Clark County Comprehensive Plan 2016 Update

Planning for growth 2015 – 2035

Summary – Issue Paper 8

Purpose

The purpose of this issue paper is to provide a summary of actions to describe the Preferred Alternative.

Background

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

- **Issue Paper 1** - Comprehensive Plan Overview: A summary of the county's Planning Assumptions, 2013 vacant and buildable lands model (VBLM) inventory and population and employment projections. **Issue Paper 2** – Population and Job Projections: Background information for a discussion with the cities and the town of Yacolt on population and job planning assumptions for 2015-2035. On Jan. 21, 2014, the Board adopted the state Office of Financial Management's (OFM) medium population projection of 562,207 for the 20-year period ending 2035 (Res. 2014-01-09).
- **Issue Paper 3** – Employment forecast based on input from Washington Employment Security Department (ESD). It was revised as Issue Paper 3.1 to include the 2014 VBLM information. On April 29, 2014, the Board adopted the high employment forecast of 91,200 net new jobs for the 20-year period ending 2035 (Res. 2014-04-01).
- **Issue Paper 4** – Population and Job Allocation: On June 24, 2014, the Board identified the methodology for allocating growth by UGA and adopted preliminary allocations for initial review (Res. 2014-06-17). It was revised as **Issue Paper 4.1** to reflect the additional capacity for population and jobs not captured by the vacant land model and presented at a BOCC Worksession on September 24, 2014. Following the 2015 assessor's population update, the issue paper was revised as **Issue Paper 4.2**. (Res. 2015-04-05).
- **Issue Paper 5** – On July 16, 2014, the Board discussed the environmental impact review process under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) and directed staff to proceed to scoping on development of alternatives. **Issue Paper 5.1** – Provides a partial list of what has transpired from July 17, 2014 through March 11, 2015 and discussed four potential alternatives for study under SEPA. (Res. 2015-04-06).
- **Issue Paper 6** - Discussed the role of the Countywide Planning Policies under RCW36.70A.130 and introduced a proposed amendment procedure for updating countywide planning policies. The BOCC elected to continue the current practice.
- **Issue Paper 7** – Provided the urban VBLM and rural capacity estimates for the Preferred Alternative as well as an update to the 20-year population and employment growth for study under SEPA. (Res.2016-03-01)

Summary

On March 1, 2016 the Board of County Councilors adopted Resolution 2016-03-01 and established a Preferred Alternative for study under SEPA. The foundation of the Preferred Alternative is the adopted 2014 Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Maps (Res. 2014-12-08). In addition, the following actions modify the adopted 2014 Comprehensive Plan and establish the Preferred Alternative.

Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Map Amendments (Binder 1, Tab 2)

Rural

1. Comprehensive Plan Map legend: In 2004, the county created a Rural (R) Comprehensive Plan designation implemented by R-5, R-10 and R-20 base zones. The Comprehensive Plan Map legend for Rural (R) was omitted.
2. Zoning Map: Reduce the minimum lot size for 2,584 parcels zoned Agriculture 20 (AG-20) to Agriculture 10 (AG-10). The Comprehensive Plan Map designation of Agriculture (AG) is retained. Table 1 shows the proposed changes.
3. Zoning Map: Reduce the minimum lot size for 2499 parcels zoned Forest 40 (FR-40) to Forest 20 (FR-20). The Comprehensive Plan Map designation of Forest Tier II is retained. Table 2 shows the proposed changes.

4. Zoning Map: Reduce the minimum lot size for 291 parcels zoned Rural 20 (R-20) to Rural 10 (R-10) for some parcels adjacent to AG-10 based zone resource lands. The Comprehensive Plan Map designation is retained. Reducing the minimum lot size of R-20 to R-10 allows Rural to continue to acts as a buffer to natural resource designated lands. Table 3 shows the proposed changes.
5. Comprehensive Plan Map legend: Create a single Rural Commercial (CR) designation implemented by the CR-2 and CR-1 base zones.
6. Comprehensive Plan Map and Zoning Map: Standardize the application of Urban Reserve (UR). Currently, Urban Reserve is both an overlay and a base zone. The Comprehensive Plan Map will retain the Urban Reserve (UR) overlay. The Zoning Map will have two Urban Reserve overlays implemented by rural zoning. Urban Reserve 10 (UR-10) overlay zone for land identified for future urban residential development and Urban Reserve 20 (UR-20) overlay zone for land identified for future urban non-residential development. The base zones UR-10, UR-20, UR-40 and Industrial Urban Reserve (IUR) are repealed.
7. Comprehensive Plan Map and Zoning Map: Remove Comprehensive Plan Urban Reserve (UR) designation with Rural (R) and Agriculture (AG). On the Zoning Map replace UR-10 and AG-20 with R-5 and AG-10 respectively for parcels located near NE 179th Street and NE 50th Avenue. Table 4 shows the proposed changes.

Battle Ground UGA

1. Expand the urban growth area to include 17 parcels totaling approximately 80 acres located at the northwest corner of NE 219th Street and NE 92th Avenue west to 87th Avenue from Rural (R-5) to Mixed Use (MU) Comprehensive Plan designation with a Mixed Use (MX) base zone with Urban Holding (UH-20) overlay zone. Table 5 shows the proposed changes.
2. Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Map: Change the Comprehensive Plan designation to reflect the residential land uses constructed since the adoption of the 2007 Plan. Residential designation surrounds two vacant parcels of Industrial; one of which is a subdivision remainder lot. This action would convert the Comprehensive Plan Industrial (I) designation and Zoning Map Business Park (BP) base zone with Urban Holding 40 (UH-40) overlay zone to a Comprehensive Plan Urban Low Density Residential (UL) designation and Zoning Map Single-Family Residential (R1-20) base zone with Urban Holding 10 (UH-10) overlay zone. In addition, this action modifies the zoning of five parcels abutting NE 189th Street. The parcels are currently zoned Single-Family Residential (R1-5) with Urban Holding 20 (UH-20) overlay zone. The proposal is to change their zoning to Single-Family Residential (R1-20) with an Urban Holding (UH-10) overlay zone to be consistent with the property abutting their southern property line. Parcel number 194218-002 is split zoned. This parcel is both Industrial (BP) and Urban Low Density Residential (R1-5) with associated Urban Holding overlays. This action would apply Urban Low Density Residential (R1-20) with Urban Holding 10 (UH-10) overlay zone. Table 6 shows the proposed changes.

La Center UGA

1. Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Map: Expand the urban growth area to include three parcels totaling approximately 56.66 acres at the northeast quadrant of Interstate 5 and NW La Center Road from Agriculture (AG-20) and Industrial Urban Reserve (IUR) overlay to a Comprehensive Plan Commercial designation and Zoning Map Community Commercial (CC) and Urban Holding (UH-20) overlay. Table 7 shows the proposed changes.
2. Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Map: Expand the urban growth are to include parcel number 258647-000 totaling approximately 17 acres located at the intersection of NW Bolen and NW 14th Avenue from a Comprehensive Plan Rural (R) designation and Rural (R-5) base zone to Public Facility (PF) with an Urban Holding (UH-20) overlay for a La Center School District school site. Table 8 shows the proposed changes.

Ridgefield UGA

1. Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Map: Expand the urban growth boundary from approximately NE 279th Street and NE 45th Avenue north to NE 289th Street. Approximately 111 acres with a Comprehensive Plan Agriculture (AG) designation and Agriculture (AG-20) base zone converted to Urban Low Density Residential (R1-10) with Urban Holding (UH-10) overlay. Table 9 shows the proposed changes.

Vancouver UGA

1. Comprehensive Plan Map: Combine three commercial Comprehensive Plan designations into one Comprehensive Plan Commercial (C) designation implemented by General Commercial (GC), Community Commercial (CC) and Neighborhood Commercial (NC) base zones.
2. Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Map: Create a Comprehensive Plan Public Facilities (PF) designation implemented by Public Facility (PF), University (U) and Airport (A) base zones. Table 10 shows the 374 proposed changes.
3. Comprehensive Plan Map: Standardize the application of Urban Holding (UH). The Comprehensive Plan Map will retain the Urban Holding (UH) overlay. The Zoning Map will have two Urban Holding overlays implemented by urban zoning instead of a combination of overlays and base zones. The Zoning Map will have an Urban Holding 10 overlay (UH-10) for land identified for future urban residential development and Urban Holding 20 overlay (UH-20) for land identified for future industrial or office type non-residential development. The Urban Holding UH-10, UH-20, and UH-40 base zones are repealed.
4. Comprehensive Plan Map: Repeal the Three Creeks Special Planning Area overlay.
5. Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Map: Three Creeks Special Planning Area identified 8 subareas for further study. The Salmon Creek and Discovery subareas were studied and it was determined that a number of land use changes were necessary to support job growth. Table 11 shows the proposed changes, per the recommendation of the Planning Commission and the Three Creeks Advisory Council.
6. Mixed use: In 2004, the county transitioned from a Comprehensive Plan designation of Mixed Use (MU) implemented by a number of zoning districts to establish a Mixed Use (MX) zoning district. A footnote was included with Table 1.6 Urban Plan Designation to Zone Consistency in the Land Use Element. This footnote stated "Properties in the UGB's that are designated Mixed Use on the Comprehensive Plan, but have zoning other than Mixed Use (MX), can develop under the zoning district applied to the property. If a rezone is requested, the only zone consistent with the Mixed Use plan designation is MX." This proposal would eliminate the footnote on Table 1.6 and would either a) rezone the property to Mixed Use (MX) or b) change the comprehensive plan designation to be consistent with the current zone. Property owners (741) were contacted for their preference. Table 12 shows the proposed changes.
7. Zoning Plan Map: Remove the Urban Holding (UH) overlay and retain the Urban Low Density Residential single-family (R1-20), (R1-10) and (R1-7.5) base zones in the area known as Fisher's Swale. The majority of the area is considered built in the Vacant Buildable Lands Model. Table 13 shows the proposed changes.

Washougal UGA

1. Zoning Map: Within the unincorporated Washougal UGA a number of residential parcels have city zoning designation. This proposal would replace city zoning with county zoning and apply an UH-10 overlay . Table 14 shows the proposed changes.
2. Steigerwald Refuge: The Steigerwald Refuge is split zoned; the northern section is zoned Heavy Industrial with an Urban Holding overlay. The southern section is zoned Parks and Open Space. This proposal would apply Parks and Open Space with an Urban Holding overlay to the entire parcel. Table 15 shows the proposed changes.

Comprehensive Plan Text (Binder 1, Tab 3)

GMA requires that Clark County have a comprehensive plan, which consists of map or maps, and descriptive text covering objectives, principles, and standards used to develop the comprehensive plan. RCW 36.70A.070.

The Comprehensive Plan serves as a complete policy document that guides county decisions and services on a wide range of topics that include: land use, transportation, parks, housing, capital facilities, and more.

With the 2016 update, staff has been reviewing the comprehensive plan document in an effort to be more concise and user friendly. In addition, the Preferred Alternative requires some policy additions and/or revisions. The following are the new proposed goals and policies.

Chapter 2 Rural and Natural Resource Element

Rationale: Include policy language related to new clustering provisions in Forest and Agricultural Lands.

Forest Lands

3.4.4 Clustering of parcels is allowed consistent with platting and zoning requirements and the Clark County Code.

Agricultural Lands

3.5.4 Clustering of parcels is allowed consistent with platting and zoning requirements and the Clark County Code.

Chapter 4 Environmental Element

Rationale: Inclusion of a goal, policy and strategy on sustainability reflecting the Clark County Sustainability Policy adopted in 2007 and the Growing Healthier Report adopted in 2012.

Goal: Promote the advancement of energy efficiency, green building, waste reduction, composting and recycling, solar and renewable energy use, and local sustainable food production; as well as actions to mitigate and adapt to climate change.

Policy

4.11.1 Clark County is committed to fostering a safe, secure future that conserves natural resources while meeting basic human needs, including clean water, air and food, along with shelter, education, and employment. This commitment to a sustainable future will be a key consideration in making public policy, developing public programs, operating public facilities, and delivering public services.

Strategies

The county will do the following to implement its sustainability policy:

1. Lead by example;
 2. Encourage innovation in both public and private pursuits;
 3. Promote and demonstrate efficient and effective use of renewable and consumable resources;
 4. Collaborate with public and private partners on projects aimed at sustainability;
 5. Continuously enhance our perspective and expertise in making sustainable choices on behalf of the citizens and communities of Clark County; and
 6. Identify and pursue new opportunities that promote sustainable practices.
-

Chapter 5 Transportation Element

Rationale: This policy is proposed to reflect the adoption of the Clark County Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan in 2010 and meets the requirements of RCW 36.70A.070 (6)(vii).

5.2.6 The 2010 Clark County Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan and its policies are included by reference in the comprehensive plan.

Rationale: This proposed policy is related to the adoption of the County Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, which includes projects and policies identified in the Clark County Trails and Bikeway System Plan and meets the requirements of RCW 36.70A.070 (6)(vii)

5.2.7 The county supports the development of its bicycle and pedestrian network identified in the 2010 Clark County Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan.

Rationale: This proposed policy ensures jurisdictional coordination required by RCW 36.70A.070 (6)(a)(v) and (vii).

5.2.8 The County supports coordination among the jurisdictions and agencies in the development of bikeway, and pedestrian facilities recommendations.

Rationale: Establishes a policy that creates opportunity to secure grant funding.

5.2.9 Support efforts to fund construction of bicycle and pedestrian improvements in the County Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan.

Rationale: This is a key policy in the County Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, the Growing Healthier Report and meets the requirements of RCW 36.70A.070 (6)(vii).

5.2.11 Promote bicycle and pedestrian safety and increased bicycling and walking through encouragement and safety activities.

Rationale: This proposed new policy works to ensure that the traveling public will have consistent travel patterns when traveling between multiple jurisdictions. It also supports RTC's (Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council) Transportation System Management and Operations Plan.

5.3.7 The county shall provide seamless arterial corridor operations between agencies and use common TSMO technology for signal coordination along multi-agency arterial corridors.

Rationale: This proposed policy assures the entire population, whether it's disabled, elderly or youth, can travel from their home to services. It also opens funding opportunities offered through the new federal transportation funding bill; Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act, or "FAST Act" that retains the multi-modal emphasis of the federal program.

5.4.4 County roadways and intersections shall be designed, when feasible, to achieve safety and accessibility for all modes. Arterial streets shall provide facilities for automobile, bike, and pedestrian mobility as defined in the Arterial Atlas, and shall include landscaping.

Rationale: This proposed policy responds to RTC's Safety Management Assessment For Clark County 2014, which shows trends for distracted drivers involved in fatalities and serious injuries from 2005 to 2011 increasing considerably in Clark County.

5.5.5 Clark County supports strong education and enforcement that helps reduce the number of fatalities and serious injuries due to distracted drivers.

Rationale: This proposed policy would support implementing a funding mechanism that strives to have new development pay for the facilities that support new development. It also supports the Transportation Concurrency Management System and helps ensure any improvements being implemented as part of the county's transportation improvement program are reasonably funded and scheduled for completion of construction within six (6) years of the final date for a decision upon the development application.

5.6.5 A proportionate share of funding for growth related roadway projects shall be obtained from Traffic Impact Fees.

Chapter 6 Housing

Rationale: Include policies that were recommended from the Aging Readiness Plan (2/7/2012) and Growing Healthier Report (6/5/2012). The Board approved the documents to be incorporated into the Comprehensive Plan.

Policy

- 2.4.7 Encourage the creation of housing that is energy efficient, resource efficient and has high indoor air quality.
- 2.7.3 Encourage housing that is created using the principles of Universal Design.

New Strategies from Aging Readiness Plan

1. Preserve and expand rental housing for seniors with incomes below 60 percent (established federal guidelines) of the area’s median income.
2. Weatherize homes to reduce energy costs. Provide information, education and assistance to moderate income households who do not qualify for the federal weatherization assistance program but cannot afford the initial weatherization investment.
3. Encourage a not-for-profit organization or community land trust to purchase homes, remodel using universal design principles, then resell the homes at affordable costs. To ensure that homes will remain affordable, the organization or trust could employ resale-restricted principles of shared equity ownership.
4. Develop a Clark County Universal Design Information Guide to assist homeowners in increasing the ease and flexibility of their home.
5. Incorporate universal design principles in Clark County’s building code review process.
6. Facilitate the development of Accessory dwelling units (ADU’s) – by exempting them from site plan review. Consider exempting ADU’s from TIF’s and PIF’s ,if age restricted to 62 plus.
7. Allow more flexibility in the creation of duplexes by allowing them in all single family zones.
8. Encourage new developments of senior housing to be within a half-mile of transit, services and retail amenities.
9. Allow cohousing to be developed in single family residential zones.
10. Allow assisted living facilities in single-family residential zones as a conditional use.
11. Develop a shared housing program.
12. Partner with the Building Industry Association to provide a universal-designed home and information at the Clark County Parade of Homes.

New Strategies from Growing Healthier Report

1. Change zoning to allow more areas to support diverse housing types, including small-lot single-family, multifamily, duplexes, Accessory dwelling units, cottages and co-housing.

Chapter 8 Historical, Archaeological and Cultural Preservation Element

Rationale: The current policies in this element were developed to implement the historic preservation program at the county. The updated policies reflect the vision and mission of the current historic preservation program as it has been in a county program since ~1999. The Clark County Historic Preservation program was created to protect the county's rich heritage. Currently, there are almost 100 sites designated as historic.

Goal: Identify, maintain, update and protect archeological and historic sites to guide decision-making in resource planning, environmental review and resource management.

Policy

- 8.1.1 Identify and evaluate archaeological and historic sites to determine which should be preserved. Identification and evaluation is a constant, ongoing process.
- 8.1.2 Identify those lands which are most likely to contain unrecorded archeological or historic sites.
- 8.1.3 Nominate cultural resources to the local, state and national Historic Registers. The Cultural Resources Inventory should be used as a reference in the identification of significant structures and places eligible for nomination.
- 8.1.4 Maintain the Clark County Heritage Register to provide a means to recognize and preserve cultural resources of local significance. The Cultural Resources Inventory should be used as a reference in the identification of significant structures and places eligible for nomination.

- 8.1.5 Review of land use actions should be sensitive and give consideration to protection of cultural resources.
- 8.1.6 Promote preservation, restoration, rehabilitation, and reuse of historically or architecturally significant older buildings.
- 8.2.1 Provide education to county employees about cultural heritage preservation issues, including state and federal penalties for disturbance, destruction or removal of archaeological resources.
- 8.2.2 Provide a program of public education concerning the need to preserve cultural resources and keep the public informed of actions to carry out preservation plans.
- 8.2.3 Promote a wide variety of community involvement in preservation issues by linking the public with preservation groups and resources.
- 8.2.4 Establish and maintain government-to-government relations with Native American tribes for the preservation of archaeological sites and traditional cultural properties.
- 8.2.5 Clark County shall pursue its cultural resource goals through collaboration with residents, property owners, cultural organizations, public agencies, tribes, schools districts, libraries and others.

Goal: Provide stewardship of County-owned cultural resources.

Policy

- 8.3.1 Maintain County-owned cultural resources in an appropriate manner by following the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation, in consultation with the Clark County Historic Preservation Commission.
- 8.3.2 Identify, on a regular basis, County-owned properties that may be historically significant. Listing in the Clark County Heritage Register should be considered for county properties when appropriate.

Goal: Devise and implement strategies and incentives that encourage historic preservation.

Policies

- 8.4.1 Continue to utilize the Clark County Historic Preservation Commission as the authority and advisor to the County Planning Commission, the Board of County Councilors and other county agencies in matters of historic preservation.
- 8.4.2 Expand the variety of incentives available to property owners to encourage historic preservation. Although many cultural resources are in private ownership, public agencies can offer incentives for their preservation and maintenance.
- 8.4.3 Develop methods to link cultural resource preservation with local economic development strategies, such as rehabilitation of commercial buildings, neighborhood revitalization and tourism.

Chapter 11 Community Design Element

Policies

Rationale: This new policy for the Community Design Element incorporates the Community Framework vision to create a sense of community that supports the human scale and pedestrian connections that work to achieve the following goal: Development in urban areas and rural centers should incorporate diverse uses designed in a manner that provides for a sense of community, supports the human scale and allows for multi-modal transportation options.

- 11.2.1 Facilitate development and create standards to achieve the following: (a) Increased streetfront use, visual interest, and integration with adjacent buildings; (b) Improved pedestrian connections and proximity of uses within developments; (c) Enhanced sense of identity in neighborhoods and subareas; and (d) Publicly and/or privately owned gathering spaces facilitating interaction.

Rationale: This new policy for the Community Design Element incorporates the Community Framework vision to create a sense of community that supports the human scale and pedestrian connections that work to achieve the following goal: Development in urban areas and rural centers should incorporate diverse uses designed in a manner that provides for a sense of community, supports the human scale and allows for multi-modal transportation options.

- 11.2.3 Encourage the development of urban activity centers that foster community identity and reduce reliance on automobiles.

Rationale: Update language of goals and policies and add new policies that reflect recommendations from community plans/reports adopted since 2007 update [Growing Healthier Report (2012) and Aging Readiness Plan (2012)].

- 11.2.8 Promote improved public health by encouraging integrated land use and street patterns with sidewalk and recreational facilities that support walking or biking and provide easy access to healthy food.
- 11.2.9 Encourage the development of age-friendly communities that have affordable and appropriate housing, supportive community features and services, and adequate mobility options, to facilitate personal independence and the engagement of residents in civic and social life.

Title 40 - Clark County Unified Development Code (Binder 1, Tab 4)

Title 40 contains all regulations relating to property development in unincorporated Clark County. The code is one of the main tools used to implement the Clark County Comprehensive Plan. The plan and code are periodically amended to reflect changes in federal and state laws and changes in county policy and direction. Click the link to review the proposed changes to Title 40 - Unified Development Code. Clark County's existing UDC Title 40 is being updated, as applicable, to implement and be consistent with the proposed changes in the Preferred Alternative. The following is a summary of the edits proposed.

- CCC 40.210 Resource and Rural Districts: Reduce minimum lot size in the Agriculture district from 20 acres to 10 acres, and reduce minimum lot size in the Forest district from 40 acres to 20 acres; the Forest 80 for minimum lot size of 80 acres will be retained. CCC40.210.010 includes proposed clustering requirements for resource lands
- CCC 40.230.010 Commercial Business Mixed Use: Combine the three commercial zones into a single Comp Plan (C) designation. Change the zoning code for Neighborhood Commercial from C-1 to NC and for Community Commercial from C-2 to CC. Include each zone's locational criteria from the Comp Plan to the Unified Development Code.
- CCC 40.230.090 Public Facilities Zone: Create a development code section for already developed public facilities.
- CCC 40.250.040 Resort Overlay: Add language regarding new resorts from the comprehensive plan.
- CCC 40.250.090 Equestrian Overlay: Add previously approved language to the development code.
- CCC 40.250.100 Urban Reserve Overlay: Make it a true overlay and move to overlay section of the development code and also the Industrial Urban Reserve overlay will be removed.
- CCC 40.250.110 Urban Holding Overlay: Make it a true overlay and move to overlay section of the development code. Urban Holding 40 (UH-40) will be removed because there is no land designated urban holding that has a minimum lot size of 40 acres. Finally all references to Railroad Industrial Overlay will be removed because there is no place on the comprehensive plan map to implement this district.
- CCC 40.560 Plan and Code Amendments: This amendment provides consistency between capital facility plans: Parks, Transportation and Schools. CCC 40.560.010 (M) includes a new amendment that prohibits the expansion of an urban growth area (UGA) into the 100-year floodplain of a river. RCW 5 36.70A.110(8)

The following are cross reference edits:

- CCC 40.100 Definition
- CCC 40.200 Land Use Districts
- CCC 40.220 Urban Residential District
- CCC 40.230 Use Tables
- CCC 40.260 Special Uses
- CCC 40.310 Signs
- CCC 40.510 Type I, II, III, IV Process
- CCC 40.530 Nonconforming
- CCC 40.630.010 Procedures

The following are proposed Title 40 amendments:

- CCC 40.250.040 Resort Overlay: Add language regarding new resorts from the comprehensive plan.
- CCC 40.250.090 Equestrian Overlay: Add previously approved language to the development code.
- CCC 40.260.157 Parks: Expand the existing neighborhood parks code section to include development standards for community and regional parks as approved by the Parks Advisory Board at their February 12 meeting.

Capital Facilities Plans (Binder 2, Tab 1)

Capital Facilities Planning is an integral element of a comprehensive plan. Three key factors must be balanced: 1) Land use priorities, 2) Public facilities to support them, and 3) Financial capacity under RCW 36.70A.070(3) Clark County reviewed service providers CFPs under RCW 36.70A.070(3). Overall, service providers indicate adequate capacity over the 20-year planning horizon. The county provides services for transportation and parks. In order to provide those services, while implementing the land use plan, the county must address the following:

1. Transportation – The estimated available revenue for county capital transportation improvements over the 20-years of the land use plan is \$533.1 million as adopted in 2014 (ORD 2014-11-03). The estimated cost of county transportation improvements over the 20-year land use plan is \$691.2 million. The county must find funding strategies to make up the \$158 million shortfall.
2. Parks, Recreation and Open Space – In 2015, the County adopted a Parks, Recreation, and Open Space (PROS) plan. The PROS is a necessary component of the County Comprehensive Plan, per RCW 36.70A.070a(8)-Mandatory Elements. As part of this Comprehensive Plan Update, however, there is a proposal to update the Park Impact Fees to confirm with the new PROS Capital Facilities Plan.

County Capital Facilities Financial Plan (Binder 2, Tab2)

The Capital Facility Financial Plan (CFFP) presents a plan for financing capital facilities identified in Clark County's Comprehensive Growth Management Plan, as required by Washington State's Growth Management Act (GMA). It covers the following types of capital facilities: transportation; parks and open space; stormwater drainage and water quality and county buildings and other facilities. The plan covers the 6-year period from 2016-2021. The plan provides for:

- Expenditures totaling \$597.7 million over the 6-year period.
- Appropriated resources, such as grants, user fees, voter-approved bonds and legally dedicated revenues, to finance over 73% (or \$434.6 million) of the expenditure program.
- General purpose funding sources --To complete the financing of its overall capital facilities program, Clark County has the option to allocate additional funds from its general-purpose resources.
- Revenues from New Development – Clark County is anticipating receiving \$163 million from new development sources.
- Stormwater facilities for present and future developments are paid for by project developers, not the county.

The following table summarizes the expenditures and resources included in this plan:

Table 14 | Capital Facilities Financial Executive Summary

	Expenditures Total Cost	Earmarked Sources	
		Appropriated Revenues	Revenues from New Development
Transportation	\$163,818,000	\$73,136,000	\$90,682,000
Parks & Open Space	117,233,845	44,908,103	72,325,742
Stormwater Drainage & Water Quality	9,603,000	9,603,000	0
County Building & Other Facilities	307,000,000	307,000,000	0
Total	\$597,654,845	\$434,647,103	\$163,007,742

Arterial Atlas Amendments (Binder 2, Tab 3)

The Arterial Atlas unites the long-range roadway system plan with the land use plan for Clark County. It is an outcome of the Clark County Comprehensive Plan which sets the course for future growth and promotes strong linkages between transportation and land use. The Arterial Atlas list streets by their classification with describe the capacity for motor vehicles, bicycles and pedestrian traffic. For the 2016 update, minor clean ups and revisions based on completed transportation projects are proposed.

Impact Fees (Binder 2, Tab 4)

Impact fees are used to ensure that adequate facilities are available to serve new growth and development. The impact fees are a tool used to finance parks, schools and roads through the provision of the GMA. These impact fees are assessed on the construction of new homes and other buildings. The fees must reflect the costs of providing capital facilities needed to serve the new development.

School Impact Fees (SIF)

School capital facilities plans are required by the state [RCW36.70A.070(3)] and must be reviewed at a minimum every 2 years** [CCC40.650(P)(1)]. These periodic updates to the plans also reflect proposed changes to school impact fees (SIF). Capital facilities plans are adopted into the comprehensive plan by reference. Impact fee are calculated as set forth in [CCC40.620.040]. Clark County collects school impact fees on behalf of any school district whose capital facilities plan has been adopted as a portion of the Clark County 20-year comprehensive growth management plan. The school districts have prepared updates to their capital facilities plans and are seeking approval from the cities and the county. Except for the Woodland School District, the Planning Commission heard testimony on the capital facility plans and associated SIF and are recommending approval. Table 15 shows the proposed changes.

Table 15 | Proposed Changes to School Impact Fees

School Districts	Single-Family SIF Rates		Multi-Family (per unit) SIF Rates	
	Current	Proposed	Current	Proposed
Battle Ground	\$5,128	\$6,397	\$2,649	\$2,285
Camas	\$4,460	\$5,371	\$2,604	\$5,371
Evergreen	\$6,989	\$6,100	\$2,678	\$7,641
Green Mountain	\$3,387	\$3,387	0	0
Hockinson	\$5,906	\$6,080	\$1,617	\$2,781
La Center	\$6,991	\$4,111	\$2,626	\$5,095
Ridgefield*	\$3,983	\$6,530	\$1,796	\$6,530
Vancouver	\$1,523	\$2,880.75	\$845	\$2,381.93
Washougal	\$2,683	\$5,600	\$2,689	\$5,800
Woodland	\$2,750	\$5,000	\$650	\$2,500

*The Ridgefield school impact fee calculation resulted in an impact fee of \$11,290 for single-family and \$13,697 per multi-family unit. The District is requesting a 2016 SIF of \$6,530 for both single-family and multi-family.

**There is a Title 40 proposed amendment in 40.560 which would increase the timeframe for minimum update from 2 to 4 years.

Park Impact Fees (PIF)

The BOCC adopted the Clark County Comprehensive Parks, Recreation and Open Space Plan and corresponding CFP on September 22, 2015. Parks capital facilities plans are required by the state [RCW36.70A.130(8)] and currently must be prepared every year [CCC40.560(P)(2)]. As part of the County Comprehensive Plan update, the proposal is to amend [CCC40.560(P)(2)] to change the frequency Capital Facilities Plan updates from annually to at least every four years. These periodic updates to the plans also reflect proposed changes to impact fees. Capital facilities plans are adopted into the comprehensive plan by reference. Impact fees are calculated as set forth in [CCC40.620.020]. The Department of Public Works has prepared updates to their capital facilities plans and are seeking approval from the BOCC.

Table 16 shows the proposed changes to impact fees, per the recommendation of the Clark County Parks Advisory Board (PAB). Their recommendation was to take references to Park Impact Fee District 1-4 out of the Draft Park Impact Fee Technical Document and also to phase in the fee increases.

Table 16 | Proposed Changes to Park Impact Fees

PIF District	Single-Family PIF Rates			Multi-Family PIF Rates		
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
1*	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2*	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
3*	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
4*	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
5	\$3,482	\$3,918	\$4,353	\$2,520	\$3,023	\$3,359
6	\$4,458	\$5,015	\$5,572	\$3,225	\$3,870	\$4,300
7	\$3,402	\$3,827	\$4,252	\$2,461	\$2,953	\$3,282
8	\$3,167	\$3,563	\$3,959	\$2,291	\$2,750	\$3,055
9	\$4,400	\$4,950	\$5,500	\$3,183	\$3,820	\$4,244
10	\$3,082	\$3,467	\$3,852	\$2,229	\$2,675	\$2,973

*These park districts are either wholly or predominately within the Vancouver city limits, which is why Clark County Parks Advisory Board voted unanimously to take references to these four districts out of the Draft Park Impact Fee technical document.

Traffic Impact Fees (TIF)

Transportation capital facilities plans are required by the state [RCW36.70A.070(6)] and shall be reviewed at a minimum every four (4) years [CCC40.560(P)(1)]. Impact fees are calculated as set forth in [CCC40.620.010]. Table 17 shows the proposed changes.

Table 17 | Proposed Changes to Transportation Impact Fees

Existing Districts	Existing Rates	Proposed Rates	Proposed Districts
Hazel Dell	\$375	\$338	Hazel Dell
Mount Vista	\$613	\$536	Mount Vista
North Orchards	\$553	\$313	Orchards
South Orchards	\$389		
Rural 1	\$315	\$264	Rural
Rural 2	\$52		

Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (Binder 2, Tab 5)

The State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), enacted in 1984, requires local jurisdictions to evaluate potential environmental impacts of actions they approve or undertake. The most common evaluation looks at potential environmental impacts of a proposed project, such as a big box store, or a large non-project action, such as

adoption of a new urban growth boundary. A SEPA checklist prescribes elements to be evaluated, and the completed checklist is shared with federal, state and local agencies, tribes, neighborhood organizations and interested residents. People can comment on the alternatives, mitigation measures, probable significant adverse impacts or other relevant topics.

Because urban growth areas are only expanding slightly, the county adopted the EIS prepared on the 2007 Comprehensive Plan update, and prepared a supplemental EIS on changes proposed in the 2016 Comprehensive Plan update. The draft SEIS was issued in August of 2015, and contained descriptions and analysis of four alternatives. The final SEIS, included here, was done on the preferred alternative, and was issued in April of 2016.