

From: [Susan Ellinger](#)
To: [Spoo, Ethan](#); [Sonja Wiser](#)
Cc: [Bryan Kast](#); [Egurrola, Alec](#); [Jacqui Kamp](#)
Subject: RE: City County Meeting Scheduled for 2023-01-12 & Attached Documents
Date: Friday, January 13, 2023 3:40:09 PM
Attachments: [image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)
[image005.png](#)
[image006.png](#)

Hi Ethan –

I took a look at this and understand your point. Those criteria are referenced as criteria for map changes, but I think those may be the most appropriate criteria in our code. I will review with other staff and determine the best criteria to reference. Thanks for your input! Please let me know if anything else comes up. Thanks!



Susan Ellinger
She/her/hers
Planner III
COMMUNITY PLANNING

564.397.4516



From: Spoo, Ethan <ethan.spoo@wsp.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 12, 2023 3:08 PM
To: Sonja Wiser <Sonja.Wiser@clark.wa.gov>; Susan Ellinger <Susan.Ellinger@clark.wa.gov>
Cc: Bryan Kast <bkast@ci.lacenter.wa.us>; Egurrola, Alec <Alec.Egurrola@wsp.com>; Jacqui Kamp <Jacqui.Kamp@clark.wa.gov>
Subject: RE: City County Meeting Scheduled for 2023-01-12 & Attached Documents

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of Clark County. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Sonja, Susan,

Please see La Center's comments on the draft Countywide Planning Policies Amendment Proposal. We only have one. Is the reference to CCC 40.560.010.F through J correct? That code seems to pertain to map amendments.

Thanks,

Ethan



Ethan Spoo, AICP

Sr. Lead Consultant, Land/Urban Planner

Pronouns: he/him

T+ 1 360-823-6138

F+ 1 360-823-6101

M+ 1 971-219-5169

From: Sonja Wiser <Sonja.Wiser@clark.wa.gov>

Sent: Thursday, January 5, 2023 12:11 PM

To: Egurrola, Alec <Alec.Egurrola@wsp.com>; April Furth <April.Furth@clark.wa.gov>; Carrico, Brian <brian.carrico@wsp.com>; Bryan Kast <bkast@ci.lacenter.wa.us>; Bryan Snodgrass-Vancouver <Bryan.Snodgrass@cityofvancouver.us>; Chad Eiken-Vancouver <Chad.Eiken@cityofvancouver.us>; Claire Lust <Claire.Lust@ridgefieldwa.us>; Domenic Martinelli <domenic.martinelli@cityofvancouver.us>; Erin Erdman-Battle Ground <erin.erdman@cityofbg.org>; Spoo, Ethan <ethan.spoo@wsp.com>; Jeff Swanson <jswanson@ci.lacenter.wa.us>; Jessica Nash <jnash@ci.lacenter.wa.us>; Kim Stube <kstube@cowlitz.org>; Lee Knottnerus-Ridgefield <lee.knottnerus@ci.ridgefield.wa.us>; Lindsey Hueer <Lindsey.Hueer@clark.wa.gov>; Mark (RTC) Harrington <Mark.Harrington@rtc.wa.gov>; Matt Jenkins <mjenkins@ci.lacenter.wa.us>; Matt Ransom <matt.ransom@rtc.wa.gov>; Mitch Kneipp-Washougal <mknipp@ci.washougal.wa.us>; Phil Bourquin-Camas <pbourquin@cityofcamas.us>; Kennedy, Rebecca <rebecca.kennedy@cityofvancouver.us>; Robert Maul-Camas <rmaul@cityofcamas.us>; Sam Crummett-Battle Ground <sam.crummett@cityofbg.org>; Steve Stuart-Ridgefield <steve.stuart@ci.ridgefield.wa.us>; Teresa Brum <teresa.brum@cityofvancouver.us>; Tom Esteb <pwd@townofyacolt.com>; Travis Goddard-Woodland <goddardt@ci.woodland.wa.us>

Cc: Bart Catching <Bart.Catching@clark.wa.gov>; Gary Albrecht <Gary.Albrecht@clark.wa.gov>; Jacqui Kamp <Jacqui.Kamp@clark.wa.gov>; Jenna Kay <Jenna.Kay@clark.wa.gov>; Jose Alvarez <Jose.Alvarez@clark.wa.gov>; Larisa Sidorov <Larisa.Sidorov@clark.wa.gov>; Michael Sallis <Michael.Sallis@clark.wa.gov>; Oliver Orjiako <Oliver.Orjiako@clark.wa.gov>; Sonja Wiser <Sonja.Wiser@clark.wa.gov>; Susan Ellinger <Susan.Ellinger@clark.wa.gov>

Subject: City County Meeting Scheduled for 2023-01-12 & Attached Documents

Please see the following email from Oliver Orjiako & Jacqui Kamp. I will be sending you a WebEx invite for our next meeting scheduled on 01/12/2023. Thank you

Greetings and happy new year!

Our next meeting is scheduled for **Thurs., Jan. 12, from 10-11:30 a.m.** A Webex meeting invitation

will follow shortly.

We will begin meeting monthly as we coordinate on the Periodic Update to the comprehensive plan(s) due June 30, 2025. On the agenda, you will see the 2023 monthly meeting schedule and list of proposed monthly hosts for your review and discussion. Please let us know if you have any conflicts. We will need to determine if we continue to be meet virtually or switch to in-person. Please let us know if you have a preference.

At the Jan. 12 meeting, we will discuss the beginning work of the Periodic Update project, which includes the population projections provided by OFM. If you haven't reviewed the projections, you can find them on [OFM's webpage](#).

The other item on the agenda includes an update on the proposed Countywide Planning Policy amendment work that has been discussed previously during the changes that were made for the Cowlitz Indian Tribe and the City of Woodland in 2020. Susan Ellinger from our staff has developed a draft process for your review which she will go over at the meeting. The overall goal is to document the process used for similar amendments in previous comprehensive plan updates and to comply with [WAC 365-196-305](#), which states in part:

(5) Recommended policies. County-wide planning policies should also include policies addressing the following:

(a) Procedures by which the county-wide planning policies will be reviewed and amended;
and

(b) A process for resolving disputes regarding interpretation of county-wide planning policies or disputes regarding implementation of the county-wide planning policies.

Please review and comment by **5 pm January 19 (1 week after the City-County-Tribe Technical Advisory Committee Meeting)**. Please send any questions about this amendment to Susan Ellinger, susan.ellinger@clark.wa.gov or 564-397-4516.

Please let us know if you have any questions. We look forward to seeing you next Thursday!


NOTICE: This communication and any attachments ("this message") may contain information which is privileged, confidential, proprietary or otherwise subject to restricted disclosure under applicable law. This message is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s). Any unauthorized use, disclosure, viewing, copying, alteration, dissemination or distribution of, or reliance on, this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, or you are not an authorized or intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately by replying to this message, delete this message and all copies from your e-mail system and destroy any printed copies.

-LAEmHhHzdJzBITWfa4Hgs7pbkI



DRAFT
Countywide Planning Policies Amendment Proposal

1.1.13 Any local jurisdiction, including the county, may initiate an amendment to or request an interpretation of any Countywide Planning Policy, as follows:

- The local jurisdiction shall submit the proposed amendment or proposed interpretation to the County Manager or their designee (County Manager), and shall include the following in the proposal:
 - In the case of an interpretation request, identification of the policy and the exact language of the proposed interpretation; or
 - In the case of a proposed amendment,
 - The exact language of the proposed amendment (shown in "strike out" for deletions and "underline" for additions); and
 - An explanation of the need for the proposed amendment, including the factors, data, or analyses that have changed since the adoption of the Countywide Planning Policies and/or the experiences with the existing Countywide Planning Policies that have prompted the proposed amendment; and
 - An analysis of how the proposal meets the criteria in 40.560.010.F through J, or city code, as applicable. 
- The county shall initially refer a proposed amendment to or interpretation request regarding the Countywide Planning Policies to the City-County Technical Advisory Committee (TAC, see also in Policy 1.1.12), which shall review the proposal and develop a consensus-based recommendation, as follows:
 - TAC Members shall endeavor to reach agreement on a mutually acceptable course of action regarding a proposed amendment or interpretation request, with decisions made by agreement rather than by majority vote where TAC members agree to support, accept, live with, or agree not to oppose the decision. The TAC can only make recommendations when a majority of members are present. The TAC can only revisit a previous decision if a majority of the TAC agrees.
 - If consensus regarding a proposed amendment or proposed interpretation is not reached, the group will explore whether modifications to that proposal can help achieve consensus. Regardless of meeting outcomes, all views will be recorded in the meeting summaries.

- Once the TAC makes a recommendation on a proposed amendment, the process continues as follows:
 - Staff from each jurisdiction shall bring the proposal through their respective adoption or approval process.
 - Each jurisdiction shall notify the County Manager of the results of its adoption process. If a majority of jurisdictions approve the proposal, the County Manager will refer it to the Clark County Planning Commission and County Council.
 - If the amendment is considered outside of the periodic review process, each jurisdiction shall consider the amendment in its next annual comprehensive plan update.
 - If the amendment is considered as part of a periodic review process, the timing of the request must reasonably coincide with the overall schedule of the periodic review, or the request will be considered as part of the next amendments docket as outlined in 40.560.030.
 - The county shall utilize the Type IV docket code amendment procedures as outlined in CCC 40.510.040, 40.560.010 and 40.560.030 for review of the proposal.

DRAFT