

From: [Jeffrey Delapena](#)
To: [Gibbens, Jason](#); [Cnty 2025 Comp Plan](#)
Cc: [Lebowsky, Laurie](#); [Albrecht, Gary](#); [Lugo, Jason](#); [Southwick, Michael](#); [Oliver Oriako](#); [Jose Alvarez](#); [Jenna Kay](#)
Subject: RE: WSDOT Comments – 2025 Clark County Comprehensive Plan Update, Draft SEPA EIS
Date: Wednesday, November 26, 2025 2:21:35 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)

Good day, Jason,

Thank you for submitting WSDOT's feedback related to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the 2025 Comprehensive Plan Update.

I have forwarded these comments to additional Staff and will enter them into the Index of Record.



Jeff Delapena
Program Assistant
COMMUNITY PLANNING

564.397.4558



NOTICE OF PUBLIC DISCLOSURE: This e-mail account is public domain. Any correspondence from or to this e-mail account may be a public record. Accordingly, this email, in whole or in part may be subject to disclosure pursuant to RCW 42.56, regardless of any claim of confidentiality or privilege asserted by an external party.

From: Gibbens, Jason <jason.gibbens@wsdot.wa.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, November 26, 2025 2:14 PM
To: Cnty 2025 Comp Plan <comp.plan@clark.wa.gov>
Cc: Lebowsky, Laurie <laurie.lebowsky@wsdot.wa.gov>; Albrecht, Gary <gary.albrecht@wsdot.wa.gov>; Lugo, Jason <jason.lugo@wsdot.wa.gov>; Southwick, Michael <michael.southwick@wsdot.wa.gov>
Subject: WSDOT Comments – 2025 Clark County Comprehensive Plan Update, Draft SEPA EIS

You don't often get email from jason.gibbens@wsdot.wa.gov. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL: 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.

WSDOT values Clark County as a partner and values our collaboration to develop and support a safe and efficient multimodal transportation network. Thank you for the opportunity to review the Draft Environmental Impact Statement of the Clark County Comprehensive Plan. Please accept this email for the record.

This document is presented as a table format where specific items are noted and addressed regarding the DRAFT EIS for your consideration.

Again, we appreciate collaborating with Clark County and we look forward to reviewing future iterations of Comprehensive Plan goals, policies, and elements as they are available.

Thanks again,

Jason Lugo, SWR Development Review Planner

Jason.Lugo@wsdot.wa.gov

| Item (incl. p.#) | Text | Comment |
|-------------------------|---|--|
| 3.9.2 (p.152) | “... identified potential deficiencies for two elements of the regional roadway network: segments (links) and intersections.” | Additionally, look at emphasizing the need to provide better cross circulation and access to existing roadways that have capacity but are underutilized, providing relief of major intersections. |
| 3.9.2 (p.152) | “Table 87 identifies roadway segments in Clark County...” | Table 87 reads Intersection but should read Roadway Segment. Please alternate with table 88 (Roadway Segment). |
| 3.9.2 (p.152) | “NE Andresen Rd & NE 88th St” | 88th is discontinuous in this area and has two intersections with Andresen. The western intersection is signalized while the eastern, referenced in the table, is stop controlled. Specify to avoid confusion. |
| 3.9.2 (p.153) | “...RTP identifies several long-range improvement projects along the SR 503 corridor between Fourth Plain in Vancouver and SR 502 in Battle | Strategies for 503 are shifting towards operational improvements, access management, and multimodal improvements. See the |

| | | |
|----------------------|---|---|
| | Ground...” | SR 503 Corridor Plan |
| 3.9.3 (p.159) | “Given the right-of-way, policy, and financial constraints, the widening of I-5 to eight travel lanes outside of the Interstate Bridge Replacement program influence area is unlikely. | What level of analysis has occurred for this claim? RTC’s RTP does not include an I-5 project of widening to eight travel lanes outside of the Interstate Bridge Replacement program. |
| 3.9.3 (p.159-160) | “... Similar constraints apply to I-205 and beyond the projects already programmed in the RTP. Minimum Level of Service standards on these corridors may need to change or be redefined...” | Reads as subjective. |
| 3.9.3 (p.160) | “Funding for major projects on state highways is primarily controlled by the State Legislature and dependent on voter approved tax packages.” | A more appropriate sentence: The state legislature ultimately decides funding for state facilities unless federal grant funding is obtained. |
| 3.9.3 (p.160) | “Widening projects beyond the functional classification of a roadway should be weighed against other options, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adding intersection capacity, or through signal coordination and access management; • Adding transit capacity; • Land use and design that increases active transportation mode share; • Identifying potential new corridors through long-range planning studies; • Circulation plans that reduce access and local trips on arterial corridors; and • Reducing Level of Service standards.” | Does this include state routes? |