From: Jeffrey Delapena
To: "Heidi Pozzo"; Rebecca Messinger
Cc: Oliver Orjiako; Jose Alvarez
Subject: RE: Comp Plan: Staff Now Ask Applicants for a Capacity Analysis the Code Does Not Provide For
Date: Thursday, October 1, 2026 4:24:00 PM

Hello Heidi,

Thank you for providing this comment and attachments. Confirming these have been received and will be added to the Comprehensive Plan Index of Record.

Best,

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.

-----Original Message-----
From: Heidi Pozzo <hcpheidi@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 1, 2026 4:17 PM
To: Jeffrey Delapena <Jeffrey.Delapena@clark.wa.gov>; Rebecca Messinger <Rebecca.Messinger@clark.wa.gov>
Cc: Oliver Orjiako <Oliver.Orjiako@clark.wa.gov>; Jose Alvarez <Jose.Alvarez@clark.wa.gov>
Subject: Comp Plan: Staff Now Ask Applicants for a Capacity Analysis the Code Does Not Provide For

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.

Dear Jeff,

Please find attached a memo on how Staff is now asking the applicant for a capacity analysis of roads that exceed v/c > .9 for inclusion in the Comp Plan Index.

Thank you,

Heidi

Staff Now Ask Applicants for a Capacity Analysis the Code Does Not Provide For

Submitted for inclusion in the index of record

Clark County Comprehensive Growth Management Plan — 2025–2045 Periodic Update

Submitted by: Heidi Pozzo

Date: October 1, 2026

County concurrency staff are now instructing applicants that their traffic studies may analyze road capacity. That is outside the code. CCC 40.350.020 sets capacity in the code and gives the applicant's traffic study a different job: measuring the project's traffic. It is inappropriate for staff to ask an applicant, whose approval depends on the volume-to-capacity ratio, to analyze the capacity that decides it.

What staff are asking for

Before an application is filed, the County's concurrency section issues pre-application comments telling the applicant what its traffic impact study must contain. The comments for Cedar Vista (PAC-2026-00246, September 23, 2026) and The Commons at Whipple Creek (PAC-2026-00247, September 30, 2026) list the usual requirements: trip generation, trip distribution and assignment to concurrency corridors and intersections within a two-mile radius, and traffic counts with volume-to-capacity analysis on the corridor segments. Both then end with the same item:

> *The volume-to-capacity ratio for some segments of the regionally significant corridors within the study radius may exceed the 0.9 threshold in the buildout year using the prescriptive method as outlined in CCC 40.350.020(G)(1)(a). If it is found that the volume-to-capacity ratio exceeds 0.9, the applicant may choose to mitigate per CCC 40.350.030(B)(6) or the traffic study may include discussion and/or calculations for the volume-to-capacity ratio using the methodology as outlined in the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM).*

This item asks the applicant to analyze capacity, which the code does not give the applicant to do. An HCM calculation does not change the traffic. It produces a different capacity figure for the road, so the same volume yields a lower ratio. The item offers that analysis as the alternative to mitigation, and it sets no standard for how the County will review or accept the applicant's figure. The traffic studies that would carry the analysis are commissioned and paid for by the applicant.

What the code asks the applicant for

Under CCC 40.350.020(D)(2), a traffic impact study analyzes the project's trip generation, modal split, distribution and assignment, and its projected impact "upon the current operating level" of affected corridors and intersections. Operating level is defined in (F), and (G)(1)(a) assigns the (F) factors to the volume side of the ratio. The study's job is the traffic.

Capacity is set in (G)(1)(a): Table 40.350.020-1 for roads built out to County standards, and current-condition lane capacities of 800, 700 or 600 vehicles per hour, keyed to lane and paved shoulder width, for roads not built out. Methodology belongs to the Public Works Director through an adopted, published administrative manual under (N)(1)–(3), and under (N)(5) the section controls where the manual conflicts with it. As documented in my September 23, 2026 submission, public records request P057715 found no update to the manual since 2011. CCC 40.350.020 does not reference the Highway Capacity Manual. “Prescriptive method” is the comment sheets’ label, not the code’s.

When a segment exceeds 0.90, the code provides approval only where the standards are met under (E)(3), mitigation volunteered by the applicant under (E)(5), or no concurrency approval under (E)(1). CCC 40.350.030(B)(6)(a), the provision the comment sheets cite, preserves denial where off-site road conditions are inadequate, subject to the applicant’s voluntary agreement to mitigate. An applicant’s capacity analysis is not among the outcomes the code provides.

Why this matters for the Plan

The Plan states the 0.90 standard and leaves how capacity is set to Title 40, which this update does not amend. RCW 36.70A.070(6)(b) requires the County to “adopt and enforce ordinances which prohibit development approval” when a development causes level of service to decline below the standards in the transportation element. That prohibition holds only if Title 40 is applied as adopted. If an applicant’s capacity analysis can replace the adopted capacity on a segment that exceeds 0.90, the standard in the Plan no longer prohibits approval on that segment.

Both comment sheets anticipate that segments within the two-mile study radius may exceed 0.90 in the buildout year. RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iv)(C) addresses that situation: if probable funding falls short of meeting identified needs, the Plan must discuss how additional funding will be raised or how land use assumptions will be reassessed to ensure that level of service standards will be met. An applicant’s capacity analysis is neither.

My submissions “Compliance Without a Standard” and “Clark County Does Not Have an Operating Transportation Concurrency System” set out what CCC 40.350.020 requires and how the 0.90 standard has been applied in project review. I will provide supplemental analysis of the legislative record behind the adopted capacity values in a separate submission.

In summary:

1. Capacity in concurrency review is set by CCC 40.350.020(G)(1)(a), using Table 40.350.020-1 and the current-condition lane values, as adopted.
2. The HCM item in the Cedar Vista and Whipple Creek pre-application comments asks applicants for a capacity analysis that CCC 40.350.020 does not provide for. Capacity is not the applicant’s to determine.

3. Where adopted capacity shows corridor segments exceeding 0.90 without a funded improvement, RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iv)(C) calls for the Plan to address the shortfall through additional funding or reassessed land use assumptions, not through an applicant's capacity analysis.

Heidi Pozzo
13023 NE Highway 99, Ste. 7-298
Vancouver, WA 98686

Documents referenced

The documents relied on in this submission are listed below, with the date each was submitted to the Index of Record. County code, statutes and the Comprehensive Plan documents prepared by the County are cited in the body rather than relisted here.

No.	Document	Date submitted to Index of Record
1	Concurrency Comments for Pre-application Developments, PAC-2026-00246, Cedar Vista, September 23, 2026	Submitted with this document
2	Concurrency Comments for Pre-application Developments, PAC-2026-00247, The Commons at Whipple Creek, September 30, 2026	Submitted with this document
3	Compliance Without a Standard	September 13, 2026
4	Clark County Does Not Have an Operating Transportation Concurrency System	September 23, 2026

proud past, promising future

CLARK COUNTY
WASHINGTON

Development Engineering - Concurrency

TO: Applicant and Planner

FROM: Craig Kathol, Engineer II

DATE: September 30, 2026

SUBJECT: Concurrency Comments for Pre-application Developments

Per CCC 40.350.020, Transportation Concurrency Management System, a transportation impact study shall be required for all development applications in which the proposed development is projected to have an impact upon any affected transportation corridor or intersection of regional significance. Unless waived or modified, a review shall address the issues in the Concurrency Administrative Manual.

Traffic Impact Study

Any development generating 10 or more peak hour trips is required to complete a traffic impact study. A general outline is provided in the concurrency administrative manual. A traffic impact study shall analyze impacts according to the following:

- 50 or less new peak hour trips; one mile from site
- 51-250 new peak hour trips; two miles from the site
- 251 or more new peak hour trips; three miles from the site

Traffic Profile

Where the proposed development will generate less than ten 10 peak hour trips, a traffic profile is required. A traffic profile shall include a summary of the development and the anticipated number of trips.

PAC-2026-00247: The Commons at Whipple Creek
Planner: Bryan Mattson **Development Engineer:** Mark Forslund

A traffic study **will be** required for a 121-lot residential unit project with a 30,000 square foot commercial/retail space, on approximately 10.73 acres.

- ☑ The applicant's traffic study shall include trip generations and analysis for the development.
- ☑ The applicant is required to provide trip distributions and assignments contributing to Concurrency corridors and intersections within a 2-mile radius of the site. The applicant shall follow the requirements of the Concurrency Ordinance 40.350.020.
- ☑ The applicant's traffic study will need to analyze the site access(es) onto the public right-of-way for level-of-service, safety, turn lane warrants, queuing and clear zone deficiencies.
- ☑ The applicant's traffic study will also need to analyze the operations of the site access, including the adequacy of vehicular turning movements.
- ☑ The applicant shall analyze the intersections identified for weekday AM & PM peak hour, unless otherwise noted.
- ☑ Provide volume counts in each traveled direction and provide volume to capacity analysis and Peak Hour Trip Impact information on the corridors segment(s) to comply with CCC 40.350.020.
- ☑ Provide traffic counts and analyze the intersections to comply with CCC 40.350.020.
- ☑ The applicant shall be responsible for mitigations necessary for any safety issue that is exacerbated by the proposed development.
- ☑ A signal warrant analysis shall be performed on any regionally significant unsignalized intersection within the concurrency study area that is determined to have a LOS E with, or without the proposed development of each parcel. Any signal warrant analysis shall be performed in compliance with the guidance found in the MUTCD.
- ☑ Traffic Impact Fees (TIF) will be assessed at the time of building permit, or at site plan approval when no building permit is required for the development.
- ☑ NW 11th Avenue is classified as an arterial roadway. Per 40.350.030(4)(d)(3) a raised median shall be required along the site frontage if access is allowed. This raised median will help to preserve roadway capacity, promote safety, and restrict cross traffic movements. If the applicant proposes to retain an access location onto NW 11th Avenue, justification for full-movement access will be required. This analysis shall be done by a traffic engineer.
- ☑ The volume-to-capacity ratio for some segments of the regionally significant corridors within the study radius may exceed the 0.9 threshold in the buildout year using the prescriptive method as outlined in CCC 40.350.020(G)(1)(a). If it is found that the volume-to-capacity ratio exceeds 0.9, the applicant may choose to mitigate per CCC 40.350.030(B)(6) or the traffic study may include discussion and/or calculations for the volume-to-capacity ratio using the methodology as outlined in the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM).

proud past, promising future

CLARK COUNTY
WASHINGTON

Development Engineering - Concurrency

TO: Applicant and Planner

FROM: Craig Kathol, Engineer II

DATE: September 23, 2026

SUBJECT: Concurrency Comments for Pre-application Developments

Per CCC 40.350.020, Transportation Concurrency Management System, a transportation impact study shall be required for all development applications in which the proposed development is projected to have an impact upon any affected transportation corridor or intersection of regional significance. Unless waived or modified, a review shall address the issues in the Concurrency Administrative Manual.

Traffic Impact Study

Any development generating 10 or more peak hour trips is required to complete a traffic impact study. A general outline is provided in the concurrency administrative manual. A traffic impact study shall analyze impacts according to the following:

- 50 or less new peak hour trips; one mile from site
- 51-250 new peak hour trips; two miles from the site
- 251 or more new peak hour trips; three miles from the site

Traffic Profile

Where the proposed development will generate less than ten 10 peak hour trips, a traffic profile is required. A traffic profile shall include a summary of the development and the anticipated number of trips.

PAC-2026-00246: Cedar Vista
Planner: Melissa Curtis **Development Engineer:** Mark Forslund

A traffic study **will be** required for a 151-lot planned unit development on approximately 16.96 acres.

- ☑ The applicant's traffic study shall include trip generations and analysis for the development.
- ☑ The applicant is required to provide trip distributions and assignments contributing to Concurrency corridors and intersections within a 2-mile radius of the site. The applicant shall follow the requirements of the Concurrency Ordinance 40.350.020.
- ☑ The applicant's traffic study will need to analyze the site access(es) onto the public right-of-way for level-of-service, safety, turn lane warrants, queuing and clear zone deficiencies.
- ☑ The applicant's traffic study will also need to analyze the operations of the site access, including the adequacy of vehicular turning movements.
- ☑ The applicant shall analyze the intersections identified for weekday AM & PM peak hour, unless otherwise noted.
- ☑ Provide volume counts in each traveled direction and provide volume to capacity analysis and Peak Hour Trip Impact information on the corridors segment(s) to comply with CCC 40.350.020.
- ☑ Provide traffic counts and analyze the intersections to comply with CCC 40.350.020.
- ☑ The applicant shall be responsible for mitigations necessary for any safety issue that is exacerbated by the proposed development.
- ☑ A signal warrant analysis shall be performed on any regionally significant unsignalized intersection within the concurrency study area that is determined to have a LOS E with, or without the proposed development of each parcel. Any signal warrant analysis shall be performed in compliance with the guidance found in the MUTCD.
- ☑ Traffic Impact Fees (TIF) will be assessed at the time of building permit, or at site plan approval when no building permit is required for the development.
- ☑ NW 11th Avenue is classified as an arterial roadway. Per 40.350.030(4)(d)(3) a raised median shall be required along the site frontage if access is allowed. This raised median will help to preserve roadway capacity, promote safety, and restrict cross traffic movements. If the applicant proposes to retain an access location onto NW 11th Avenue, justification for full-movement access will be required. This analysis shall be done by a traffic engineer.
- ☑ The volume-to-capacity ratio for some segments of the regionally significant corridors within the study radius may exceed the 0.9 threshold in the buildout year using the prescriptive method as outlined in CCC 40.350.020(G)(1)(a). If it is found that the volume-to-capacity ratio exceeds 0.9, the applicant may choose to mitigate per CCC 40.350.030(B)(6) or the traffic study may include discussion and/or calculations for the volume-to-capacity ratio using the methodology as outlined in the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM).