

CLARK COUNTY RURAL INDUSTRIAL LAND BANK

**Programmatic Environmental Review pursuant to RCW
36.70A.367 (2)(b), and**

**Addendum to the Clark County Comprehensive Growth
Management Plan Final Environmental Impact Statement May
4, 2007**

Prepared by:

BERK Consulting, in conjunction with:
Anchor QEA, LLC
Cairncross & Hempelman
MacKay Sposito
Kittelson & Associates Inc.

Prepared for:



Clark County Community Planning

October 2015

ADDENDUM OVERVIEW AND PURPOSE

PROPOSAL

Clark County is considering the establishment of a rural industrial land bank (RILB) as provided in the Growth Management Act (GMA; RCW 36.70A.367). Clark County received an application to establish the RILB on two properties that front SR-503 north of the Vancouver urban growth area (UGA): Ackerland property west of 117th Avenue, 223.72 acres and Lagler property east of 117th Avenue, 378.71 acres.

Designation of the RILB would allow large properties in rural areas to accommodate light industrial and manufacturing businesses, and limited commercial uses. Future development would need to be master planned and demonstrate consistency with the Clark County Comprehensive Plan, the Light Industrial Zone, and development standards requiring a perimeter landscaped buffer, water quality and air quality standards, critical areas regulations, stormwater standards, and adequate roadway, water, sewer, power and other infrastructure.

The Clark County Comprehensive Plan identifies the subject areas as agricultural lands of long-term commercial significance. Portions of the properties are identified as Railroad Industrial Reserve or Industrial Reserve. As part of designating the RILB, the properties would be de-designated from agricultural lands of long-term commercial significance, designated as a RILB, and rezoned as Light Industrial (IL).

Based on the requirements of GMA, alternative locations for the RILB have been considered. An inventory identified five sites – one site in the Vancouver Urban Growth Area (UGA) and four non-UGA sites including the docket site for analysis as alternative sites:

- Site 1 is the subject docket site north of the Vancouver UGA straddling SR 503.
- Site 2 is adjacent to and north of the Ridgefield UGA along I-5.
- Site 3 lies between the Vancouver and Ridgefield UGAs along I-5 at SR 502.
- Site 4 is adjacent eastward of the Vancouver city limits.
- Site 5 consists of the Section 30 subarea plan site in eastern Vancouver city limits.

All sites were considered for industrial or employment center purposes in the Clark County 2007 Comprehensive Plan Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The City of Vancouver led a subarea plan for Section 30 and development agreements were prepared in 2009. Environmental review was conducted with the subarea plan and also has occurred as developments have been proposed.

PURPOSE OF ADDENDUM

Clark County has prepared this Addendum in order to evaluate and disclose potential environmental impacts and mitigating measures associated with the Proposal. The Addendum is a companion document to the analysis contained in the following EIS:

- Clark County Comprehensive Growth Management Plan Final EIS, May 2007

This Addendum builds on the analysis contained in the prior EIS, but does not significantly change the analysis, nor identify new or significantly different impacts. This addendum to the 2007 EIS is in the form of a programmatic environmental review consistent with the GMA at RCW 36.70A.367 (2)(b). The Addendum analysis indicates that the Revised Proposal will result in similar impacts as alternatives

studied in the prior EIS. Because the Proposal contains a master concept plan and development regulations designed to assure compliance with the County code to reduce potential impacts to the natural and built environment, no new impacts beyond those studied previously are anticipated.

ADDENDUM CONTENTS

In accordance with the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Rules (WAC 197-11) an addendum may be issued for any SEPA document, and there is no set format.

RCW 36.70A.367 (2) requires that the environmental review for amendment of the comprehensive plan be at the programmatic level. In addition to a threshold determination, the programmatic environmental review must include:

1. An inventory of developable land as provided in RCW 36.70A.365; and
2. An analysis of the availability of alternative sites within UGAs and the long-term annexation feasibility of sites outside of UGAs (RCW 37.70A.367(2)(b)).

This Addendum includes this Addendum Overview and Purpose plus the following documents:

Part I. Inventory

Part II. Alternative Sites Analysis

Part III. Appendices

Appendix A: Conceptual Plans, including Master Plan Objectives and Perimeter Setback Cross Sections

Appendix B: Agricultural De-Designation Analysis

Appendix C: Critical Areas Reports for Docket and Alternative Sites

Appendix D: Docket Application Checklist

Appendix E: Utilities Analysis, Docket Site

Appendix F: Transportation Analysis, Docket Site

Appendix G: 2007 EIS Summary Excerpt

ADDENDUM DISTRIBUTION AND AVAILABILITY

The Determination of Significance and Notice of Adoption, together with this addendum is available at: <http://www.clark.wa.gov/planning/landbank/>.

Notice of new documents posted to the website has been provide to interested persons who have elected to sign up for notices at the above link.

Consistent with SEPA Rules, the County will circulate the Addendum to recipients of the Final EIS together with the Determination of Significance and Adoption of Existing Environmental Document prior to the County's decision on the proposal.

COMMENTS

Comments on the addendum will be taken for 14 days after the date of issuance of this notice (October 21, 2015). Comments may be sent as follows:

- Post a comment online: [Engage Clark County](#)
- Send us an email at: commplanning@clark.wa.gov
- Mail your comments:
Clark County Community Planning
Attn: Rural Industrial Land Bank
P.O. Box 9810, Vancouver, WA 98666-9810

APPEALS

SEPA appeals shall be filed in writing with the Board of County Councilors within fourteen (14) calendar days of the close of the comment period (November 4, 2015). Any SEPA appeal shall be decided by the Board in conjunction with its decision on the underlying recommendation.