1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7	GROWTH MANAGEMENT HEARINGS BOARD WESTERN WASHINGTON REGION			
8	STATE OF WASHINGTON			
9	FRIENDS OF CLARK COUNTY &			
10	FUTUREWISE,	Case No.:		
11	Petitioners,			
12	V.	FRIENDS OF CLARK COUNTY'S & FUTUREWISE'S PETITION FOR		
13	CLARK COUNTY,	REVIEW COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND		
14	Respondent.	DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS UPDATE		
15				
16	COMES NOW Petitioners Futurewise and Friends of Clark County to submit this			
17	Petition for Review to the Growth Management Hearings Board as authorized by Chapter			
18	36.70A RCW.			
19	I. PETITIONER			
20				
21				
22	whose mailing address is:			
23	Friends of Clark County PO Box 513			
24	Vancouver, Washington 98666 Email: info@friendsofclarkcounty.org			
25	Telephone: 360 887-7880			
26				

1	2. Petitioner Futurewise is a Washington State nonprofit corporation whose mailing			
2	address is:			
3	Futurewise			
4	816 Second Avenue, Suite 200			
5	Seattle, Washington 98104 Email: tim@futurewise.org			
6	Telephone: 206 343-0681 Ext. 118			
7	3. For purposes of this action all correspondence shall be served upon the following			
8	attorney for the Petitioners:			
9	Tim Trohimovich, Director of Planning and Law			
10	Futurewise 816 Second Avenue, Suite 200			
11	Seattle, Washington 98104			
12	Telephone: 206 343-0681 Ext. 118 Email: tim@futurewise.org			
13	II. ACTION FOR WHICH REVIEW IS SOUGHT			
	ii. ACTION FOR WHICH REVIEW IS SOUGHT			
14	1. On June 28, 2016, the Board of County Councilors for Clark County, Washington			
15 16	enacted Amended Ordinance No. 2016-06-12 adopting an updated Growth Management			
17	Comprehensive Land Use Plan, zoning maps, and certain development regulations. A true,			
18	correct, and complete copy of Ordinance No. 2016-06-12 with its exhibits is in Tab 2016-06-12			
19	attached to this petition for review.			
20	2. Clark County reports that on June 29, 2016, the County issued a notice of			
21	adoption of the comprehensive plan and development regulation update approved by Amended			
22	Ordinance 2016-06-12.			
23	III. ISSUES PRESENTED FOR REVIEW			
24				
25	1. Did the adoption of Amended Ordinance 2016-06-12 expanding the Battleground, La Center,			
26	and Ridgefield urban growth areas violate RCW 36.70A.020(1), (2); RCW 36.70A.070			

(internal consistency); RCW 36.70A.110(1), (2), (3); RCW 36.70A.115; RCW
36.70A.130(1), (3), (5); RCW 36.70A.210(1); or RCW 36.70A.215(1)(b) because the
expansions were not needed to accommodate the planned growth and reasonable measures
were not adopted and implemented? See Amended Ordinance 2016-06-12 and Exhibit 1
Clark County, Washington 20 Year Comprehensive Growth Management Plan 2015-2035
pp. 11 –13, pp. 14 – 15, pp. 26 – 29, pp. 41 – 46, pp. 267 – 68, Figure 12, Figure 14, Figure
15, and Figure 24A; Exhibit 2 County/UGA Comprehensive Plan Clark County, Washington
[map]; and Exhibit 3 County/UGA Zoning Clark County, Washington [map].

- Did the adoption of Amended Ordinance 2016-06-12, including the de-designation of 57 acres of agricultural land of long-term commercial significance in the La Center urban growth area expansion and 111 acres in the Ridgefield urban growth area expansion, violate RCW 36.70A.020(8); RCW 36.70A.030(2), (10); RCW 36.70A.050(3); RCW 36.70A.060(1)(a); RCW 36.70A.070 (internal consistency); RCW 36.70A.130(1), (3), (5); RCW 36.70A.170; RCW 36.70A.210(1); WAC 365-190-040(10)(b); or WAC 365-190-050 or is the de-designation inconsistent with the Clark County comprehensive plan? See Amended Ordinance 2016-06-12 and Exhibit 1 *Clark County, Washington 20 Year Comprehensive Growth Management Plan 2015-2035* pp. 10 12, pp. 14 15, pp. 43 44, pp. 84 86, pp. 94 95, Figure 14, Figure 15, Figure 22A, Figure 22B, and Figure 24A; Exhibit 2 County/UGA Comprehensive Plan Clark County, Washington [map]; and Exhibit 3 County/UGA Zoning Clark County, Washington [map].
- 3. Did Amended Ordinance 2016-06-12's amendments to the comprehensive plan including the land use, rural, and capital facility plan elements, amendments to the Agriculture 20 (AG-20) District to create the Agriculture 10 (AG-10) District, amendments to the Forest 40 (FR-40)

4. Did Amended Ordinance 2016-06-12's adoption of a single "Rural," comprehensive plan designation, excluding limited areas of more intense rural development and similar categories, in the land use and rural elements and on Exhibit 2 the "County/UGA Comprehensive Plan Clark County, Washington" map, the county's future land use map, violate RCW 36.70A.020(2), (9), (10); RCW 36.70A.070 (preamble), (1), (5); or RCW 36.70A.130(1), (5) because the rural element fails to provide for a variety of rural densities and rural uses? See Amended Ordinance 2016-06-12 and Exhibit 1 Clark County, Washington 20 Year Comprehensive Growth Management Plan 2015-2035 p. 10, pp. 14 –

- 16, p. 31, pp. 36 45, Chapter 3 Rural and Natural Resource Element, and Figure 24A; and Exhibit 2 County/UGA Comprehensive Plan Clark County, Washington [map].
- 5. Did Amended Ordinance 2016-06-12's adoption of the Urban Reserve Overlay and the Urban Reserve-10 (UR-10) and Urban Reserve-20 (UR-20) zoning districts, the repeal of the Urban Reserve-40 (UR-40) zoning district, and the application of the overlay and districts to rural and natural resource lands violate RCW 36.70A.020(2), (8), (10); RCW 36.70A.040(3); RCW 36.70A.050(3); RCW 36.70A.060(1)(a); RCW 36.70A.070 (preamble), (1), (5); RCW 36.70A.110(1); RCW 36.70A.115; RCW 36.70A.130(1), (3), (5); or WAC 365-196-815 because the land is not needed to accommodate planned urban growth and the overlay and zoning does not conserve natural resource lands or comply with the requirements for rural areas? See Amended Ordinance 2016-06-12 and Exhibit 1 *Clark County, Washington 20 Year Comprehensive Growth Management Plan 2015-2035* pp. 12 13, pp. 36 38, pp. 96 97, p. 192, p. 228, p. 239, p. 265, p. 276, Figures 12 18, Figure 24A; Exhibit 2 County/UGA Comprehensive Plan Clark County, Washington [map]; and Exhibit 3 County/UGA Zoning Clark County, Washington [map]; Exhibit 5; Exhibit 6; Exhibit 8; and Exhibit 23.
- 6. Did Amended Ordinance 2016-06-12's adoption of the transportation element, including an admitted deficit of \$158,104,000 for the 20-year transportation facility plan, violate RCW 36.70A.020(3), (12); RCW 36.70A.070 (preamble), (1), (6); or RCW 36.70A.130(1), (3), (5)? See Amended Ordinance 2016-06-12 and Exhibit 1 *Clark County, Washington 20 Year Comprehensive Growth Management Plan 2015-2035* Chapter 5 Transportation, Appendix A

¹ Exhibit 1 *Clark County, Washington 20 Year Comprehensive Growth Management Plan 2015-2035* Chapter 5 Transportation p. 160. Petitioners allege the deficit is larger than this figure from Chapter 5 Transportation.



Transportation Issues, Appendix E Capital Facility Plans Review, Appendix G: Capital
Facilities Financial Plan, and Figure 24A; Exhibit 2 County/UGA Comprehensive Plan Clark
County, Washington [map]; and Exhibit 3 County/UGA Zoning Clark County, Washington
[map].

- 7. Did Amended Ordinance 2016-06-12's adoption of the capital facilities plan element violate RCW 36.70A.020(1), (12); RCW 36.70A.070 (preamble), (1), (3); or RCW 36.70A.130(1), (3), (5) because it does not comply with the requirements for capital facility plan elements? See Amended Ordinance 2016-06-12 and Exhibit 1 *Clark County, Washington 20 Year Comprehensive Growth Management Plan 2015-2035* Chapter 6 Capital Facilities and Utilities Element, Appendix E Capital Facility Plans Review and Analysis, Appendix G: Capital Facilities Financial Plan, and Figure 24A; Exhibit 2 County/UGA Comprehensive Plan Clark County, Washington [map]; and Exhibit 3 County/UGA Zoning Clark County, Washington [map].
- 8. Did Amended Ordinance 2016-06-12's adoption of the comprehensive plan's Chapter 4 Environmental Element and the failure to review and if necessary revise Subtitle 40.4 Clark County Code (CCC), Critical Areas and Shorelines, violate RCW 36.70A.020(9), (10); RCW 36.70A.040(3); RCW 36.70A.050(3); RCW 36.70A.060(2), (3); RCW 36.70A.130(1), (5), (7); RCW 36.70A.170; RCW 36.70A.172(1); WAC 365-190-080; WAC 365-190-090; WAC 365-190-100; WAC 365-190-110; WAC 365-190-120; WAC 365-190-130; Chapter 365-195 WAC; WAC 365-196-485; or WAC 365-196-830 because they fail to adequately designate and protect critical areas. See Amended Ordinance 2016-06-12 and Exhibit 1 *Clark County, Washington 20 Year Comprehensive Growth Management Plan 2015-2035* Chapter 4 Environmental Element and Figures 7 and 8.



- 9. Did the adoption of Amended Ordinance 2016-06-12 violate RCW 36.70A.367(6) and RCW 36.70A.130(1)(d) because the industrial land banks were designated after the deadline in RCW 36.70A.367(6) and RCW 36.70A.130(4)? See Amended Ordinance 2016-06-12 and Exhibit 1 *Clark County, Washington 20 Year Comprehensive Growth Management Plan 2015-2035* p. 31, pp. 36 37, p. 97, p. 228, p. 402, and Figure 24A; Exhibit 2 County/UGA Comprehensive Plan Clark County, Washington [map]; and Exhibit 3 County/UGA Zoning Clark County, Washington [map].
- 10. Did the adoption of Amended Ordinance 2016-06-12 violate RCW 36.70A.020(8); RCW 36.70A.030(2), (10); RCW 36.70A.050(3); RCW 36.70A.060(1)(a); RCW 36.70A.070 (internal consistency); RCW 36.70A.130(1), (5); RCW 36.70A.170; WAC 365-190-040(10)(b); WAC 365-190-050; or is the ordinance inconsistent the Clark County comprehensive plan because it de-designated approximately 602.4 acres of agricultural lands of long-term commercial significance? See Amended Ordinance 2016-06-12 and Exhibit 1 *Clark County, Washington 20 Year Comprehensive Growth Management Plan 2015-2035* pp. 10 12, pp. 14 15, p. 31, pp. 36 37, pp. 43 44, pp. 84 86, pp. 94 95, p. 97, p. 228, p. 402, Figure 22A, Figure 22B, and Figure 24A; Exhibit 2 County/UGA Comprehensive Plan Clark County, Washington [map]; and Exhibit 3 County/UGA Zoning Clark County, Washington [map].
- 11. Did the adoption of Amended Ordinance 2016-06-12 violate RCW 36.70A.130(1), (3), (5); RCW 36.70A.210(2), (3); the applicable provisions of RCW 36.70A.365(2); or RCW 36.70A.367(1), (2), (3), (4), (7) by failing to comply with the procedural and substantive requirements for industrial land banks? See Amended Ordinance 2016-06-12 and Exhibit 1 *Clark County, Washington 20 Year Comprehensive Growth Management Plan 2015-2035* p.



- 31, pp. 36 37, p. 97, p. 228, p. 402, Figure 24A; Exhibit 2 County/UGA Comprehensive Plan Clark County, Washington [map]; and Exhibit 3 County/UGA Zoning Clark County, Washington [map].
- 12. Does the annexation of land within an urban growth area expansion under appeal violate RCW 36.70A.020(1), (2), (8); RCW 36.70A.060(1)(a); RCW 36.70A.070 (internal consistency), (1); RCW 36.70A.110; RCW 36.70A.115; RCW 36.70A.130(1), (3), (5); RCW 36.70A.170; RCW 36.70A.215(1), (2), (3), (4); or any other applicable provision of state law? See Amended Ordinance 2016-06-12 and Exhibit 1 *Clark County, Washington 20 Year Comprehensive Growth Management Plan 2015-2035* pp. 11 –13, pp. 14 15, pp. 26 29, pp. 41 46, pp. 267 68, and Figure 24A; Exhibit 2 County/UGA Comprehensive Plan Clark County, Washington [map]; and Exhibit 3 County/UGA Zoning Clark County, Washington [map].

IV. STANDING

1. Petitioner Friends of Clark County is a Washington State non-profit corporation that works with community partners and policy makers to keep Clark County a beautiful and healthy place to live, work, and play. The organization has members and supporters that are landowners and residents of Clark County and who are aggrieved and adversely affected by the County's adoption of Amended Ordinance 2016-06-12 and the matters at issue in this petition. Friends of Clark County staff and its supporters and members participated in the public process writing emails, letters, and testifying at public hearings concerning all matters at issue in this petition. The Friends of Clark County therefore assert that, in addition to other forms of standing, it has participation standing to challenge the actions at issue pursuant to RCW 36.70A.280.

19

18

20 21

22 23

25

26

24

2. Petitioner Futurewise is a Washington State non-profit corporation and a statewide organization devoted to ensuring compliance with the Growth Management Act (GMA). The organization has members and supporters that are landowners and residents of Clark County and who are aggrieved and adversely affected by the County's adoption of Amended Ordinance 2016-06-12 and the matters at issue in this petition. Futurewise staff and its supporters and members participated in the public process writing emails, letters, and testifying at public hearings concerning all matters at issue in this petition. Futurewise therefore asserts that, in addition to other forms of standing, it has participation standing to challenge the actions at issue pursuant to RCW 36.70A.280.

\mathbf{V} . ESTIMATED LENGTH OF HEARING

The Petitioners estimate that the Hearing on the Merits for this matter will last one day.

VI. **RELIEF SOUGHT**

- 1. The Friends of Clark County and Futurewise respectfully request that the Board find that Amended Ordinance 2016-06-12 violates the goals and requirements of the Growth Management Act.
- 2. The Friends of Clark County and Futurewise respectfully request that the Board issue a Final Decision and Order directing the County to properly review and revised its comprehensive plan and development regulations and to remand the matter back to Clark County for action consistent with the Growth Management Act.
- 3. The Friends of Clark County and Futurewise request that the Board make a determination of invalidity for the comprehensive plan and development regulations on the grounds that the challenged provisions substantially interfere with the fulfillment of the goals of the Growth Management Act.



	1	
	2	
	3	
	4	
	5	
	6	
	7	
	8	
	9	
1	0	
1	1	
1	2	
1	3	
1	4	
1	5	
1	6	
1	7	
	8	
1	9	
2	0	
2	1	
2	2	
2	3	
	4	
2	5	

4. In addition, the Friends of Clark County and Futurewise request that the Board conclude that any annexation of the urban growth area expansions challenged in this appeal violated state law and must be remedied.

The Petitioners, the Friends of Clark County and Futurewise, have read this Petition for Review and believe the contents to be true.

DATED this 22nd day of July, 2016, and respectfully submitted,



Tim Trohimovich, WSBA No. 22367 Attorney for Petitioners Futurewise and Friends of Clark County

1	VII. DECLARATION OF SERVICE			
2 3 4	I, Tim Trohimovich, declare under penalty of perjury and the laws of the State of Washington that, on July 22, 2016, I caused the following document to be served on the persons listed below in the manner shown: The Friends of Clark County's and Futurewise's Petition for Review and attachment.			
5 6 7 8 9	Growth Management Hearings Board PO Box 40953 Clark County Auditor P.O. Box 5000 Tel: 360-664-9170 Original and three copies X By United States Mail, postage prepaid and properly addressed By Legal Messenger or Hand Delivery The Honorable Greg Kimsey Clark County Auditor P.O. Box 5000 Vancouver, WA 98666-5000 X By United States Mail, postage prepaid and properly addressed By Legal Messenger or Hand Delivery			
10 11 12	By Facsimile By Federal Express or Overnight Mail prepaid X By Email: western@eluho.wa.gov By Facsimile By Federal Express or Overnight Mail prepaid By Facsimile By Federal Express or Overnight Mail prepaid By Email: auditor@clark.wa.gov			
13 14 15 16	Ms. Christine M. Cook Sr. Deputy Prosecuting Attorney Clark County Prosecuting Attorney's Office Civil Division P.O. Box 5000 Vancouver, WA 98666-5000 Tel. 360-397-2478 Attorneys for Clark County			
17 18 19 20 21 22	X By United States Mail, postage prepaid and properly addressed By Legal Messenger or Hand Delivery By Facsimile By Federal Express or Overnight Mail prepaid X By Email: Christine.Cook@clark.wa.gov By United States Mail, postage prepaid and properly addressed By Legal Messenger or Hand Delivery By Facsimile By Federal Express or Overnight Mail prepaid By Federal Express or Overnight Mail prepaid By Federal Express or Overnight Mail prepaid By Email:			
23 24 25 26	Tim Trohimovich			

