



SEPA Determination of non-significance and associated documents

Click on the text below to quickly access that section of the document. Please note that there is no back button in the PDF to return to this page. You will need to scroll back to return.

Contents

Determination of non-significance.....	2
SEPA checklist.....	3
SEPA comments.....	24
SEPA email notification.....	28
SEPA newspaper notice.....	30



STATE ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT

DETERMINATION OF NON-SIGNIFICANCE

Description of Proposal: *Adoption of amendment to the Clark County Shoreline Master Program (SMP) based on the Department of Ecology Periodic Review SMP guidelines.*

Proponent: *Clark County Community Planning*

Location of proposal, including street address, if any: *Clark County, Washington*

Lead Agency: *Clark County, Washington*

The lead agency for this proposal has determined that it does not have a probable significant adverse impact on the environment. An environmental impact statement (EIS) is not required under RCW 43.21C.030(2)(c). This decision was made after review of a completed environmental checklist and other information on file with the lead agency. This information is available to the public on request.

This DNS is issued under WAC 197-11-340(2); the lead agency will not act on this proposal for 14 days from the date below.

Comments must be submitted by: February 27, 2020

Responsible Official: Oliver Orjiako
Position/title: Director
Address: **RE: SEPA Comments**
 Clark County Community Planning
 1300 Franklin Street; 3rd Floor
 P.O. Box 9810
 Vancouver, WA 98666-9810
 564-397-4112
oliver.orjiako@clark.wa.gov

Date: 1-21-20 **Signature:** Oliver Orjiako

The staff contact person, e-mail address, and telephone number for any questions on this review is Jenna Kay, Planner II, jenna.kay@clark.wa.gov, (564) 397-4968.

For other formats, contact the Clark County ADA Office at ADA@clark.wa.gov.



**Clark County SEPA Environmental Checklist
Washington Administrative Code (WAC) 197-11-960**

A. BACKGROUND

1. Name of proposed project, if applicable:

CPZ2019-00030 Clark County Shoreline Master Program Periodic Review

2. Name of applicant:

Clark County

3. Address and phone number of applicant and contact person.

*Oliver Orjako; Director
Clark County Community Planning
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666-9810
(360) 397- 4112*

4. Date checklist prepared:

January 21, 2020

5. Agency requesting checklist:

Clark County, WA

6. Proposed timing or schedule (including phasing, if applicable):

If approved by the Clark County Council, the Clark County Shoreline Master Program (SMP) Periodic Review amendment will go to the Department of Ecology (Ecology) for formal review. The proposed amendment to the SMP would become effective 14-days after Ecology approves it, expected sometime in 2020.

7. Do you have any plans for future additions, expansion, or further activity related to or connected with this proposal? If yes, explain.

No, this is a non-project action. See #9 below. The Shoreline Management Act requires that SMPs be reviewed at least every eight (8) years (RCW 90.58.080(4)). Minor amendments may need to be made once the proposed SMP amendment becomes effective.

8. List any environmental information you know about that has been prepared, or will be prepared, directly related to this proposal.

The Inventory and Characterization Report (ICR) was prepared for the 2012 SMP update and describes baseline conditions and shoreline ecological functions for all lakes, rivers, and creeks in the county that are subject to shoreline jurisdiction. Reach breaks were established based on the ICR, as were proposed shoreline designations. The ICR was also the basis for the 2012 cumulative impacts assessment and no net loss report. Given the scope of work of this SMP Periodic Review project, and pursuant to the Department of Ecology guidelines, the ICR, was not updated as part of this project and is still considered to be the current resource for baseline data.

9. Do you know whether applications are pending for governmental approvals of other proposals directly affecting the property covered by your proposal? If yes, explain.

There are two projects in Clark County that are in progress that relate to shoreline jurisdiction and the SMP Periodic Review.

First, there is the 2019 bi-annual code amendments. This project is a batch of proposed changes to the Clark County Code. Included in the proposal are amendments to Clark County Code 40.410 Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas (CARAs). The Clark County Council is scheduled to make a decision on the proposal in early 2020. Should the CARA amendment be adopted, staff will recommend that the SMP Periodic Review amendment proposal include reference to this amended critical areas ordinance. The current SMP Periodic Review proposal includes a noted placeholder to show where/how that ordinance would be incorporated into this project.

Second, the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) is in the process of updating the flood insurance rate maps (FIRMs) for much of Clark County. This current effort addresses the areas of the county that fell outside of the previously studied watershed boundary (Lower Columbia – Sandy HUC-8 watershed, which was updated in 2018). The exact timeline of when this project will be complete is uncertain. Should the updated maps be available before the end of the SMP Periodic Review process, then staff will recommend that the SMP incorporate the updated flood hazard maps. Should the mapping be completed after the SMP Periodic Review process, then a SMP (and flood hazard code) amendment will be proposed at a future time.

10. List any government approvals or permits that will be needed for your proposal, if known.

The Department of Ecology will conduct a formal review of the Shoreline Master Program Periodic Review amendment once adopted by the County Council.

11. Give brief, complete description of your proposal, including the proposed uses and the size of the project and site. There are several questions later in this checklist that ask you to describe certain aspects of your proposal. You do not need to repeat those answers on this page. (Lead agencies may modify this form to include additional specific information on project description.)

This proposal is a non-project action to amend the Clark County Shoreline Master Program (SMP) so that it is 1) consistent with the Shoreline Management Act and Department of Ecology guidelines, 2) consistent with the county comprehensive plan and development regulations adopted under chapter 36.70A RCW, and 3) incorporates other new information or changed circumstances. Amendments are proposed to the Comprehensive Plan, Clark County Code chapter 40.460, and to the shoreline map.

- *Proposed changes to the shoreline map would:*
 - *Incorporate revised flood maps (that took effect Jan. 19, 2018) for the Washougal River, Little Washougal River, and along the Columbia River from roughly the City of Washougal eastward to Skamania County*
 - *Correct the shoreline jurisdiction boundary to incorporate the full extent of the floodplain near Lacamas Lake*
 - *Remove some wetlands near Shanghai Creek not in shoreline jurisdiction, but currently included on the shoreline map*
 - *Add Carty Lake which is currently missing from the shoreline map, but in shoreline jurisdiction*
 - *Refine the shoreline map near the confluence of the Lewis and Columbia Rivers*
 - *Update the shoreline map to incorporate the current Dept. of Natural Resources water feature layer*
- *Proposed changes to the development code would update the code text related to the following topics:*
 - *Critical areas*
 - *Floating homes and on-water residences*
 - *Freshwater docks*
 - *Public boat ramps*
 - *Shift in the Ordinary High Water Mark due to restoration*
 - *Scrivener errors*
- *Proposed changes to the Comprehensive Plan would:*
 - *Update the introductory/background text and fix scrivener errors in the Shoreline Master Program chapter (Ch. 13)*
 - *Add the shoreline map to Appendix B – Figures*

- *Update the comprehensive plan legislative history in Appendix H*

12. Location of the proposal.

The proposal addresses shorelines of the state within Clark County that are subject to shoreline jurisdiction as defined by RCW 90.58. There are shorelines meeting this definition throughout Clark County, WA.

B. ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENTS

1. Earth

- a. General description of the site: flat, rolling, hilly, steep slopes, mountainous, other.**

The SMP will apply to all shorelines in Clark County jurisdiction, which include areas containing steep slopes and unstable soils.

- b. What is the steepest slope on the site (approximate percent slope)?**

Steep slopes in excess of 40% exist in county shoreline jurisdiction.

- c. What general types of soils are found on the site (for example, clay, sand, gravel, peat, muck)? If you know the classification of agricultural soils, specify them and note any agricultural land of long-term commercial significance and whether the proposal results in removing any of these soils.**

This is a non-project action. Specific soil types will be determined during the shoreline review process for any future development proposal. Generally, soils in Clark County are of the Sauvie-Puyallup, Hillsboro-Gee-Odne, Hillsboro-Dollar-Cove, Lauren-Sifton-Wind River, Cinebar-Yacolt, Olympic-Kinney, Hesson-Olequa, and Hesson-Olympic associations. They range from fine to coarse and from poorly- to well-drained. There are agricultural soils and agricultural land of long-term significance within county shoreline jurisdiction.

- d. Are there surface indications or history of unstable soils in the immediate vicinity? If so, describe.**

This is a non-project action. Specific soil types and their characteristics will be determined during the shoreline review process. Generally, there are unstable soils within shoreline jurisdiction in the county.

- e. Describe the purpose, type, total area, and approximate quantities, and total affected area of any filling or grading proposed. Indicate source of fill.**

This is a non-project action. No development is anticipated as part of this proposal. Fill and grading impacts will be determined during the shoreline review process for any future development projects.

- f. Could erosion occur as a result of clearing, construction, or use? If so, generally describe.**

This is a non-project action. No development is anticipated as part of this proposal. Erosion impacts will be determined during the shoreline review process for specific projects.

- g. About what percent of the site will be covered with impervious surfaces after project construction (for example, asphalt or buildings)?**

This is a non-project action and no development is anticipated as part of this proposal. Impervious surface impacts will be determined during the shoreline review process for specific projects.

- h. Proposed measures to reduce or control erosion, or other impacts to the earth, if any:**

This is a non-project action. Site-specific measures and any mitigation measures will be developed during the shoreline review process for specific projects, if needed.

2. Air

- a. What types of emissions to the air would result from the proposal (i.e., dust, automobile, odors, industrial wood smoke) during construction, operation, and maintenance when the project is completed? If any, generally describe and give approximate quantities if known.**

This is a non-project action. Development projects within shoreline jurisdiction will require a shoreline review.

- b. Are there any off-site sources of emissions or odor that may affect your proposal? If so, generally describe.**

This is a non-project action. Development projects within shoreline jurisdiction will require a shoreline review.

- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control emissions or other impacts to air, if any:**

This is a non-project action. Site-specific measures and any mitigation measures will be developed during the shoreline review process, if needed.

3. Water

a. Surface:

- 1) Is there any surface water body on or in the immediate vicinity of the site (including year-round and seasonal streams, saltwater, lakes, ponds, wetlands)? If yes, describe type and provide names. If appropriate, state what stream or river it flows into.**

The proposal includes shorelines of the state within Clark County that are subject to shoreline jurisdiction as defined by RCW 90.58. Shorelines of the state include the associated waters.

- 2) Will the project require any work over, in, or adjacent to (within 200 feet) the described water? If yes, please describe and attach available plans.**

This is a non-project action. Development projects within shoreline jurisdiction will require a shoreline review.

- 3) Estimate the amount of fill and dredge material that would be placed in or removed from surface water or wetlands and indicate the area of the site that would be affected. Indicate the source of fill material.**

This is a non-project action. Development projects within shoreline jurisdiction will require a shoreline review.

- 4) Will the proposal require surface water withdrawals or diversions? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known.**

This is a non-project action. Development projects within shoreline jurisdiction will require a shoreline review.

- 5) Does the proposal lie within a 100-year flood plain? If so, note location on the site plan.**

Clark County shoreline jurisdiction includes the 100-year floodplain for shorelines of the state.

- 6) Does the proposal involve any discharges of waste materials to surface waters? If so, describe the type of waste and anticipated volume of discharge.**

This is a non-project action. Development projects within shoreline jurisdiction will require a shoreline review.

b. Ground Water:

- 1) **Will ground water be withdrawn from a well for drinking water or other purposes? If so, give a general description of the well, proposed uses and approximate quantities withdrawn from the well. Will water be discharged to groundwater? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known .**

This is a non-project action. Development projects within shoreline jurisdiction will require a shoreline review.

- 2) **Describe waste material that will be discharged into the ground from septic tanks or other sources, if any. Describe the general size of the system, the number of such systems, the number of houses to be served (if applicable), or the number of animals or humans the system(s) are expected to serve.**

This is a non-project action. Development projects within shoreline jurisdiction will require a shoreline review.

c. Water Runoff (including storm water):

- 1) **Describe the source of runoff (including storm water) and method of collection and disposal, if any (include quantities, if known). Where will this water flow? Will this water flow into other waters? If so, describe.**

This is a non-project action. Development projects within shoreline jurisdiction will require a shoreline review.

- 2) **Could waste materials enter ground or surface waters? If so, generally describe.**

This is a non-project action. Development projects within shoreline jurisdiction will require a shoreline review.

- 3) **Does the proposal alter or otherwise affect drainage patterns in the vicinity of the site? If so, describe.**

This is a non-project action. Development projects within shoreline jurisdiction will require a shoreline review.

d. Proposed measures to reduce or control surface, ground, and runoff water, and drainage pattern impacts, if any:

This is a non-project action. Site-specific measures and any mitigation measures will be developed during the shoreline review process, if needed.

4. Plants

a. Check or circle types of vegetation found on the site.

- deciduous tree: alder, maple, aspen, other
- evergreen tree: fir, cedar, pine, other
- shrubs
- grass
- pasture
- crop or grain
- orchards, vineyards or other permanent crops.
- wet soil plants: cattail, buttercup, bullrush, skunk cabbage, other
- water plants: water lily, eelgrass, milfoil, other
- other types of vegetation

b. What kind and amount of vegetation will be removed or altered?

This is a non-project action. Development projects within shoreline jurisdiction will require a shoreline review.

c. List threatened or endangered species known to be on or near the site.

This is a non-project action. Development projects within shoreline jurisdiction will require a shoreline review. Generally, there are threatened or endangered species in Clark County, including the federally listed Golden paintbrush, Water howelia and Bradshaw's desert parsley.

d. Proposed landscaping, use of native plants, or other measures to preserve or enhance vegetation on the site, if any;

This is a non-project action. Site-specific measures and any mitigation measures will be developed during the shoreline review process.

e. List all noxious weeds and invasive species known to be on or near the site.

Not applicable, this is a non-project action. Development projects within shoreline jurisdiction will require a shoreline review. Generally, there are noxious weeds and invasive species in Clark County, such as Eurasian water-milfoil, reed canary grass, Japanese knotweed and non-native blackberry species.

5. Animals

a. Circle any birds and animals which have been observed on or near the site or are known to be on or near the site:

birds: hawk, heron, eagle, songbirds
 mammals: deer, bear, elk, beaver, coyotes, nutria, mice and other small rodents
 fish: bass, salmon, trout, herring, shellfish

This is a non-project action. Development projects within shoreline jurisdiction will require a shoreline review that will identify any birds and animals which have been observed on or near any future specific development site. Generally, Clark County has many species of fish, birds and mammals.

b. List any threatened and endangered species known to be on or near the site.

This is a non-project action. Development projects within shoreline jurisdiction will require a shoreline review to identify any threatened or endangered species known to be on or near the site.

Generally, Clark County has the populations of the following federally listed threatened or endangered species:

Fish: Columbia River chum, Lower Columbia River coho, Chinook (Lower Columbia River, Snake River Fall, Snake River Spring/Summer, Upper Columbia River Spring, Upper Willamette River), Steelhead (Lower Columbia River, Upper Columbia River, Snake River Basin, Middle Columbia River, Upper Willamette River), Sockeye (Snake River Basin), Pacific eulachon, Green sturgeon southern DPS, and Bull trout.

Wildlife: Oregon spotted frog, Northern spotted owl, Streaked horned lark, Yellow billed cuckoo, Columbian white-tailed deer, Gray wolf, and Fisher.

The bald eagle is a federal species of concern in Clark County.

c. Is the site part of a migration route? If so, explain.

This is a non-project action. Development projects within shoreline jurisdiction will require a shoreline review. Generally, Clark County is located within the bird migration route known as the Pacific Flyway that extends from the Bering Sea in Alaska along the Pacific Seaboard to South America.

d. Proposed measures to preserve or enhance wildlife, if any:

This is a non-project action. Development projects within shoreline jurisdiction will require a shoreline review.

e. List any invasive animal species known to be on or near the site.

This is a non-project action. Development projects within shoreline jurisdiction will require a shoreline review. Generally, there are invasive animal species within Clark County.

6. Energy and Natural Resources

a. What kinds of energy (electric, natural gas, oil, wood stove, solar) will be used to meet the completed project's energy needs? Describe whether it will be used for heating, manufacturing, etc.

This is a non-project action. Development projects within shoreline jurisdiction will require a shoreline review.

b. Would your project affect the potential use of solar energy by adjacent properties? If so, generally describe.

This is a non-project action. Development projects within shoreline jurisdiction will require a shoreline review.

c. What kinds of energy conservation features are included in the plans of this proposal? List other proposed measures to reduce or control energy impacts, if any:

This is a non-project action. Site-specific measures and any mitigation measures will be developed during the shoreline review process, if needed.

7. Environmental Health

a. Are there any environmental health hazards, including exposure to toxic chemicals, risk of fire and explosion, spill, or hazardous waste, that could occur as a result of this proposal? If so, describe.

This is a non-project action. Development projects within shoreline jurisdiction will require a shoreline review.

1) Describe any known or possible contamination at the site from present or past uses.

This is a non-project action. Development projects within shoreline jurisdiction will require a shoreline review.

2) Describe existing hazardous chemicals/conditions that might affect project development and design. This includes underground hazardous liquid and gas transmission pipelines located within the project area and in the vicinity.

This is a non-project action. Development projects within shoreline jurisdiction will require a shoreline review.

- 3) Describe any toxic or hazardous chemicals that might be stored, used, or produced during the project's development or construction, or at any time during the operating life of the project.**

This is a non-project action. Development projects within shoreline jurisdiction will require a shoreline review.

- 4) Describe special emergency services that might be required.**

This is a non-project action. Development projects within shoreline jurisdiction will require a shoreline review.

- 5) Proposed measures to reduce or control environmental health hazards, if any:**

This is a non-project action. Site-specific measures and any mitigation measures will be developed during the shoreline review process, if needed.

b. Noise

- 1) What types of noise exist in the area which may affect your project (for example: traffic, equipment, operation, other)?**

This is a non-project action. Development projects within shoreline jurisdiction will require a shoreline review.

- 2) What types and levels of noise would be created by or associated with the project on a short-term or a long-term basis (for example: traffic, construction, operation, other)? Indicate what hours noise would come from the site.**

This is a non-project action. Development projects within shoreline jurisdiction will require a shoreline review.

- 3) Proposed measures to reduce or control noise impacts, if any:**

This is a non-project action. Site-specific measures and any mitigation measures will be developed during the shoreline review process, if needed.

8. Land and Shoreline Use

- a. **What is the current use of the site and adjacent properties? Will the proposal affect current land uses on nearby or adjacent properties? If so, describe.**

This is a non-project action. Shorelands accommodate a wide variety of uses.

- b. **Has the project site been used as working farmlands or working forest lands? If so, describe. How much agricultural or forest land of long-term commercial significance will be converted to other uses as a result of the proposal, if any? If resource lands have not been designated, how many acres in farmland or forest land tax status will be converted to nonfarm or nonforest use?**

This is a non-project action. Much of the land in shoreline jurisdiction has been and is being used for agricultural activities.

- 1) **Will the proposal affect or be affected by surrounding working farm or forest land normal business operations, such as oversize equipment access, the application of pesticides, tilling, and harvesting? If so, how:**

This is a non-project action. Development projects within shoreline jurisdiction will require a shoreline review.

- c. **Describe any structures on the site.**

This is a non-project action. There are a variety of existing structures within shoreline jurisdiction. Development projects within shoreline jurisdiction will require a shoreline review.

- d. **Will any structures be demolished? If so, what?**

This is a non-project action. Development projects within shoreline jurisdiction will require a shoreline review.

- e. **What is the current zoning classification of the site?**

The SMP covers shorelines of the state within Clark County. Shorelands outside of urban growth areas are zoned for rural and resource lands uses. Shorelands in urban growth areas are zoned for a variety of residential and commercial uses.

- f. **What is the current comprehensive plan designation of the site?**

The SMP covers shorelines of the state within Clark County. Shorelands outside of urban growth areas are designated for rural and resource land uses. Shorelands in urban growth areas are designated for a variety of residential and commercial uses.

g. If applicable, what is the current shoreline master program designation of the site?

Current Shoreline designations include aquatic, natural, rural conservancy-residential, rural conservancy-resource lands, urban conservancy, medium intensity, and high intensity.

h. Has any part of the site been classified as a critical area by the city or county? If so, specify.

This is a non-project action. There are critical areas within shoreline jurisdiction. Development projects within shoreline jurisdiction will require a shoreline review.

i. Approximately how many people would reside or work in the completed project?

This is a non-project action. Development projects within shoreline jurisdiction will require a shoreline review.

j. Approximately how many people would the completed project displace?

This is a non-project action. Development projects within shoreline jurisdiction will require a shoreline review.

k. Proposed measures to avoid or reduce displacement impacts, if any:

This is a non-project action. Site-specific measures and any mitigation measures will be developed during the shoreline review process, if needed.

l. Proposed measures to ensure the proposal is compatible with existing and projected land uses and plans, if any:

This is a non-project action. Site-specific measures and any mitigation measures will be developed during the shoreline review process, if needed.

m. Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts to agricultural and forest lands of long-term commercial significance, if any:

This is a non-project action. Site-specific measures and any mitigation measures will be developed during the shoreline review process, if needed.

9. Housing

a. Approximately how many units would be provided, if any? Indicate whether high, middle, or low-income housing.

This is a non-project action. Development projects within shoreline jurisdiction will require a shoreline review.

- b. Approximately how many units, if any, would be eliminated? Indicate whether high, middle, or low-income housing.**

This is a non-project action. Development projects within shoreline jurisdiction will require a shoreline review.

- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control housing impacts, if any:**

This is a non-project action. Site-specific measures and any mitigation measures will be developed during the shoreline review process, if needed.

10. Aesthetics

- a. What is the tallest height of any proposed structure(s), not including antennas; what is the principal exterior building material(s) proposed?**

This is a non-project action. Development projects within shoreline jurisdiction will require a shoreline review. This proposal does not amend the structure limits in the current SMP. The current SMP includes height limits for various types of structures. The tallest structures allowed in urban and rural areas within county jurisdiction is 45 feet. Over-water structures are limited to 15 feet. These heights are consistent with the Shoreline Management Act requirement of providing public access to shorelines, both physical and visual.

- b. What views in the immediate vicinity would be altered or obstructed?**

This is a non-project action. Development projects within shoreline jurisdiction will require a shoreline review.

- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control aesthetic impacts, if any:**

This is a non-project action. Site-specific measures and any mitigation measures will be developed during the shoreline review process, if needed.

11. Light and Glare

- a. What type of light or glare will the proposal produce? What time of day would it mainly occur?**

This is a non-project action. Development projects within shoreline jurisdiction will require a shoreline review.

- b. Could light or glare from the finished project be a safety hazard or interfere with views?**

This is a non-project action. Development projects within shoreline jurisdiction will require a shoreline review.

- c. What existing off-site sources of light or glare may affect your proposal?**
This is a non-project action. Development projects within shoreline jurisdiction will require a shoreline review.
- d. Proposed measures to reduce or control light and glare impacts, if any:**
This is a non-project action. Site-specific measures and any mitigation measures will be developed during the shoreline review process, if needed.

12. Recreation

- a. What designated and informal recreational opportunities are in the immediate vicinity?**
This is a non-project action. Development projects within shoreline jurisdiction will require a shoreline review. Generally, shorelines in the county are home to several state, county, and local parks and greenways, in addition to the Ridgefield and Steigerwald National Wildlife Refuges. There are also several boat launching facilities, both public and private, in the county. Access to the shorelines is a stated goal of the Shoreline Management Act. Adoption of the proposal will not impact current recreational opportunities.
- b. Would the proposed project displace any existing recreational uses? If so, describe.**
This is a non-project action. Development projects within shoreline jurisdiction will require a shoreline review.
- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts on recreation, including recreation opportunities to be provided by the project or applicant, if any:**
This is a non-project action. Site-specific measures and any mitigation measures will be developed during the shoreline review process, if needed.

13. Historic and Cultural Preservation

- a. Are there any buildings, structures, or sites, located on or near the site that are over 45 years old listed in or eligible for listing in national, state, or local preservation registers? If so, specifically describe.**
This is a non-project action. Development projects within shoreline jurisdiction will require a shoreline review. Generally, there are sites in the county listed on federal, state, and local inventories and registers.

- b. Are there any landmarks, features, or other evidence of Indian or historic use or occupation? This may include human burials or old cemeteries. Are there any material evidence, artifacts, or areas of cultural importance on or near the site? Please list any professional studies conducted at the site to identify such resources.**

This is a non-project action. Development projects within shoreline jurisdiction will require a shoreline review.

- c. Describe the methods used to assess the potential impacts to cultural and historic resources on or near the project site. Examples include consultation with tribes and the department of archeology and historic preservation, archaeological surveys, historic maps, GIS data, etc.**

This is a non-project action. Development projects within shoreline jurisdiction will require a shoreline review. Generally, when a shoreline use or development is in an area with known archaeological artifacts, or with a low-moderate to high probability to contain archaeological artifacts based on the state's predictive model, and the potential impact of the use or development is considered a significant risk to the archaeological artifacts that may be present, then the applicant shall provide for a site inspection and evaluation by a professional archaeologist prior to issuance of any shoreline permit or approval.

- d. Proposed measures to avoid, minimize, or compensate for loss, changes to, and disturbance to resources. Please include plans for the above and any permits that may be required.**

This is a non-project action. Site-specific measures and any mitigation measures will be developed during the shoreline review process, if needed.

14. Transportation

- a. Identify public streets and highways serving the site or affected geographic area, and describe proposed access to the existing street system. Show on site plans, if any.**

This is a non-project action. Development projects within shoreline jurisdiction will require a shoreline review.

- b. Is the site or affected geographic area currently served by public transit? If so, generally describe. If not, what is the approximate distance to the nearest transit stop?**

This is a non-project action. Development projects within shoreline jurisdiction will require a shoreline review.

- c. How many additional parking spaces would the completed project or non-project proposal have? How many would the project or proposal eliminate?**

This is a non-project action. Development projects within shoreline jurisdiction will require a shoreline review.

- d. Will the proposal require any new or improvements to existing roads, streets, pedestrian, bicycle or state transportation facilities, not including driveways? If so, generally describe (indicate whether public or private).**

This is a non-project action. Development projects within shoreline jurisdiction will require a shoreline review.

- e. Will the project or proposal use (or occur in the immediate vicinity of) water, rail, or air transportation? If so, generally describe.**

This is a non-project action. Shoreline jurisdiction is typically in the immediate vicinity of water. Development projects within shoreline jurisdiction will require a shoreline review.

- f. How many vehicular trips per day would be generated by the completed project or proposal? If known, indicate when peak volumes would occur and what percentage of the volume would be trucks (such as commercial and non-passenger vehicles). What data or transportation models were used to make these estimates?**

This is a non-project action. Development projects within shoreline jurisdiction will require a shoreline review.

- g. Will the proposal interfere with, affect or be affected by the movement of agricultural and forest products on roads or streets in the area? If so, generally describe.**

This is a non-project action. Development projects within shoreline jurisdiction will require a shoreline review.

- h. Proposed measures to reduce or control transportation impacts, if any:**

Development projects within shoreline jurisdiction will require a shoreline review. Site-specific measures and any mitigation measures will be developed during the shoreline review process, if needed.

15. Public Services

- a. **Would the project result in an increased need for public services (for example: fire protection, police protection, health care, schools, other)? If so, generally describe.**

This is a non-project action. Development projects within shoreline jurisdiction will require a shoreline review.

- b. **Proposed measures to reduce or control direct impacts on public services, if any.**

This is a non-project action. Site-specific measures and any mitigation measures will be developed during the shoreline review process, if needed.

16. Utilities

- a. **Circle utilities currently available at the site: electricity, natural gas, water, refuse service, telephone, sanitary sewer, septic system, other.**


This is a non-project action. Development projects within shoreline jurisdiction will require a shoreline review.

- b. **Describe the utilities that are proposed for the project, the utility providing the service, and the general construction activities on the site or in the immediate vicinity which might be needed.**

This is a non-project action. Development projects within shoreline jurisdiction will require a shoreline review.

C. SIGNATURE

The above answers are true and complete to the best of my knowledge. I understand that the lead agency is relying on them to make its decision.

Signature: 
Name of signee: Jenna Kay
Position and Agency/Organization: Planner II, Clark County
Date Submitted: 1/21/2020

D. SUPPLEMENTAL SHEET FOR NONPROJECT ACTIONS

Because these questions are very general, it may be helpful to read them in conjunction with the list of the elements of the environment. When answering these questions, be aware of the extent of the proposal, or the types of activities likely to result from the

proposal, would affect the item at a greater intensity or at a faster rate than if the proposal were not implemented. Respond briefly and in general terms.

1. How would the proposal be likely to increase discharge to water; emissions to air; production, storage, or release of toxic or hazardous substances; or production of noise?

Adoption of the proposed amendment to the SMP would not have a direct impact on discharges to water; emissions to air; production, storage, or release of toxic or hazardous substances; or production of noise. The current SMP for Clark County contains provisions restricting such or regulating these types of emissions. Additionally, any development within shoreline jurisdiction would be required to comply with all local, state and federal regulations and standards.

Proposed measures to avoid or reduce such increases are:

None

2. How would the proposal be likely to affect plants, animals, fish or marine life?

This amendment proposal incorporates updated county critical areas protection ordinances into the existing SMP. Generally, the proposed amendment to the SMP provides updated policies and regulations to afford a greater level of protection for the shoreline environment.

Existing SMP regulations protect plants, fish and other animals and habitats by requiring development to first avoid impacts to fish and wildlife habitat, wetlands, frequently flooded areas and geologic hazard areas. Where impacts are unavoidable, they must be minimized and then mitigated to ensure no net loss of functions.

For the areas of the shoreline jurisdiction map that are proposed to be removed from shoreline jurisdiction: any critical areas that fall outside of shoreline jurisdiction would be protected through the county critical areas code regulations (chapters 40.410 through 40.450).

Proposed measures to avoid or reduce such increases are:

None

3. How would the proposal be likely to deplete energy or natural resources?

The proposed amendment would not deplete energy or natural resources.

Proposed measures to avoid or reduce such increases are:

None

- 4. How would the proposal be likely to use or affect environmentally sensitive areas or areas designated (or eligible or under study) for governmental protection: such as parks, wilderness, wild and scenic rivers, threatened or endangered species habitat, historic or cultural sites, wetlands, floodplains, or prime farmlands?**

No development is proposed at this time. Site plans for any proposed development will be prepared and submitted at a future time. Future applications will be reviewed for compliance with applicable ordinances and code sections including habitat, wetlands, historic/archaeology, etc.

This amendment proposal incorporates updated county critical areas protection ordinances into the existing SMP. Generally, the proposed amendment to the SMP provides updated policies and regulations to afford a greater level of protection for the shoreline environment.

- 5. How would the proposal be likely to affect land and shoreline use, including whether it would allow or encourage land or shoreline uses incompatible with existing plans?**

This proposal includes amendments to the shoreline designation map. In developing the proposed amendment to the SMP, the comprehensive plan and the existing zoning were taken into consideration. The proposal is designed to be compatible with existing plans.

- 6. How would the proposal be likely to increase demands on transportation or public services and utilities?**

There are no expected changes to the demands on transportation or public services and utilities from this proposal.

- 7. Identify, if possible, whether the proposal may conflict with local, state, or federal laws or requirements for the protection of the environment.**

Care has been taken to ensure that the provisions of the proposed amendment to the SMP will not conflict with other local, state, or federal laws or requirements for the protection of the environment. In many cases, existing state and local requirements are built into or cited in the SMP. Where conflicts do occur, the current SMP provides that the regulations providing the most protection to the environment will prevail.

From: [Sonja Wiser](#)
To: [Jenna Kay](#)
Subject: FW: CPZ2019-00030: Clark County Shoreline Master Program Periodic Review
Date: Wednesday, January 29, 2020 11:33:12 AM
Attachments: [image007.png](#)

From: Shaun Dinubilo [mailto:sdinubilo@squaxin.us]
Sent: Wednesday, January 29, 2020 8:57 AM
To: Sonja Wiser
Subject: [Contains External Hyperlinks] RE: CPZ2019-00030: Clark County Shoreline Master Program Periodic Review

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.

Hi Sonja,

Thank you for contacting the Squaxin Island Tribe Cultural Resources Department regarding the above listed project for our review and comment. This project is outside the Squaxin Island Tribe's traditional area and we do not need any further consultation for this project.



Shaun Dinubilo
Archaeologist
CR Department
Squaxin Island Tribe
200 S.E. Billy Frank Jr. Way
Shelton, WA 98584
Office Phone: 360-432-3998
Cell Phone: 360-870-6324
Email: sdinubilo@squaxin.us

From: Rhonda Foster
Sent: Tuesday, January 28, 2020 12:46 PM
To: Sonja Wiser <Sonja.Wiser@clark.wa.gov>; Shaun Dinubilo <sdinubilo@squaxin.us>
Cc: Rhonda Foster <rfoster@squaxin.us>
Subject: RE: CPZ2019-00030: Clark County Shoreline Master Program Periodic Review

Starting August 6th, 2019 our new archaeologist, Shaun Dinubilo will be reviewing and commenting on all projects for the Cultural Resources

Department at the Squaxin Island Tribe. Please send all project review requests to him in the future. I am forwarding this to him now.

Thank you



Rhonda Foster
CR Director, THPO
CR Department
Squaxin Island Tribe
200 S.E. Billy Frank Jr. Way
Shelton, WA 98584
D 360-432-3850
rfoster@squaxin.us

Email is my preferred method of communication

From: Sonja Wiser [<mailto:Sonja.Wiser@clark.wa.gov>]

Sent: Tuesday, January 28, 2020 8:26 AM

Cc: Jenna Kay <Jenna.Kay@clark.wa.gov>

Subject: CPZ2019-00030: Clark County Shoreline Master Program Periodic Review

Subject: CPZ2019-00030: Clark County Shoreline Master Program Periodic Review

A full copy of the shoreline periodic review proposal is available at:

<https://www.clark.wa.gov/smp2020>.

CPZ2019-00030: Clark County Shoreline Master Program Periodic Review

Comments are due by: **February 27, 2020**

Staff Contact: Jenna Kay

Email: jenna.kay@clark.wa.gov

Phone: 564-397-4968



Sonja Wiser
Program Assistant
COMMUNITY PLANNING

360.397.2280 ext 4558



This e-mail and related attachments and any response may be subject to public disclosure under state law.



Nisqually Indian Tribe
4820 She-Nah-Num Dr. S.E.
Olympia, WA 98513
(360) 456-5221

February 4, 2020

Mr. Oliver Orijako, Director
Clark County Community Planning
1300 Franklin St., 3rd Floor
Vancouver, WA 98666

Dear Mr. McCormick,

The Nisqually Indian Tribe thanks you for the opportunity to comment on:

Re: CPZ2019-00030: Clark County Shoreline Master Program Periodic Review

The Nisqually Indian Tribe has reviewed the SEPA Determination of Nonsignificance that was provided for the above-named project and has no further information or concerns at this time. Please keep us informed if there are any Inadvertent Discoveries of Archaeological Resources/Human Burials.

Sincerely,

Brad Beach
THPO Department
360-456-5221 ext 1277
beach.brad@nisqually-nsn.gov

Annette "Nettsie" Bullchild
THPO Department
360-456-5221 ext 1106
bullchild.annette@nisqually-nsn.gov

Jeremy "Badoldman" Perkuhn
THPO Department
360-456-5221 ext 1274
badoldman.jp@nisqually-nsn.gov

From: [Sonja Wiser](#)
Cc: [Jenna Kay](#)
Bcc: ["Judy Zeider"; "Richard Young"; "Shawn Yanity"; "Doug Woodruff"; Sonja Wiser; "Jerry Winters"; "Jerry Winters"; "Doug Wilson"; "Denise Wilhelm"; "John Wiley"; "Robert Whitlam"; "Mark White"; "Bill White"; "Steve West"; "Purchase Wenonah"; "Steven T. Webb"; "Denny Waters"; "Leroy Ward"; "s wall"; "Jackie Wall"; "Jude Wait"; Florence Wager; "Tyson Vogeler"; "Tami Villalobos"; "Tami Villalobos"; "Gibson Vickie"; "Dave Vial"; "Kirk VanGelder"; "Kim Van Zwalenburg"; "Lynn Valenter"; "Kate Valdez"; "Tim Trohimovich"; "Teresa Torres"; Rebecca Messinger; "Richard Till"; "Kristen Tiede"; "Jeffrey Thomas"; "Mary Templeton"; "Eric Temple"; "mike taylor"; "David Taylor"; "Nick Swinart"; Rod Swanson; "Jeff Swanson"; "George Swanaset Jr."; "Dana Sutherland"; "Fred Suter"; "Benjamin Surmi"; "Ron Suppah"; "Truman Sturdevant"; "Kim Stube"; "Steve Stuart"; "John Straub"; "Alan Stewart"; "A Stewart"; "Kaiser Steve"; "Burdick Stephen"; "Susan Steinbrenner"; "Sue Steinbrenner"; "Joe Steinbrenner"; "Joe Steinbrenner"; "Gretchen Starke"; "Gretchen Starke"; "Judie Stanton"; "Lua Stanek"; "Ila Stanek"; "Ila Stanek"; "Firestone Stan"; "Chuck Stambaugh-Bowey"; Cnty Health CCPH LandUse; "Maria Southgate"; Sorenson, Scott; "Dave Socolofsky"; Snodgrass, Bryan; "Terry Smith"; "Terry Smith"; "Carolyn Smith"; "Haak Skip"; "Lynn Simpson"; "Robin Shoal"; "Stacey Shields"; "Bridget Schwarz"; "Scott Schuyler"; "Elizabeth Schober"; "Tricia Schimpp"; "J Scheldorf"; "Howard Schaller"; "Lourdes Schaard"; "Paul Scarpelli"; "Earngy Sanstrom"; "Wood Sandy and"; "Suhas Sakhalkar"; "Langstraat Ruth"; "Sutter Russ and"; "Devan Rostorfer"; "Mark Ross"; "Heidi Rosenberg"; "Ferguson Rosemary"; "McRae Rosalee"; "Ellen Rogers"; "Bambi Rodriguez"; "Des Rochers Laurie"; "A Roberts"; "Souher Robert"; "David Ripp"; "David Ripp"; "David Ripp"; "Brandon Reynon"; "Nathan Reynolds"; "SEPA REVIEW"; "County Reporters"; "Lisa Renan"; "Megan Reed"; Tina Redline; "Nick Redinger"; Matt Ransom; "Craig Rackline"; "David Quirk"; "Stormy Purser"; "Kelly Puntene"; "Wendy Probstfield"; "Randall Printz"; "Randall Printz"; "Pitel"; "John Peterson"; "John Peterson"; "Judith Perez"; "Samuel Penney"; "Dan Penn"; "Roscoe Paul and"; "William Ostrander"; "adam Osbekoff"; "Zorah Oppenheimer"; Ron Onslow; "Ike Nwankwo"; "Ike Nwanko"; "SEPA Notifications"; "Mike Norris"; "John Nohr"; "Evan Neptune"; "Skinner Neno"; "Charlene Nelson"; "Kathy Neary"; "Christine Myers"; "Barbara Murray"; "Barbara Murray"; "Laura Murphy"; "Steve Mullen"; "Rebecca Morris"; "David Morgan"; "Shawn Moore"; "Antone Minthorn"; Alice Millward; "mp mills"; "John Mills"; "Latasha Miller"; "Kris Miller"; "Carey Miller"; "Aaron Miles"; "Tara Milburn"; "Roxanne Mikaeletupua"; "Christine Meyers"; "Michael Merlino"; "Jordan Mercier"; "Johnson Meninick"; "Johnson Meninick"; "Joe Melo"; "Barbara Meisenheimer"; "Mike Means"; "Sharleen & Dave Meadows"; "Anne McNamara"; "Sean McGill"; "Mark McCuddy"; "Nathan McCann"; Marilee McCall; "Robert Maul"; "Robert Maul"; "Dan Matlock"; "Pam Mason"; "Martha Martin"; "Martin Martha"; "Danny K Marshall"; "Steve Marshal"; "Petersen Marley"; "Childs Marlene"; "Campbell Maria and"; "Steven Manlow"; "Ryan Makinster"; "Ryan Mackinster"; "Kerry Lyste"; "Kevin Lyons"; "Jason Lyon"; "Van Luvanee Don"; "Patti Lundgren"; "Andrew lundgren"; "Cheryl Luce"; "Handlos Lloyd"; "Mather Linda"; "Dretzman Linda"; "Dennis Lewarch"; "Benjamin Levy"; "Carol Levanen"; "Rhonda Letterman"; "Jason Lehto"; "Jerry Lehman"; Patrick Lee; "Connolly Larry"; "Christopher Lapp"; "Jacqueline Lane"; "Kent C. Landerholm"; "Ted Labbe"; "Ted Labbe"; "Marc Krsul"; "Gano Kristi"; "Manoj Kripalani"; "Russell Knutson"; "Larry Knight"; "Mitch Kneipp"; "Mitch Kneipp"; "Tom Knappenberger"; Rob Klug; "Randy Kline"; "Denny Kiggins"; "English Kenneth"; "Jennifer Keene"; "Justin Keeler"; "Dennis Karnopp"; "Norma Joseph"; "Ben Joseph"; "Kelley Jorgensen"; "Moon Joon and"; "Moon Joon and"; "Kevin Jolma"; "Todd Johnson"; "Roy Johnson"; "Sharp Jodie"; "Belston Jessi"; "Sowder Jerry and"; "Larry Jennings"; "Mark Jeffries"; "Joseph Jefferson"; "Long Jason and"; "Baldwin Jan"; "Justine James"; Jackson, Mike; "Dode Jackson"; "Scott J."; "James Huinker"; "Robert Hubenthal"; "James Howsley"; "James Howsley"; "Todd Horenstein"; "Dave Holmes"; "Kathy Hoime"; "Wuanita Herron"; "Lynne Hermanson"; "Pfleger Herbert"; "Don Hardy"; "Rex Hapala"; "Steve Hansen"; "Cecile Hansen"; "Ken Handley"; "Tim Halme"; "Jennifer Halleck"; "Jennifer Halleck"; "Jennifer Halleck"; "Vicki Hall"; "Serin Hale"; "Eric Hale"; "Roland Haerti"; "Ken Hadley"; "Dan Guy"; "Suzanne Grover"; "Brent Grening"; Green, Jerry External; "Jode Goudy"; "Travis Goddard"; "Little Gina"; "David Gilroy"; "Lydia Gherman"; "Fritz Gerry"; "Rich Georgina"; "Louisa Garbo"; "Eric Fuller"; "Jill Friedman"; "Ricky Frasier"; "Sarah Fox"; "Rhonda Foster"; "Ed Forbes"; "Hugo Flores"; "Bob Fleischmann"; "Vicki Fitzsimmons"; "Vicki Fitzsimmons"; "Christy Finnie"; "Jackie Ferry"; "Mark R. Feichtinger"; "Teara Farrow"; "Lakeside Estates"; "Steve Erickson"; "Erin Erdman"; "Roger Entrekin"; "Roger Entrekin"; "Ken English"; "J Eldridge"; "Eric Eisemann"; Eiken, Chad; "Ralph Edwards"; "Richard Dyrland"; "Dick Dyrland"; "Dennis R. Dykes"; "Nolan Don and Deb"; "Hardy Don"; "Cody Dickman"; "Pratt Dennis and"; "Earl Davis"; Brent Davis; "Page David and"; "Yang David"; Lynda David; "Beck David"; "Casey Dale"; "Markeis Dabney"; "Harvey Cyndi"; "Garrett Curt"; "Sam Crummett"; Cothron, Cayla; Cothron, Cayla; Christine Cook; Conley, Ashley; "Mark Collier"; "Mark Cline"; "Wendy Cleveland"; "Jim Clapp"; "Public Library City of Camas"; "Hu Chester"; "Chris Chandler"; "Neil Chambers"; "Neil Chambers"; "Doug Cashen"; "Lisa Cartwright"; "Julie Carter"; "Amber Carter"; "Gallas Caroline"; Carnes, Mike; Carlson, Linda; Campos, Jennifer; "Larry Campbell"; "Andrea Cameron"; "Patty Cam"; "Wilson Cady"; "Barb Cabe"; "Jim Byrne"; "Bob Butler"; "Smith Buster and"; "Bobby Burns"; "Dave Burlingame"; "Dave Burlingame"; "Ken Burgstahler"; "Judy Bumbarger-Enright"; "Annette Bullchild"; "Rex Buck"; "Robert Brunoe"; "Doug Brumfield"; "Watson Bruce and"; "Brown Bruce"; "Christie BrownSilva"; "Christie BrownSilva"; "Cgrustue BrownSilva"; "Bob Brink"; "Tim Brewer"; "George Brereton"; "Naomi Brandenfels"; "Patty Boyden"; "Patty Boyden"; "Gary Bowles"; "Phil Bourquin"; "Phil Bourquin"; "Kena Boer"; "Young Bob and Sue"; "Nicholson Bob"; "Fleischmann Bob"; "Iou Klathlee"; "Bill Bjerke"; "Sally Bird"; "Dygart Bill"; "Streif Bianca"; Jo Anne Berg; "Sandra Bennett"; "Keith Bellisle"; "Tofte Belinda"; "Bradley Beach"; "Jeff Barsness"; "Baker Barry and"; "Doug Ballou"; "Jennifer Baker"; "Jennifer Baker"; "Jennifer Baker"; "Keith Pat Baird"; "Ran Baier"; "Jon Babcock"; "Douglas Babcock"; "Proebstel Neighborhood Association"; Gordon Brooks; "Angela Arnett"; "Joe Arndt"; "Jill April"; "Randy Anrahamson"; "Milada Allen"; "Milada Allen"; "Marnie Allen"; "Erin Allee"; "Jon Alldrift"; Gary Albrecht; "Jackson Al and"; "Houston Aho"; "Stephan Abramson"; "Barb Aberle"; "Taylor Aalvik"; Eldred, Chris; "Steve & Nikki"; "Audrey & Brint"; "Tribal Historic Office"; "Tom King"; "SWCA"; "Norris"; "Judy"; "jessie"; "Development Review"; Curtis Eavenson; "Christie"; "CCAR"; "Broad water"; "Blackman"; "andrew"; Corrie Guardino; "Woodland School District #404"; City Parks and Recreation; "Port of Vancouver"; "Nisqually Indian Tribe"; "KPDx Fox 49"; "Cowlitz Indian Tribe"; "Cowlitz Indian"; "Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs"; "Confederated Tribes of Grand](#)

[Ronde](#)"; ["Confederated"](#); ["Confederated"](#); ["Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission"](#); ["Columbia River"](#); ["Chinook Nation/Indian Country"](#); ["Chehalis Tribal Council"](#)

Subject: CPZ2019-00030: Clark County Shoreline Master Program Periodic Review
Date: Tuesday, January 28, 2020 8:26:26 AM
Attachments: [SEPA DNS and Checklist - SMP Periodic Review.pdf](#)

Subject: CPZ2019-00030: Clark County Shoreline Master Program Periodic Review

A full copy of the shoreline periodic review proposal is available at:

<https://www.clark.wa.gov/smp2020>.

CPZ2019-00030: Clark County Shoreline Master Program Periodic Review

Comments are due by: **February 27, 2020**

Staff Contact: Jenna Kay

Email: jenna.kay@clark.wa.gov

Phone: 564-397-4968



Sonja Wisner
Program Assistant
COMMUNITY PLANNING

360.397.2280 ext 4558



The Columbian

P.O. Box 180 • Vancouver, WA 98666-0180
 Questions regarding this Statement
 Call: (360) 735-4432
 From Portland Call: 800-743-3391

BILLING PERIOD		ADVERTISER/CLIENT NAME	
01/28/2020 - 01/28/2020		CLARK CTY COMMUNITY PLANNING	
TOTAL AMOUNT DUE	INVOICE NUMBER	TERMS OF PAYMENT	
81.60	18951		

LEGAL INVOICE

PAGE #	BILLING DATE	BILLED ACCOUNT NUMBER	ADVERTISER/CLIENT NUMBER
1	01/28/2020	70914	70914

BILLED ACCOUNT NAME AND ADDRESS

CLARK CTY COMMUNITY PLANNING-L
 PO BOX 9810
 VANCOUVER WA 98666-9810

REMITTANCE ADDRESS

THE COLUMBIAN
 P.O. BOX 180
 VANCOUVER WA 98666-0180

PLEASE DETACH AND RETURN UPPER PORTION WITH YOUR REMITTANCE

DATE	NEWSPAPER REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION-OTHER COMMENTS/CHARGES	SAU SIZE BILLED UNITS	TIMES RUN RATE	GROSS AMOUNT	NET AMOUNT
01/28/20	Ad: 350690	CLASSIFIED CL DNS: CPZ2019-00030 [01/28/20] Balance Due: <i>Shorelines</i> <i>9000</i> <i>PG 0428</i> <i>9120000084</i> <i>A018111</i>	1x4	1 LEGAL CL	81.60	81.60
						<u>81.60</u>

REC0000017797

New Payment Option for our Customer!

Visit payments.columbian.com for a quick and easy payment option. All you need is your account number and a credit/debit card! For customers who have not paid Columbian/C-W Post invoices with a credit card in the past, please call (360) 735-4432 to set up your initial online payment.

PLEASE PAY THIS AMOUNT ▶

81.60

AN ADDITIONAL \$25.00 WILL BE CHARGED FOR ANY RETURNED CHECK.
 FED I.D. #91-0452320 D.U.N.S. #00-905-1632

INVOICE NUMBER	ADVERTISER INFORMATION			
	BILLING PERIOD	BILLED ACCOUNT NUMBER	ADVERTISER/CLIENT NUMBER	ADVERTISER/CLIENT NAME
18951	01/28/2020 - 01/28/2020	70914	70914	CLARK CTY COMMUNITY PLANNING

**Affidavit of Publication
STATE OF WASHINGTON**

County of Clark

)
)
)

ss:

COLUMBIAN

CLARK CTY COMMUNITY PLANNING-L
PO BOX 9810
VANCOUVER WA 98666-9810

REFERENCE:


0000070914
0000350690 DNS: CPZ2019-00030

I, the undersigned say,
That I am over the age of eighteen and not interested in the above entitled matter; that I am now, and at all times embraced in the publication herein mentioned, was, the principal clerk of the printer of The Columbian, a daily newspaper printed, published and circulated in the said county and adjudged a newspaper of general circulation by the Superior Court of the County of Clark, State of Washington, under Proceeding No. 802006715; that the advertisement, of which the annexed is a true printed copy, was published in the above-named newspaper on the following dates, To wit:

PUBLISHED ON 01/28/2020.
TOTAL COST: 81.60
FILED ON: 01/28/2020

I Certify (or declare) under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Signature _____



NOTICE OF DETERMINATION OF NON SIGNIFICANCE (DNS)
NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the following proposal has been determined to have no probable significant adverse impact on the environment, and that an environmental impact statement is not required under RCW 43.21C.030(2)(c). Written comments on the following proposal, or DNS, may be submitted to the Responsible Official by **February 27, 2020**.
DESCRIPTION:
CPZ2019-00030: Clark County Shoreline Master Program Periodic Review
This proposal is a non-project action per WAC 197-11-704(2)(b). Clark County is undertaking a periodic review of its Shoreline Master Program, as required by the Washington State Shoreline Management Act, RCW 90.58.080(4). The proposed amendments are to keep the Shoreline Master Program current with changes in state law, changes in other county plans and regulations, and are responsive to changed circumstances and new information. The proposal would amend the Clark County Comprehensive Growth Management Plan 2015-2035 Shoreline Master Program chapter and associated appendices, Clark County Code Chapter 40.460 Shoreline Master Program regulations, and the Shoreline Master Program map.
ACTION REQUESTED: Clark County is proposing to amend the Clark County Comprehensive Growth Management Plan 2015-2035 Shoreline Master Program chapter and associated appendices, Clark County Code Chapter 40.460 Shoreline Master Program regulations, and the Shoreline Master Program map.
RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL:
Oliver Orijako,
Director Community Planning
PO Box 9810
Vancouver WA 98666-9810
oliver.oriako@clark.wa.gov
Jan. 28 - 350690

NOTICE OF DETERMINATION OF NON SIGNIFICANCE (DNS)

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the following proposal has been determined to have no probable significant adverse impact on the environment, and that an environmental impact statement is not required under RCW 43.21C.030(2)(c). Written comments on the following proposal, or DNS, may be submitted to the Responsible Official by **February 27, 2020**.

DESCRIPTION:**CPZ2019-00030: Clark County Shoreline Master Program Periodic Review**

This proposal is a non-project action per WAC 197-11-704(2)(b). Clark County is undertaking a periodic review of its Shoreline Master Program, as required by the Washington State Shoreline Management Act, RCW 90.58.080(4). The proposed amendments are to keep the Shoreline Master Program current with changes in state law, changes in other county plans and regulations, and are responsive to changed circumstances and new information. The proposal would amend the Clark County Comprehensive Growth Management Plan 2015-2035 Shoreline Master Program chapter and associated appendices, Clark County Code Chapter 40.460 Shoreline Master Program regulations, and the Shoreline Master Program map.

ACTION REQUESTED: Clark County is proposing to amend the Clark County Comprehensive Growth Management Plan 2015-2035 Shoreline Master Program chapter and associated appendices, Clark County Code Chapter 40.460 Shoreline Master Program regulations, and the Shoreline Master Program map.

RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL:

Oliver Orjiako, Director Community Planning
PO Box 9810
Vancouver WA 98666-9810
oliver.orjiako@clark.wa.gov

BILL TO:

Sonja Wiser, Program Assistant
Clark County Community Planning
PO Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666-
9810 (360) 397-2280 ext.
4558
Sonja.wiser@clark.wa.gov

PUBLICATION DATE: Tuesday January 28, 2020

PLEASE E-MAIL OR CALL TO CONFIRM RECEIPT AND PUBLICATION DATE



The Chronicle 360-807-8203

SHORELINE VALLEY NEWS 360-458-2681

The Reflector 360-687-5151

Classified Advertising & Legal Invoice

**CLARK COUNTY COMMUNITY PLANNING
PO BOX 9810
VANCOUVER, WA 98666**

**Acct#:29111269
Ad#:113310
Phone#:360-397-2375
Date:01/21/2020**

Salesperson: CINDYT

Classification: Legal Notices

Ad Size: 1.0 x 229.00

Advertisement Information:

Description	Start	Stop	Ins.	Cost/Day	Total
REFLECTOR CLASSIFIED	01/29/2020	01/29/2020	1	74.25	74.25

Payment Information:

Date: 01/21/2020 Order#: 113310 Type: ACCOUNT

**Total Amount: 74.25
Amount Due: 74.25**

Comments: 113310 Notice of DNS

Attention: Please return the top portion of this invoice with your payment including account and ad number.

Ad Copy

*Shoreline
Grant*

AFFIDAVIT OF PUBLICATION STATE OF WASHINGTON COUNTY OF CLARK

Kailyn Sawyer, and/or Cindy Thayer, and/or Alysa Andrews says that she is the legal clerk of

The Reflector

a weekly newspaper, which has been established, published in the English language, and circulated continuously as a weekly newspaper in the City of Battle Ground, and in Clark County, Washington, general circulation in said county for more than six (6) months prior to the date of the first publication of the notice hereto attached, and that The Reflector is an approved legal newspaper by the Superior Court of said Clark County. And that the attached is a true copy and was published in regular issues (and not in supplement form) of said newspaper as LEGAL # 113310 RE:113310 Notice of DNS

once each week for a period of 1 week(s)


commencing on 01/29/2020 and ending on 01/29/2020

and both regularly distributed to its subscribers during all of said period. That the full amount of the fee charged for the foregoing publication is the sum of \$ 74.25

Cindy Thayer
Subscribed and sworn to before me on 01/29/2020
Ronda Barr

Notary Public in and for the State of Washington,
residing at

Chenakis



113310 Notice of DNS NOTICE OF DETERMINATION OF NON SIGNIFICANCE (DNS)

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the following proposal has been determined to have no probable significant adverse impact on the environment, and that an environmental impact statement is not required under RCW 43.21C.030(2)(c). Written comments on the following proposal, or DNS, may be submitted to the Responsible Official by February 27, 2020.

DESCRIPTION:

CPZ2019-00030: Clark County Shoreline Master Program Periodic Review

This proposal is a non-project action per WAC 197-11-704(2)(b). Clark County is undertaking a periodic review of its Shoreline Master Program, as required by the Washington State Shoreline Management Act, RCW 90.58.080(4). The proposed amendments are to keep the Shoreline Master Program current with changes in state law, changes in other county plans and regulations, and are responsive to changed circumstances and new information. The proposal would amend the Clark County Comprehensive Growth Management Plan 2015-2035 Shoreline Master Program chapter and associated appendices, Clark County Code Chapter 40.460 Shoreline Master Program regulations, and the Shoreline Master Program map.

ACTION REQUESTED: Clark County is proposing to amend the Clark County Comprehensive Growth Management Plan 2015-2035 Shoreline Master Program chapter and associated appendices, Clark County Code Chapter 40.460 Shoreline Master Program regulations, and the Shoreline Master Program map.

RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL:
Oliver Orjiako, Director
Community Planning
PO Box 9810
Vancouver WA 98666-9810
oliver.orjiako@clark.wa.gov

Published: The Reflector
January 29, 2020